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CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Overview

The chapter provides a review of the literature relevant to this study. The first part of the chapter begins with a review of literature on employee turnover and the most consistent and discussed employee turnover antecedents. The second part examines the employee retention issues and various retention factors. Then, the third part provides a description on the teacher turnover and retention issues. It also highlights the factors affecting teacher turnover and consequences of teacher turnover. Finally, the chapter presents a review of turnover and retention studies in Indian context. The chapter concludes with identifying problem areas and research gaps in the existing literature on employee turnover and retention in general and on teacher turnover and retention issues in Indian context to be specific.

2.1 Employee Turnover: An Overview

Employee turnovers, as defined by Horn and Griffeth (1995), are "voluntary terminations of members from organizations" (p.1). Employee turnover is the rotation of workers around the labor market, between firms, jobs and occupations, and between the states of employment and unemployment (Abassi & Hollman, 2000). It can also be defined as the "individual movement across the membership boundary of an organization" (Price, 2001: p. 600). The concept "individual" refers to the employees within an organization and the notion of movement can be interpreted either as an accession or a separation of the company. In other words, employee turnover is the movement of labor out of and into a working organization (Lashley, 2000). Turnover is referred as an individual’s estimated probability that they will stay in an employing organization (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). Explicitly or implicitly, turnover research posits that individuals independently decide to leave their organization, regardless of whether antecedents to their decision are individual or

In turnover literature, authors had also used other labels for turnover, such as quits, attrition, exits, mobility, migration or succession (Morrell et al., 2004). Since, it is very important to distinguish between cases where individuals have decided to leave and cases where they had to leave, as well as ignoring the reasons why they leave; the three fundamental characteristics of turnover were discussed by Morrell et al. (2001) viz. voluntariness, avoidability and functionality. It should be emphasized that this study's concern would be the voluntary form of turnover.

Voluntary turnover is a major problem for organizations in many Asian countries such as Hong Kong, China, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Taiwan (Barnett, 1995; Chang, 1996; Mac Lachlan, 1996; Syrett, 1994). Similarly, employee turnover is very prevalent in India as well (Abdul Rahman et al., 2008; Ramachandran et al., 2011). In voluntary turnover, an employee leaves the organization of his own free choice with some of the possible reasons being: low salary, job dissatisfaction or better job opportunities elsewhere whereas involuntary turnover takes effect when the organization makes the decision to remove an employee due to poor performance or economic crisis (Aksu, 2004). In addition, Price (2001) said that voluntary turnover can be termed as 'avoidable' turnover and involuntary turnover as 'unavoidable' turnover. For most part, voluntary turnover is treated as a managerial problem that requires attention, thus its theory has the premise that people leave if they are unhappy with their jobs and job alternatives are available (Hom & Kimicki, 2001). Thereof, most studies have focused on voluntary rather than involuntary turnover (Wright, 1993).

2.1.1 The Cost of Employee Turnover

A low level of employee turnover is normal and healthy in any occupation, in that it offsets potential stagnancy, eliminates low performers, and encourages innovation with the insertion of new blood (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). However, high levels of employee turnover lead to low performance and ineffectiveness in organizations, and
result in a number of costs and negative consequences. According to Mobley (1982), the most frequently studied organizational influence of turnover is monetary cost. The cost, both direct and indirect, can vary substantially between and within organizations (Rothwell, 1992). Abbasi and Hollman (2000) sought to determine the impact of employee turnover on organizations and found that excessive employee turnover often engenders far-reaching consequences and, at the extreme, may jeopardize efforts to attain organizational objectives. Many researchers found high turnover rates might have negative effects on the profitability of organizations (Aksu, 2004; Hinkin & Tracey, 2001; Kaak et al., 1998). The financial impact of turnover is usually expressed in monetary terms. Cascio in 1991 made the most significant contribution in this respect, discussing the extent to which turnover cost are important (Tziner & Birati, 1996). Table 2.1 illustrates his model that consists of categories of expenses. According to Cascio, the summation of the components of the three major categories should constitute the expense of an employee turnover (Tziner & Birati, 1996: p.114). Norton (1999) explains that replacing employees costs 25% of each person's salary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: Categories of Expense Associated with Turnover Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The costs incurred for exit interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative functions related to termination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separation/severance pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replacement Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advertising position availability in various media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entrance interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Holding decision making meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Norms of conduct and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disseminating relevant information for organizational socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation in on-the-job training activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Johnson (1981) viewed turnover as problematic for the industry, affecting the quality of products and services and incurring considerable replacement and recruitment costs. Examples from prior research reveal the incredible cost incurred in losing critical employees. For example, in one study (Hale, 1998), employers cited recruitment costs of 50 to 60% of an employee's first year's salary and up to 100% for certain specialized, high-skill positions. In another study, Fitz-enz (1997) indicated
that when direct and indirect costs are combined, the total turnover cost of an exempt
employee is a minimum of one year's pay and benefits, or a maximum of two years' 
pay and benefits. Also, earlier researches have concluded that people who leave are 
those who are most talented (e.g. Hinkin & Tracey, 2000). It is extremely difficult to 
place exact estimates on the total financial impact of labor turnover, particularly as 
lost intellectual capital is almost immeasurable (Fitz-enz & Phillips, 1998). The issue 
of quality is highlighted when someone unfamiliar with the tasks takes on the vacant 
position. It takes a long time to learn a new job and ranges from 54 to 80 days to reach 
an acceptable level of competence (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000). The American 
Management Association (1997) reports the costs of the loss of a knowledge worker 
at between six and eighteen months salary. Branch (1998) believes the cost to be 
150% of the departing person's salary.

Elevated rates of teacher turnover are costly in the recruitment, hiring, and training of 
new personnel (Brewster & Railsback, 2001; Chapman & Green, 1986; Shen, 1997). 
According to Hunt and Carroll (2002, p. 8) “This churning staff turnover keeps school 
administrators scrambling to find replacements, and in too many cases quality 
teaching is compromised in an effort to find a sufficient number of warm bodies to 
staff the classrooms. In the wake of this turmoil, student achievement declines”.

The high price tag of teacher turnover does not include the cost of what Kastelic calls 
“the loss of intellectual capital” (Eltorre, 1997, p. 4). However, the issue of quality 
cannot be ignored when dealing with employee turnover. Curtis and Wright (2001) 
stated that “high turnover can damage factors such as quality and customer service 
which provide competitive advantage, thereby inhibiting business growth or even 
causing a decline in the level of business”. It is often said that the people who leave 
are those who are most talented (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000). Turnover besides causing a 
talent deficit in an organization, also ends up in the valuable talent moving to 
competing entities (Stovcl & Bontis, 2002). Studies have found that teachers leaving 
the profession were more gifted academically and were more qualified than those who 
stayed (Chapman & Green, 1986; Halford, 1998; Henke et al., 2000; Heyns, 1988; 
found that 67.7% of the 108 teachers who had voluntarily withdrawn from teaching had average to superior performance ratings by their principals.

2.1.2 Turnover Process Models

Several studies were already conducted that focused on developing and estimating a causal model specifying the factors of voluntary turnover. Five important turnover models/studies were identified from the extant literature, which are instrumental in shaping the present research. The common theme which can be observed from the following described models is that turnover behavior is a multistage process that includes behavioral, attitudinal, and decisional components.

1) Bluedorn's Unified Model

Bluedorn (1982), through his unified model for employee turnover, made an attempt to develop a more complete understanding of the turnover process by synthesizing three of the earlier developed turnover models by Price (1977), Mobley (1977) and the organization commitment model. Exhibit 2.1 presents an illustration of the model, developed by Bluedorn (1982), which incorporates these three previous models. The variables (in the model) leading directly to job satisfaction were suggested in the previous model by Price (1977). He developed a model of the turnover process which illustrates this process as beginning with a series of structural and individual determinants of job satisfaction (e.g. centralization, pay, communication etc.). The work of Marsh and Mannari (1971) suggested the position of organizational commitment in the model as they hypothesized, in their study, that job satisfaction was a determinant of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has been consistently related to turnover, and may itself be caused by several of the determinants of job satisfaction in Price's model, as well as by job satisfaction itself. The positioning of job search and intent to leave in the model was earlier confirmed in the work of Mobley (1977). Bluedorn (1982) simplified his work to the following sequence: dissatisfaction leads to job search which leads to an intention to quit or stay which leads to the individual's actual quitting or staying behavior.
This unified model of turnover was empirically tested by Bluedorn (1982) through path analysis and a subsequent cross-validation in another data set. Overall, the form of the general model developed in the theoretical synthesis was supported in its empirical examination with few modifications.

Exhibit 2.1: Bluedorn's Unified Model for Employee Turnover

Promotion opportunities +
Centralization −
Formalization +
Instrumental communication +
Equity +
Pay −
Routinization −
Member integration −
Environmental opportunities −
Foregone environmental opportunities −
Role conflict −
Length of service +
Age +
Education −
Marital status −

Source: Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations, Human relations, 35

2) Price and Mueller's Model

Price and Mueller's model from 1986 analyzes the causal determinants of turnover (Morrell et al., 2001). This model offers a comprehensive list of determinants, including generic factors like job satisfaction. Turnover is interpreted as the result of a "decision process" (Morrell et al., 2001: p. 38). Exogenous variables, which are independent from the states of other variables in the model, are subdivided into three major groups: Environmental, individual and structural groups (Price, 2001). Endogenous variables which values are determined by the states of other variables in the model are job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intent to leave. Several
unidirectional causal relationships with the dependent variable turnover are illustrated in Exhibit 2.2.

Price and Mueller enhanced their model by adding other exogenous (e.g. social support) and endogenous (e.g. search behavior) variables in their construct (Price, 2001). Nevertheless, this model also shows some limitations. There is a lack of fundamental theory of behavior or action, thus this limits an adequate explanation for the turnover process (Morrell et al., 2001). However, even with the inclusion of more than 15 determinants of turnover, these models explained only about 13% of turnover variance (Hom & Griffeth, 1995).

3) Lum et al.'s Model

The purpose of Lum et al.'s (1998) study was to assess both the direct and indirect impact of certain pay policies upon the turnover intentions. The two major questions addressed were: What was the relative impact of job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and organizational commitment upon the turnover intentions of employees eligible for
these pay policies? And what model accurately portrays the relationship among these three independent variables and turnover intentions? By deriving and testing causal inferences regarding pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, as illustrated in Exhibit 2.3, this research has somewhat clarified the combined effects of these variables on turnover intent. The results reveal a model of association which is more complex than assumed by previous researchers (Lum et al., 1998).

The satisfaction-to-commitment mediation process found in this study is consistent with Porter et al.'s basic model (1974) which proposes that commitment takes longer to develop and is more stable than satisfaction. This model suggests that job satisfaction has only an indirect influence on the intention to quit, whereas organizational commitment has the strongest and most direct impact. A further finding revealed that pay satisfaction had both direct and indirect effects on turnover intention. Some potential limitations of the study were also cited. Murray and Smith (1988) have suggested that career satisfaction might be a more appropriate measure than job satisfaction. Also, measures of overall job satisfaction by virtue of their greater vagueness may evoke a response bias known as the halo effect (Irvine & Evans, 1992).

Exhibit 2.3: Lum et al.'s Conceptual Model for Employee Turnover

PAY SATISFACTION → JOB SATIS. → ORG. COMM. → TURNOVER INTENT


25
4) Griffith's Traditional Turnover Model

Turnover models developed by Price (1977), Mobley (1979) and Steers and Mowday (1991) are regarded as typical attitude models in the development of research on organizational employees' turnover in the monograph of Horn and Griffeth, published in 1995. Later, Griffith et al., (2000) conducted a review research in the model of element analysis on all papers on employees' volunteer turnover published in classic management magazines. He described that related variables around attitude models reached eleven kinds of demographic predictors; sixteen kinds of sub-structure variables related to job satisfaction and organization factors and work environment factors, such as expectations, pay satisfaction, distributive justice, supervisory satisfaction, leader-member exchange, work group cohesion, coworker satisfaction, role clarify; six kinds of variables related to job content and external environment factors, such as job scope, routinization, job involvement, alternative job opportunities, comparison with present job etc.; three kinds of other behavioral predictors; and nine kinds of adjusting variables for withdraw process.

Following Griffith et al., (2000) review, a general research model and analyzing route for traditional attitude research model are displayed in Exhibit 2.4. It is generally believed that in the traditional attitude turnover model, the process of employees' volunteer turnover (including the turnover intention and behavior of turnover) is the reversed transformation process of employees' retention psychology and behaviors, mainly consisting of four sectors: first is the quit process caused by job dissatisfaction; then, employees' search for substitutable jobs before turnover; evaluation on such substitutable jobs; and result is occurrence of turnover behavior (Lee & Mitchell, 1994).
5) Hausknecht’s List of Retention Factors

A content model of 12 retention factors is developed in the context of previous theory and research on employee turnover. Hausknecht (2008) listed the major 12 retention factors that have been published in the literature over the last 60 years from 24,829 employees in leisure and hospitality industry, which helped in explaining why employees stay or quit. A brief summary of these content models is described in Table 2.2. The study revealed that job satisfaction, extrinsic rewards, constituent attachments, organizational commitment, and organizational prestige were the most frequently mentioned reasons for staying. Advancement opportunities and organizational prestige were more common reasons for staying among high performers and non-hourly workers, and extrinsic rewards was more common among low performers and hourly employees, providing support for ease/desirability of movement and psychological contract rationales.
The findings highlight the importance of differentiating human resource management practices when the goal is to retain those employees valued most by the organization. One of the limitations of this study was that the participants did not (nor could they) describe the fundamental psychological process underlying retention. They would also unlikely to comment on market-related, behavioral, or demographic factors that sometimes influence retention when observed across participants. Also, it was felt that there were likely to be some additional factors contributing to employee retention that were not identified in the study (Hausknecht, 2008). Furthermore, although participants were asked to list the top two reasons for staying so that the most...
important reasons for staying could be identified, employees may have responded differently if they were not limited this way. However, this study answered several calls of that time for additional research on factors that contribute to employee retention (Maertz & Campion, 1998; Steel et al., 2002).

2.2 Determinants of Employee Turnover

Several studies based on western research (e.g. Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Malhotra et al., 2007; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Smith, 2000; Mowday et al., 1982; Mueller & Price, 1990), have shown that work-related factors are major determinants of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions among employees. Several factors appear to be linked to turnover (Boxall et al., 2003). A review article on studies of turnover (Mobley et al., 1979) revealed that age, tenure, overall satisfaction, job content, intentions to remain on the job and commitment were all negatively related to turnover. Griffeth et al. (2000) have concluded from their studies that when high performers receive inadequate remuneration/rewards, they look out for alternative employment.

Causes of turnover include limited career and financial advancement, organizational climate, and work–family conflict (O’Leary & Deegan, 2005; Stalcup & Pearson, 2001). Aggarwal and Bhargava (2009) have investigated how aspects of compensation strategies, are related to various key organizational variables such as psychological contract, affective organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Many of the respondents of the study conducted by O’Leary and Deegan (2005) reported that they left the industry because of the incompatibility of work and family life and that the incompatibility hampered their advancement in the industry. Stalcup and Pearson (2001) reported that long working hours and regular relocation are additional reasons for hotel management turnover, but participants in their study emphasized that the primary concern regarding work time was not working too much, but not having enough time to spend with family. A variety of variables that have been found to predict turnover include work stress (Ramrup & Pacis, 2008) and heavy workloads (McGowan, 2001).
Employee perceptions regarding the family supportiveness of their organization are related to intentions to leave the organization (Allen, 2001; Anderson et al., 2002; Thompson et al., 1999). Glance et al., (1997) mentioned the relationship between turnover and productivity asserted that the lower turnover is positively correlated with productivity. Altarawneh and Al-Kilani (2010) examine the impact of human resource management (HRM) practices on employees’ turnover intentions. The employees have tendency to turnover their job when they have poor supervision (Keashly & Jagatic, 2000), without proper or poor training (Poulston, 2008) and low wage (Martins, 2003). Both organizational commitment and job satisfaction predict intention to quit (Ramachandran et al., 2011). Abdul Rahman et al. (2008) found that job opportunities had significant positive impact on turnover intentions.

A study of turnover by Boxall et al (2003) in New Zealand confirmed the view that motivation for job change is multidimensional and that no one factor will explain it. Khatri et al.'s (2001) study of employee turnover employs a model that posits three groups of factors influencing employee turnover, namely, demographic, uncontrollable and controllable factors. Demographic factors include age, gender, education, tenure, income level, managerial and non-managerial positions. Uncontrollable factors are the perceived alternative employment opportunity and job-hopping. Controllable factors include pay, nature of work, supervision, organizational commitment, distributive justice and procedural justice. Ruhland (2001) develop a public school teacher retention/attrition model. According to this model, teacher retention and thus attrition is a function of teachers' personal characteristics, educational preparation, initial commitment to teaching, quality of first teaching experience, social and professional integration into teaching and external influences. Aryee et al. (1998) found a significant positive correlation between satisfaction with work flexibility and organizational commitment and intentions to stay. Mano-Negrin and Kirschenbaum (2000) indicated that turnover is affected by organizational size. They suggest that organizational size impacts turnover primarily through wage rates but also through career progression paths. Developed internal organizational labor markets produce lower departure rates since promotion opportunities have a strong negative influence on departures for career-related reasons. Martin (2003) looked at
the effect of unions on labor turnover and found clear evidence that unionism is associated with lower turnover. He suggested that lower turnover is a result of the ability of unions to secure better working conditions; thus increasing the attractiveness for workers of staying in their current job. New professionals' intentions to turnover have been attributed to their level of job satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Klenke-Hamel & Mathieu, 1990; Lorden, 1998). According to Martin (2003), the relationship between lower turnover and unionization has been well established by researchers using both industry-level and individual data.

A study by Kirschenbaum and Weisberg (2002) of 477 employees in 15 firms examined employees' job destination choices as part of the turnover process. One of their main findings was that co-workers' intentions have a major significant impact on all destination options - the more positive the perception of their co-workers desire to leave, the more employees themselves wanted to leave. The researchers suggest that a feeling about co-workers' intentions to change jobs or workplace acts as a form of social pressure or justification on the employee to make a move. Mosadeghrad et al. (2008) and Mobley et al. (1979) concluded that a number of studies offered moderate support for a negative relationship between satisfaction with supervision and turnover (i.e. the higher the satisfaction with supervision, the lower the turnover). Researchers like Griffeth et al. (2000) show that lateness and absence can be predictors of turnover because they represent withdrawal responses from the organization. Furthermore, turnover may also be influenced by certain other factors. This includes attitudinal, behavioral and organizational factors. Literature has also identified that work related factors, personal characteristics and external factors as determinants of employee turnover tendency (Wotruba & Tyagi, 1991).

It is quite evident from the review of past researches that intention to stay/quit, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were among the most consistent, close and commonly researched determinants of employee turnover. Table 2.3 provides an overview of determinants of employee turnover identified from the literature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DETERMINANTS OF EMPLOYEE TURNOVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wasmuth &amp; Davis, (1983)</td>
<td>Insufficient pay, fringe benefits, turnover intention, dissatisfactions with academic environment, poor quality of supervision, better offer, personal adjustment to work situation (grievances), sexual harassment, inadequate orientation, lack of training, dead end (no chance for promotion), job insecurity, relocation from area, health problems, difficulty in handling students and home responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Career plateaus were positively associated with intentions to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrtz et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Affective forces, calculative forces, contractual forces, behavioral forces, alternative forces, normative forces, moral/ethical forces, turnover intention and constituent forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondrich et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Different salary comparisons under different circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paré &amp; Tremblay (2007)</td>
<td>Recognition, empowerment, fair rewards, competence development, information sharing, affective commitment, procedural justice, continuance commitment and OCB-helping behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maimon &amp; Ronen, (1978)</td>
<td>Working conditions, relationship with peers, relationship with one's supervisor, pay and fringe benefits, promotion opportunities, interest and responsibility, opportunities to utilize skills and knowledge and overall job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Training, workplace relationship, mentorship, subjective norms and job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman &amp; Bohlauder (1992)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, communication with superior, autonomy, altruism-supervisor, need fulfillment (esteem), need fulfillment (higher order), need fulfillment (self actualization), goal congruence and unit Morale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalessio et al. (1986)</td>
<td>Age, job satisfaction, thinking of quitting, intention to search and intention to quit/stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Recruiting, orientation and training, separation management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship building (all are meant for retaining employees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNatt &amp; Judge, (2008)</td>
<td>Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, professional commitment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxall et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Work-related accident or illness, unhappy with co-workers, obtain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>easier commuting to work, difficult relationship with the supervisor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>job was not what it was made out to be, excessive work demands,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>promotion elsewhere, organization that didn't listen to its employees,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to work with more up-to-date technology or work methods, for better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>job security, better pay elsewhere, change of career, obtain better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balance between work demands and life outside work, better training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities, management didn't recognize employee merit and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interesting work elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluedorn (1982)</td>
<td>Promotion opportunities, centralization, formalization, instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication, equity, pay, environmental opportunities, job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction, job search and organizational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lum et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Perception of discrimination, economic, interpersonal and deontic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>need fulfillment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price &amp; Mueller (1986)</td>
<td>Opportunity, pay, promotion opportunity, organization and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group size, satisfaction, commitment and intent to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandran et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction and job stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Neill et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Work-family climate, organizational leadership characteristics, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizational commitment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Prepared by Researcher*
2.2.1 Intention to Quit/Stay (IS)

Unlike actual turnover, turnover intent is not explicit. Intentions are a statement about specific behavior of interest (Berndt, 1981). Turnover intent is defined as the reflection of "the (subjective) probability that an individual will change his or her job within a certain time period" (Sousa-Poza & Henneberger, 2002: p.1) and is an immediate precursor to actual turnover. Intention is an act or instance of determining mentally upon some actions or result or the end or object intended, purpose (Oxford Dictionary, 2006). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) described the definition of intention in detail where they refer to an intention approach as a theory of reasoned action. The theory of reasoned action suggested that intention was a psychological precursor to the actual behavior act (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). This means that an individual's intention to perform or not to perform a behavioral act is the immediate determinant of action. Based on this notion an individual who nurtures the thought of quitting his present profession is more likely to do so if the right condition exists, or if the adverse condition that warranted the thought of intent persists (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Turnover intention has been interpreted in two ways in the literature; Intention to quit and intention to stay. Intention to stay is simply the converse of the turnover (quit) intention (Kim et al., 1996). Several studies have revealed that intention (stay or leave) was clearly the most important determinant of turnover (Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Much of the empirical research on turnover is based on turnover (Quit) intentions (e.g. Goldman et al., 2008; Jamal, 1990; Lum et al., 1998; Mosadeghrad et al., 2008; Paré & Tremblay, 2007; Wright & Bonnet, 1997). Turnover intention is used instead of actual turnover because in general, the theory of planned behavior suggests that behavioral intention is a good predictor of actual behavior (Ajzen, 1991). In fact, researchers have found intent to leave or stay as the strongest predictor of actual turnover (Discenza & Gardner, 1992; Hendrix et al., 1999; Igbaria & Greenhaus, 1992; Igbaria et al., 1994; Joseph & Ang, 2003; Lee & Liu, 2007; Ryan, 1989). Apart from the practical difficulty in conducting turnover research among people who have left an organization, some researchers suggest that there is a strong link between intentions to quit and actual turnover (Bluedorn, 1982; Griffeth et al., 2000; Mobley et al., 1979 and Dalessio et al., 1986). Literature
indicates that turnover intention is the most immediate precursor of turnover (Griffeth et al., 2000; Meyer et al., 2002; Mobley et al., 1978; Mobley et al., 1979; Bluedorn, 1982; Steel & Ovalle, 1984) and it is widely acknowledged that identifying and dealing with antecedents of turnover intentions is an effective way of reducing actual turnover (Tumwesigye, 2010).

Intention to stay is seen simply as the converse of the turnover (quit) intention (Kim et al., 1996). Intention to stay mirrors the employee's level of commitment to his organization and the willingness to remain employed (Hewitt, 2004). It refers to as the propensity to leave, intent to quit, intent to stay, behavioral commitment and attachment (Halaby, 1986; Mueller et al., 1999). Mobley et al. (1979) noted that the relationship between intentions and turnover is consistent and generally stronger than the satisfaction-turnover relationship, although it still accounted for less than a quarter of the variability in turnover. Much of the research on perceived opportunities has been found to be associated with intentions to leave but not actual turnover (Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 1990). One of the possible reasons is that intentions do not account for impulsive behavior and also that turnover intentions are not necessarily followed through to lead to actual turnover. Reviews on the antecedents of turnover intentions have highlighted intent to leave rather than actual turnover as the outcome variable. This is due to two reasons. Firstly, employees have decided in advance the decision to leave the organization. This is in line with attitude-behavior theory (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) that one's intention to perform a specific behavior is the close predictor of that behavior.

Results on the study of the relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover have given support and evidence of the significant relationship between these variables (Lambert et al., 2001). Therefore Price (2001) suggested turnover intentions construct as an alternative in measuring actual turnover. On the other hand, longitudinal studies of turnover (Farkas & Tetrick, 1989; Johnston et al., 1990; Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 1990; Vandenbergh & Lance, 1992) suggest that intent to turnover does not always predict actual turnover behavior. Researches in psychology and organizational behavior implies that actual turnover is strongly influenced by internal labor market attributes such as promotion ability, wage levels, skills demand,
and external labor market attributes such as mobility, and availability of jobs (Horn & Kinicki, 2001; Trevor, 2001; Kirschenbaum & Mano-Negrin, 1999).

Several studies have revealed that this concept whether it was called 'intent to stay' or 'intent to leave', it was clearly the most important determinant of turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) proposed that behavior intentions constitute the most immediate determinant of actual behavior. Supporting this argument, Steel and Ovalle (1984) suggested that intention to stay or leave and the actual action are related. According to Steel and Ovalle (1984), Carsten and Spector (1987) and Iverson (1996) intention to stay had a strong negative relationship with turnover. Dalessio et al. (1986) have emphasized that more concern should be given on intention to stay rather than turnover, as whenever an employee exit an organization has to incur the cost of recruiting and maintaining another employee. According to Mobley (1982), Steers and Mowday (1981), Black and Stevens (1989), intention to stay is significantly negatively correlated with turnover. Since intention to stay is referred to as employees' willingness to stay with an organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993), it consistently demonstrates a stronger relationship with turnover than do other turnover precursors (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992). Intention to stay is simply the converse of the turnover (quit) intention (Kim et al., 1996). The intention to stay or leave is a better predictor of actual actions than some affective variables such as job and career satisfaction. Liu (2000) suggested that intention to stay is the positive aspect comparing to the intention to leave. He also suggested that intention to stay is what makes employees be willing and work in the organization. Turnover intention is a mediating variable between organizational commitment and turnover as suggested by Sjoberg and Sverke (2000).

2.2.2 Organizational Commitment (OC)

Over the past three decades, an impressive amount of research efforts have been devoted to understanding the nature, antecedents, and consequences of organizational commitment (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). Employee commitment is important because
high levels of commitment lead to several favorable organizational outcomes. Meta analyses indicate that commitment is negatively related to turnover (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), absenteeism (Farrell & Stamm, 1988), and counterproductive behavior (Dalal, 2005) and positively related to job satisfaction (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005), motivation (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), and organizational citizenship behaviors (Riketta, 2002).

Organizational commitment is defined as the degree to which the employee feels devoted to their organization (Spector, 2000). Jaros et al. (2004) argue that the commitment is determined by being obligated to work in the organization, a sense of moral obligation following their parents, who may have been long-term employees of the organization therefore, a sense of duty to belong. Commitment can be defined as comprising (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of an organization's/profession's goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert significant effort on behalf of the organization/profession, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization/profession (Mowday et al., 1982). Higher commitment among special educators has also been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994).

Teachers’ organizational commitment (OC), professional commitment (PC), and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB)—are key factors in their performance in a school setting (Diefendorff et al., 2002; Howell & Dorfman, 1986). Employee commitment is argued to be critical to contemporary organizational success (Pfeffer, 1998).

Reflecting on organizational commitment and managerial efficiency of the managers, reports of some researchers (Akintayo, 2006; Ciarrochi et al., 2001; George, 2000, Tsui et al., 1992) revealed that organizational commitment has significant influence on managerial efficiency of the managers. Organizational commitment has become one of the most popular work attitudes studied by practitioners and researchers (Meyer et al., 1993; Mowday et al., 1982). One of the main reasons for its popularity is that organizations have continued to find and sustain competitive advantage through teams of committed employees. It improves trust between employees, managers, owners, units and other concerned parties of any organization. Therefore, it
fosters better superior-subordinate relationships and improves organizational climate (Suki & Suki, 2011). Stronger and more generalized commitment may enhance organizational development, growth and survival (Awamleh, 1996). On the other hand, non-committed employees may describe the organization in negative terms to outsiders thereby inhibiting the organization’s ability to recruit high-quality employees (Mowday et al., 1982). Mowday et al. (1982) and Meyer et al. (1989) have found that committed employees are more likely to remain with the organization and strive towards the organization's mission, goals and objectives.

Organizational commitment is strongly related to turnover intention (Addae et al., 2006; Addae & Parboteeah, 2006). Many other such studies have reported a significant association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions (e.g. Bluedorn, 1982; Goldman et al., 2008; Jamal, 1990; Lum et al., 1998; Mosadeghgrad et al., 2008; Paré & Tremblay, 2007; Wright & Bonnet, 1993). A great deal of research has been conducted that attempts to link employee attitudes e.g. organizational commitment with behavioral factors e.g. turnover intention (Zhao et al., 2007). Previous research supports the idea that organizational commitment is strongly associated with turnover (Dunham et al., 1994; McFarlane et al., 1993; Newton, et al., 2004; Somers, 1995). Lacity et al. (2008) concluded that organization commitment is one of the significant factors that impact turnover intention. Tang et al. (2004) confirmed the link between commitment and actual turnover. Griffeth et al. (2000) noted that organizational commitment was a better predictor of turnover than overall job satisfaction. Allen and Meyer (1990) investigated the nature of the link between turnover and the three components of attitudinal commitment and his study indicated that all three components of commitment were a negative indicator of turnover. Elangovan (2001) in his study added that commitment had a very strong negative effect on turnover intentions. In other words, the lower the employee commitment, the higher the propensity for the employee to leave.

Committed employees have been found to be less likely to leave an organization than those who are uncommitted (Angle & Perry, 1981; Porter et al., 1975). If the employee does not feel satisfied with the job, he will blame the organization and thus possess a lower commitment to the job (Ahuja et al., 2001). Although, a more resent
research conducted by Hsu (2009) showed no significant relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention, most researchers have found a significantly negative relationship between affective organizational commitment and turnover intention (Addae et al., 2006; Pare & Tremblay, 2007; Zhao et al., 2007). Samad (2006) found organizational commitment to be negatively correlated with turnover intentions. Moncrief (1996) conducted a research survey on job stress among salespersons and their results reveal a negative correlation between organizational commitment and propensity to quit the job. Elangovan (2001) has argued that there is a reciprocal link between organizational commitment and turnover intention i.e. lower commitment increases turnover intention which lowers commitment further. Two meta-analyses conducted by Griffeth et al. (2000) and Meyer et al. (2002) confirm that organizational commitment is well established as an important antecedent of withdrawal behaviors.

2.2.3 Job Satisfaction (TS)

The concept of job satisfaction is very complex (McCormick & Ilgen, 1985) and in the past few years, several studies have investigated this concept (e.g. Akpofure et al., 2006; Heller et al., 2009; Ishitani, 2010; Judge et al., 2008; Sutin et al., 2009 among others). Job satisfaction is defined as how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs (Spector, 1997). It is defined as a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of one’s important job values (Noe, 2000). It is the phenomenon ascertaining the contentment of the employee and appearing when the qualifications of the job and the demands of the employees match (Reichers, 2006). According to another definition, job satisfaction is an overall feeling about one’s career or in terms of specific facets of the job or career, and it can be related to specific outcomes such as productivity and job performance (Akpofure et al., 2006).

In line with these definitions, job satisfaction might be handled as the consequence resulting from the comparison between the expectations of the employee from his job and the job in question which is performed. The consequence may emerge as
satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the employee from the job (Adenike, 2011). An employee who is satisfied with his job would perform his duties well and be committed to his job, and subsequently to his organization (Awang & Ahmad, 2010) whereas when the employee sees that his expectations are not met in the job environment, the job dissatisfaction emerges. It leads to the decrease in the workforce productivity, organizational commitment and commitment to the job and increase in the rates of the optional discontinuation of the job (Denizer, 2008; Gellatly, 2005; Payne & Morrison, 2002; Redfern, 2005; Sagie, 2002; Santhapparaj et al., 2005). The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover has been consistently found in many turnover studies (Amah, 2009; Cooper & Kelly, 1993; Dalessio et al., 1986; Goldman et al., 2008; Khaleque et al., 1992; Lum et al., 1998; Wright & Bonett, 1997).

Subsequently, teacher satisfaction refers to a teacher's affective relation to his or her teaching role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from teaching and what one perceives it is offering to a teacher (Lawler, 1973). Job satisfaction of academicians is well documented across the literature (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010) and over the last few decades, many studies have attempted to identify sources of teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction (e.g., Farber, 1991; Friedman & Farber, 1992; Kyriacou, 1987; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1979; Mykletun, 1984).

Increasing teachers' job satisfaction is one of the most important ways to reduce attrition, because job satisfaction and attrition are strongly linked (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Billingsley et al., 1995; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Smith & Billingsley, 1993; Gersten et al., 2001; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Westling & Whitten, 1996; Whitaker, 2000). Gersten et al. (2001) found that satisfaction reflects greater differences between those intending to stay and those intending to leave than other factors. Job satisfaction can be an important policy issue since it is closely associated with teachers' work attitude and performance that ultimately affect student learning (Ostroff, 1992). Teachers' job satisfaction may influence the quality of instructional practice. Some researchers argue that dissatisfied teachers are less likely to do their best work in the classroom (Evans, 2001). In addition, highly satisfied teachers are less likely to switch schools or to quit the profession than those who are dissatisfied.
with low salary, poor working conditions and lack of professional development support (Baker & Smith, 1997; MacDonald, 1999).

Many researchers (e.g. Falkenburg & Scyns, 2007; Summer & Niederman, 2004; Tan & Igbaria, 1994; Thatche et al., 2002) commented that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention are negatively related. Job satisfaction has a significant impact on employee turnover (Rajendran & Chandramohan, 2010). Amah (2009) stressed that job satisfaction was found to have a direct negative relationship with turnover intention. Griffith et al. (2000) also found a negative association between job satisfaction and staff turnover. Employee satisfaction has been found to be negatively related to intention to quit and turnover (Bockerman & Iimakunnas, 2004; Clark, 2001; Kristensen & Nielsen, 2004; Levy-Garboua et al., 2007; Lum et al., 1998; Schields & Price, 2002). Job satisfaction plays an important role in determine turnover of employees (Mudor & Tooksoon, 2011). Porter et al. (1974) suggested satisfaction with the work itself was an important variable in differentiating between stayers and leavers. They further suggested that there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave. On the other hand, there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and intention to stay. Moboly (1982) found that a weak-to-moderate negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover. High job satisfaction leads to low turnover. In general, dissatisfied workers are more likely to quit than those who are satisfied.

Karsh et al. (2005) found that turnover intentions had strong negative correlations with organizational identification, intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction. According to Moorman et al. (1998), there are three practical points of view that illustrate the meaning of job satisfaction: First, is a valuable product of the society; second, is an early warning indicator at early stage for an organization and third, can serve as a predictor of organizational behavior. Similar to Moorman’s point of view, Cranney et al. (1992) found that job dissatisfaction could result in psychological frustration and low productivity.

Job satisfaction plays a very critical role in attracting and retaining of employees’ ability in an organization (Brookfield, 1998). Igbaria and Guimarães (1999) reported
that employees who have insufficient information to perform their jobs adequately, unclear expectations of peers, ambiguity of performance evaluation methods, extensive job pressures and lack of consensus on job functions or duties among peers, supervisors and customers, may feel less satisfied with their jobs, less committed to the organization and have a high propensity to quit their organizations. Studies discover that dissatisfied workers are more likely to quit their current matches. In other words, the self-reported level of job satisfaction is a good predictor for job mobility (Clark et al., 1998; Clark, 2001; Delfgaauw, 2007; Flanagan et al., 1974; Freeman, 1978; Kristensen & Westergård-Nielsen, 2004; Lévy-Garboua et al., 2007).

Dieter et al. (1996) pointed out that in most studies of turnover in the organizational literature, job satisfaction is the key psychological construct leading to turnover. Steel (2002: p. 347) calls this "the basic approach that would be used by most researchers for performing turnover studies." Additionally, Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that overall job satisfaction was negatively related to turnover. Shader et al. (2001) observed the significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and the anticipated turnover. Job satisfaction has been found to be a significant predictor of turnover intentions (Lee et al., 2004; Van Dick et al., 2004; Wright & Bonett, 2007). It partially mediates the relationship between hostile attribution styles and turnover intentions (Harvey et al., 2008).

Working the other way, Akerlof et al. (1984) show that job changes lead to an increase in job satisfaction. Mobley et al. (1979) indicated that overall job satisfaction is negatively linked to turnover but explained little of the variability in turnover. Maimon and Ronen's (1978) findings suggest that: (a) intrinsic factors of job satisfaction are far better predictor of turnover than extrinsic (b) overall job satisfaction has meaning above and beyond satisfaction with various aspects of job (c) satisfaction with intrinsic rewards and overall job satisfaction by the level of the satisfaction with the job are good predictors of both the tendency to stay and tendency to leave.

Meta-analytic research shows that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of turnover (Horn & Griffeth, 1995), with overall job satisfaction explaining more
variance than the job satisfaction facets (i.e. satisfaction with the work itself, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with the supervision, etc.) considered individually (Griffeth et al., 2000). Researchers have also used these meta-analytically derived correlations to build structural models of employee turnover. These studies found evidence consistent with the possibility that (the lack of) job satisfaction causes turnover (Carsten & Spector, 1987; Horn et al., 1992; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Griffeth et al. (2000) found that overall job satisfaction modestly predicted turnover. Job satisfaction is an important determinant of absenteeism and turnover intention (Koh & Boo, 2004; Lee & Liu, 2007). Certainly, job satisfaction remains a key variable in the prediction of employee turnover (Mossholder et al., 2005). Rahman et al. (2008) found that job satisfaction had negative effect on turnover intentions of IT professional. Khatri and Fern (2001) concluded that there was a modest relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Sarminah (2006) found a moderate relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Korunka et al. (2005) also found a significant negative association between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Van Dick et al. (2004) have also identified job satisfaction as a predictor of turnover intention; however, they argue that it is a mediating variable between organizational identification and turnover intention.

Job Satisfaction as an Antecedent of Organizational Commitment

Earlier researchers have identified a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Abbott et al., 2006; Bhuian et al., 1996; Bhuian & Menguc, 2002; Naumann, 1993). Markovits et al. (2007) suggested that affective organizational commitment was found to be most influential with respect to levels of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Many researches pointed out that job satisfaction has positive influence to organizational commitment (Bartle et al., 2002; Liao et al., 2008; Lin & Lin, 2011; Mathieu, 1988; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Price & Mueller, 1986). It is supported by Fu et al. (2009) and Van Dam (2005) which also reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Basically, if the job dimensions meet their needs, the employees will give full commitment, and in this way commitment is interrelated to satisfaction.
(Awang & Ahmad, 2010). Fletcher (2007) found a significant relationship between the level of emotional quotient, job satisfaction and work commitment in his study on teachers in secondary schools. Meta-analytic findings based on 59 empirical studies indicated that organizational commitment is primarily a consequence, rather than an antecedent, of job satisfaction (Brown & Peterson, 1993). Furthermore, compared to employees with lower level of job satisfaction, employees with higher job satisfaction also have higher level of organizational commitment (Woo et al., 2005).

In the service industry, job satisfaction affects organizational commitment and further influences service behaviors (Testa, 2001). It is believed that satisfied workers will be committed to their job and remains in the organization while dissatisfied workers will intend to quit (Sharma & Bajpai, 2010). Higher commitment among special educators has also been associated with higher levels of job satisfaction (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994). A number of previous researchers have reported mixed findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, Curry et al. (1986) found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, other researchers (Busch et al., 1998; Chiu-Yueh, 2000; Feinstein, 2002; Freund, 2005; Mannheim et al., 1997) found that job satisfaction was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. If an employee does not feel satisfied with the job, he will blame the organization and thus possess lower commitment to the job (Abuja et al., 2001). Martin and Bennet (1996) mentioned four alternative models of the job satisfaction-organizational commitment relationship. First, job satisfaction is antecedent to organizational commitment (Porter et al., 1974; Poznanski & Bline, 1997). Second, organizational commitment is antecedent to job satisfaction (Curry et al., 1986; Lu et al., 2007). Third, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are reciprocally related (Martin & Bennet, 1996). Fourth, organizational commitment and job satisfaction are independent (Martin & Bennet, 1996).
Turnover Predictors: Job Satisfaction versus Organizational Commitment

Literature has shown that organizational commitment and job satisfaction may have negative relationships with turnover, intent to leave and tardiness (Angle & Perry, 1981; Cohen, 1993; Jaros et al., 2004; Meyer et al., 2002). Researchers like, Carbery et al. (2003), Robinson and Baron (2007) and Tutuncu and Kozak (2007) have established consistently that employee turnover has a direct correlation with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction has a significant association with several variables such as work performance and organizational commitment (Tony & Cathy, 1995). Some researchers have established a relationship between satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover (Bluedorn, 1982; Mosadeghrad et al., 2008). Lum et al’s (1998) study suggested that organizational commitment has the strongest and most direct impact on the intention to quit whereas job satisfaction has only an indirect influence. They suggested that satisfaction indirectly influences turnover in that it influences commitment and hence turnover intentions. (Mueller & Price, 1990).

Researchers have linked organizational commitment to high performance levels, low turnover (commitment is thought to be even more predictive of turnover than job satisfaction), and other measures of organizational effectiveness (e.g. Angle & Perry 1983; Goodman 1980; Straw & Heckscher 1984; Verma & McKersie, 1987). Previous research to identify the causes of employee turnover has examined the relationship between several antecedent variables and turnover intentions. Studies have confirmed that measures of employee job satisfaction are negatively associated with turnover intentions (Strawser et al., 2000) and employee organizational commitment are also negatively associated with turnover intentions (Jones et al., 2003). Both job satisfaction and organizational commitment have typically been found to be negatively related to turnover (Mobley et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter & Steers, 1973). Some studies suggested that the job satisfaction can be better predicted variable toward turnover intention than organizational commitment (Sumner & Niederman, 2003; Falkenburg & Schyns, 2007). Job satisfaction has been associated with organizational commitment (Boles et al., 2007; Brown & Peterson,
In addition, research comparing commitment and various facets of job satisfaction as predictors of turnover suggest that commitment is more strongly related to turnover than is satisfaction (Porter et al., 1974). Such results might be expected, because commitment, which reflects one's identification with a particular organization as a whole, represents a more global attitude than job satisfaction, which reflects one's identification with specific facets of the organization (Porter et al., 1974). It could also be argued that a person's organizational commitment should be partially determined by his or her satisfaction with various facets of the job. To the extent that turnover more closely follows from a person's attitudes toward the organization as a whole than toward highly specific facets of it, both commitment and satisfaction could be expected to predict turnover, with the stronger relationship involving organizational commitment. Although job satisfaction may partially influence organizational commitment, it is conceptually distinct from it. These constructs differ not only with regard to the focus of their referent (the organization as a whole versus specific job facets), but also with regard to their hypothesized stability over time. In this regard, commitment represents a more stable, slowly evolving attitude than does satisfaction, which reflects a more immediate and changeable evaluative reaction to particular aspects of the job (Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974). As Mowday et al., (1979) state; although day-to-day events in the workplace may affect an employee's level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to seriously reevaluate his or her attachment to the organization; therefore, although one's commitment might change as a function of prior levels of satisfaction, at any given point in time a range of dissatisfaction should exist among people with common levels of organizational commitment. Likewise, withdrawal behavior, including cognitive antecedent variables such as thoughts and intentions of quitting, could be expected to differ among people who are equally uncommitted to the organization but who differ with respect to their current levels of experienced dissatisfaction.
Boxall et al. (2003) found in a study in New Zealand that the main reason by far for people leaving their employer was for more interesting work elsewhere. It is generally accepted that the effect of job satisfaction on turnover is less than that of organizational commitment. Meta-analytic findings based on 59 empirical studies indicated that "organizational commitment is primarily a consequence, rather than an antecedent, of job satisfaction" (Brown & Peterson, 1993). The topic of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important issues because of both reflecting a positive evaluation of the job (Udo et al., 1997). Many past studies reported a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Fu et al., 2009; Johnston et al., 1990; Van Dam, 2005).

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are two important variables in turnover studies (Gaertner, 1999). Earlier researchers (e.g. Carberry et al., 2003; Robinson & Baron, 2007 and Tutuncu & Kozak, 2007) have established consistently that employee turnover has a direct correlation with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction is defined as the set of affective reactions employees have toward their work situation (Vroom, 1964) whereas, organizational commitment refers to one's identification with and loyalty to an organization (Steers, 1977). The relationship of these constructs with voluntary turnover has been firmly established in a number of empirical studies (e.g., Bluedorn, 1982; Cohen, 1993; Gaertner, 1999). Specifically, job satisfaction is found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment (Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Gaertner, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), and organizational commitment, in turn, is a strong predictor of turnover intention (Williams & Hazer, 1986; Dailey & Kirk, 1992; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). It has been strongly assumed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are predictors of turnover intention, as suggested by Karsh et al. (2005). According to Igbaria and Guimaraes (1992) organizational commitment was an intervening variable in models of turnover, and job satisfaction had direct effect on turnover intentions, and indirect effect through organizational commitment. Aryee et al. (1998) have also identified job satisfaction and organizational commitment as main predictors of turnover intention. The study was conducted among professional accountants in Singapore. A research in Turkish context by Wasti (2003) also proved organizational
commitment to be a predictor of turnover intentions. Korenka et al. (2005) conducted a research on IT workforce and found significant negative correlation between turnover intentions and job satisfaction. Similar has been proved by Harrell (1990), who have explored relationship among organizational-professional conflict, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. A research by Chen et al. (2004) on career management, job satisfaction and turnover intentions reveal a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Job satisfaction has been verified to be a strong negative predictor of turnover intentions. (Brough & Frame, 2004). Howard & Homma, (2001) conducted a research on Japanese career women and have argued that job satisfaction, alone, is not a sufficient predictor of turnover intentions. The authors suggested that organizational commitment should also be included in the turnover model as another independent variable.

Table 2.4 illustrates previous researches that have taken IS, TS and OC as antecedents of employee turnover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Intention to stay/quit</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mosadeghrad (2008)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heilmann et al. (2008)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldman et al. (2008)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paré and Tremblay (2007)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurn et al. (1998)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright and Bornet (1997)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zey-Ferrell (1982)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalessio (1986)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffeth et al. (2000)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluedorn (1982)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobley et al. (1979)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (2001)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Researcher
2.3 Socio-demographic Determinants of Employee Turnover

Demographic variables, also known as personal characteristics, are widely used in turnover research. These variables are seen as social categories for an individual (Price, 1995). Researchers have suggested a list of demographic dimensions relevant to studies on turnover, for example, gender, marital status, age, qualification, annual income and experience (Naval & Srivastava, 2004; Saiyadain, 1998). The catalyst role of employee's personal attributes and demographic characteristics is recorded by almost every researcher on job satisfaction. Almost all the researchers of job satisfaction have identified 'demographics' as the catalysts, which modify employee's attitude towards his/her work, pay, supervision, promotion and work environment (DeVane & Sandy, 2003). Demographics also affect workers attitudes in terms of productivity, involvement and commitment on one hand, and on the other, hand the degrees of absenteeism and turnover or intention to leave (Shah & Jalces, 2004). Another group of researchers have recorded that age, gender, experience, department, foreign qualification or exposure to different culture, and technological challenges always influence the overall satisfaction of the employees (Asadi, et al., 2008; Tella et al., 2007).

Gender: Findings of the studies on the relationship between gender and turnover are mixed (Khatri et al., 2001). Weisberg and Krischenbaum (1993) and Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found females were more likely to leave companies than males. Similarly, Brough and Frame (2004) stated that female employees generally have higher turnover levels than males. Arnold and Feldman (1982) suggested that a female is more likely to leave the organization because they have more sporadic work histories, lower tenure and lower pay. On the other hand, Miller and Wheeler (1992) reported no relationship between gender and turnover. In the hotel industry scenario, Carbery et al. (2003) stated that male employees tend to be dominant because they play an important role when compared to females as providers for the family, which in turn is reflected in a low intention to leave. However Khatri et al. (2001) used the same argument to state that males are more likely to quit than females because the traditional belief that males are the breadwinner for the family still persists. Since
women have had to overcome more barriers to attain their positions in the organization, they may place greater value on their organizations and jobs than do their male counterparts (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Morris et al., 2001; Mowday et al., 1982). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found a weak correlation between gender and organizational commitment, with women being more committed to the organization than men. Khalid et al. (2009) in their study of organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention in Malaysia found that female employees moderated better the relationship between behavior and intention than males. It has been investigated that differences exist concerning job satisfaction and gender. One may assume that women tend to be more satisfied than men which generally reduce job turnover inclination (Souza-Poza, 2007).

Marital status: Marital status also plays an important role in predicting an employee’s intention to leave a job. However, there is inconsistent evidence on the influence of marital status in explaining turnover intention. In a study of turnover decision and gender status, Mano-Negrin and Kirschenbaum (2000) highlighted that the decision about staying or leaving in one organization is interdependent on the spousal conditions of employment. They further explained that the decision to leave a post not only involves employees’ familial or economic status but can also be dependent on employee work-related factors. Married employees exhibited higher organizational commitment largely due to greater family obligations which constrain their opportunities to change employers (Cetin, 2006; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Taormina, 1999). Horn and Griffith (1995) stated managers who are married showed a lower intention to leave a job compared to an unmarried manager. The primary reason for this is that being married usually increases manager’s financial requirements, thereby serving as a situational constraint. The other reason was due to location considerations. In general, a married employee chooses to remain in the same company rather than move to a different location because they do not want to force their spouse to move. Camilleri (2002) found that marital status was more related to continuance commitment, suggesting that married employees had more financial concerns. On the other hand, inter-role conflict between work and family may
influence turnover intention (Horn & Kinicki, 2001). Married employees have to balance work and family commitments with family and a lack of time and energy to participate in family activities may also encourage an employee to leave his/her job. Mellor et al. (2001) suggest that married teachers perceive higher monetary costs associated with leaving this profession. While they do not dare to leave this profession because of their familial responsibilities, they do not want to risk their accumulated investments in their schools. As it was indicated by Fuller et al. (2003), Haar and Spell (2009), Shore and Wayne (1993) and researches, for strengthening the married ones' weak affective and normative bonds to this profession, they may be treated in a supportive manner (family supporting treatments etc.) that makes them feel valued.

Experience: Khatri et al. (2001) state that length of employment also plays an important role in shaping employee attitude towards leaving their present job. Some employees prefer to stay in one company because they want to keep the benefits offered. In the event of the long serving employee leaving, he or she would often not get the full benefits and welfare payments provided by the company. In most cases, the longer an employee works in one company, the longer will the employee tend to stay and in turn this minimizes any intention to leave a job. In short, long stay employees become locked into benefits, financially and with reference to status, while additionally such long service also indicates possible commitment to the industry (Khatri et al., 2001). In other cases, Griffeth et al. (2000) found employee tenure was negatively related to suggesting that an employee who stayed longer in one organization were less likely to quit. Allen and Meyer's (1990) show that as tenure increases, employees feel themselves to be bound to continue with the organization. They attempt to justify their actions, retrospectively, by developing emotional attachment to their organizations (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Also, as age and tenure increases, employees' perceptions on the cost of leaving increases, leading them to develop continuance commitment (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Allen & Meyer, 1990).
2.4 Employee Retention

Unnecessary employee turnover costs organization needless expenses (Buck & Watson, 2002). Replacements and training expenses have a direct impact on organizational costs, productivity and performance, and as such, an increasing number of organizations are now recognizing employee retention as a key strategic issue (Glen, 2006). The main purpose of retention is to prevent the loss of competent employees from the organization as this could have adverse effect on productivity and service delivery (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009). The Harvard Business Essentials (2002) defined retention as the converse of turnover, being voluntary and involuntary. It is a voluntary move by an organization to create an environment which engages employees for a long term (Chaminade, 2007).

2.4.1 Concept and Overview

It is often believed that an organization is only as good as its people (Templer & Cawsey, 1999). Organizations failing to retain high performers will be left with an understaffed, less qualified workforce that ultimately hinders their ability to remain competitive (Rappaport et al., 2003). Therefore, worldwide, retention of skilled employees has been of serious concern for organizations in the face of ever increasing high rate of employee turnover (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009). The private sector managers admit that one of the most difficult aspects of their jobs is the retention of key employees in their organizations (Litheko, 2008). Empirical studies such as Stovel and Bonits (2002) have shown that employees, on average switch employers every six years. Replacing exiting employees is detrimental to organizations and may have adverse affects to service delivery. It is therefore imperative for management to reduce, to the minimum, the frequency at which employees, particularly those that are crucial to its operations quit (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009). Retention is a critical element of an organization’s more general approach to talent management (Lockwood, 2006).

Retention activities simply put may be defined as a sum of all those activities aimed at increasing organizational commitment of employees, giving them an overall
ambitious and myriad of opportunities where they can grow by outperforming others (Bogdanowicz & Bailey, 2002). Branch (1998) contends that the objective of retention policies should be to identify and retain committed employees for as long as is profitable both to the organization and the employee. It can be further categorized as functional or dysfunctional (Johnson et al., 2005). When non-performers leave and performers stay, it is identified as functional, and can in fact assist organizations to increase optimal performance (Johnson et al., 2005). On the contrary, when non-performers stay and performers leave, retention is highly dysfunctional, and damages organizational innovation and performance (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000).

In conceptualizing interventions that hold promise for improving retention, much analysis has been devoted to the question of why teachers leave teaching (Billingsley, 2004; Kozleski et al., 2000; NCTAF, 2003). Samuel and Chipunza (2009) noted that the main purpose of retention is to prevent the loss of competent employees from leaving the organization as this could have adverse effect on productivity and profitability. Similarly, Guarino et al. (2006) maintained that studies focusing on retention might identify factors that relate to teacher attrition. Similarly, Bogdanowicz and Bailey (2002) noted that organizations try to provide their workforce benefits and a holistic motive to stick with the current organization and making their decision to leave the organization difficult and pointless. Certo and Fox (2002) found that “reasons for leaving and reasons for staying often acted as inverse variables (for example, a teacher may leave because of poor administration or stay because of quality administration)” (p. 60). The literature reveals that there is a multiplicity of suggested methods for retaining talent, approaching retention on many different levels, and in many different ways; as Ettore (1997: 49), notes “...at its most effective, corporate retention is a sophisticated juggling act”.

Provided this, it can be assumed that employee retention and employee turnover are two faces of the same coin. Both the concepts are inseparable and each from the point of view of research is impractical to study in isolation or independently. It should also be emphasized here that understanding the behavioral intention (quit/stay) of an employee not only provides input to foresee the actual turnover decision of that
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employee, but it can also vastly aid in taking measures that can lead to employee retention as well.

2.4.2 Retention Factors

Extant literature has so far overwhelmingly proved the importance of valuable workforce or functional workforce for the survival of an organization (Bogdanowicz & Bailey, 2002). Replacements and training expenses have a direct impact on organizational costs, productivity and performance, and as such, an increasing number of organizations are now recognizing employee retention as a key strategic issue (Glen, 2006). Mak and Sockel (2001) noted that retaining a healthy team of committed and productive employees is necessary to maintain corporate strategic advantage. Hence, organizations must design appropriate strategies to retain their quality employees. These strategies may range from lucrative compensation packages to involving employees in every sphere of the functioning of the organization (Mak & Sockel, 2001). Empirical studies (Kinnear & Sutherland, 2000; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) have revealed that factors such as competitive salary, good interpersonal relationships, friendly working environment, and job security were cited by employees as key motivational variables that influenced their retention in the organizations. It is important to recognize the commitment of individuals to an organization, as well as the organization’s need to create an environment in which one would be willing to stay (Harris, 2000).

Employee satisfaction has been found to be positively related to the intent to remain with the company (Light, 2004). This is well supported in previous studies, which maintained that job satisfaction is the most important tool for employee retention and if employees experience high satisfaction with their jobs, it may create a pleasurable emotional state (Bartolo & Furlonger, 1999; Ivancevich et al., 2008) and a positive reaction towards the organization (Feinstein, 2002; Oshagbemi, 2000). Understanding the different dimensions of a job that may increase satisfaction or, at least, reduce dissatisfaction would be the very first step towards designing a strategy for retention
of quality staff (Raju, 2004). McCarthy et al. (2007) found the significant association between job satisfaction and intention to stay.

Organisational commitment is seen as vital to preserving and attracting well qualified talent pool in any organization (Suki & Suki, 2011). Meyer et al. (2002) have found that committed employees are more likely to remain with the organization and strive towards the organization’s mission, goals and objectives. Ruwan (2007) empirically evaluated six HR practices (realistic job, information, job analysis, work family balance, career development, compensation and supervisor support) and their likely impact on the marketing executives’ turnover. Teacher commitment has been recognized as a “critical predictor of teachers’ work performance” (Day et al., 2005, p. 571). Several special education studies have suggested that teachers with higher levels of professional and organizational commitment are more likely to stay (Miller et al., 1999) or intend to stay (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994) in teaching. In a study of 139 academics from a Jordanian university, Al-Omari et al. (2008) found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment had significant positive effects on intent to stay. The study suggested that efforts to improve faculty retention should focus on the work-related factors that affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Pay satisfaction, satisfaction with promotion opportunities, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with work-schedule flexibility have been considered as retention factors primarily by Moratis et al. (2005) and Hausknecht et al. (2008), whereas, several other researchers (e.g. Carraher, 2011; Cicero-Reese & Black, 1998; Denton, 1992; Ellett & Millar, 2001; Preyra & Pink, 2001) have also studied their respective roles as retention factors.

Pay Satisfaction

Satisfaction with pay refers to “the amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-à-vis that of others in the organization” (Luthans, 2005:212). The important relationships among job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention have been well established in studies by Brown and Peterson (1993) as well as Roberts and
Chonko (1996). Lane (1993) examined the relationship between benefit satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Low salary has often been found to be a significant predictor of teachers' intent to leave (Liu & Meyer, 2005). The use of financial inducements has featured prominently on both the agendas of human resource researchers and practitioners (Koh & Neo, 2000) and it has been considered an important reward to motivate the behavior of employees (Taylor & Vest, 1992).

Compensation links all pay and benefits to attracting and motivating employees (Daley, 2002; Mello, 2002). Provision of effective training and effective compensation are considered to be the top strategic human resource management that is considered to be relevant for retention and turnover intention (Chew & Chen, 2008). It is believed that all other behavioral factors are important for enhancing job satisfaction of employees but satisfaction from pay is a must (Sharma & Bajpai, 2011). Lamberti et al. (2001) found financial rewards to have a significant impact on job satisfaction. Hamermesh (2001) found that changes in compensation (increases or decreases) have concomitant impact on job satisfaction levels of employees.

According to Robbins et al. (2003), employees seek pay systems that are perceived as just, unambiguous, and in line with their expectations. When pay is perceived as equitable, is commensurate with job demands, individual skill level, and community pay standards, satisfaction is likely to be the result. A number of studies suggest that higher wages reduce teacher quit propensity (Brewer, 1996; Gritz & Theobald, 1996; Murnane & Olsen 1989; Theobald, 1990). Theobald (1990) found that salaries are positively related to decisions to continue teaching.

Pouliakas and Theodossiou (2004) show that a significant difference in the job satisfaction of performance related pay and non-performance related pay workers exist. Judge et al. (2001) found if job utility depends on both the level of pay and on pay relative to some reference point or aspiration level, it is clear that incentive pay could significantly affect job satisfaction through both of these routes. Employees tend to be satisfied with their job when they have effective and good pay (Droussiotis & Austin, 2007). Singh et al. (2004) found that employees had a higher degree of satisfaction with their pay when the organization provided adequate opportunities for growth and when compensation practices included bonuses.
In a number of turnover studies, pay satisfaction is proposed as a major factor affecting employees' turnover intention, and this has been subsequently tested to directly affect turnover (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Roberts & Chonko, 1996; Tekleab et al., 2005); and to indirectly affect turnover intention via organizational commitment (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004). Griffeth et al. (2000) noted pay and pay-related variables have a modest effect on turnover. Their analysis also included studies that examined the relationship between pay, performance and turnover. They concluded that when high performers are insufficiently rewarded, they leave. According to Milkovich and Newman (1999), when collective reward programs replace individual incentives, their introduction may lead to higher turnover among high performers.

Martin (2003) investigates the determinants of labor turnover using establishment-level survey data for the UK. He indicated that there is an inverse relationship between relative wages and turnover. Research confirms the role that low pay and lack of opportunities for better pay plays an important role in the decision to leave an organization (Gustafson, 2002). Furthermore, employees will willingly remain in organizations where work is stimulating and challenging, chances for advancement are high and if they feel reasonably well paid (Paré & Tremblay, 2000). A number of other studies too suggest that higher wages reduce teacher quit propensity (e.g. Baugh & Stone, 1982; Brewer, 1996; Dolton & van der Klaauw, 1995; Gritz & Theobald, 1996; Mont & Rees, 1996; Mumane & Olsen 1989; Stinebrickner, 2001 and Theobald, 1990). Theobald (1990) found that salaries are positively related to decisions to continue teaching in the same place.

**Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities**

Promotional opportunities refer to the possibilities an employee perceives are there for his or her chances to grow and be promoted within the organization (Lambert et al., 2008). According to McCormick and Ilgen (1985), employees' satisfaction with promotional opportunities will depend on a number of factors, including the probability that employees will be promoted, as well as the basis and the fairness of such promotions. Robbins (1998) maintains that promotions provide opportunities for
personal growth, increased responsibility, and increased social status. A number of researchers are of the opinion that job satisfaction is strongly related to opportunities for promotion (Pergamit & Veum, 1999; Peterson et al., 2003; Sclafane, 1999). In a study by Jayarame and Chess (1984, cited in Staudt, 1997), the opportunity for promotion was found to be the best and only common predictor of job satisfaction.

Dratke and Kossen (2002) postulate that many people experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are good. Kreitner and Kinicki (1992) however, state that the positive relationship between promotion and job satisfaction is dependent on perceived equity by employees. Promotions, therefore, appear to occupy a central role in the turnover process (Price & Mueller, 1986). However, literature examining promotion as an antecedent of turnover is inconsistent and inconclusive. Major theoretical reviews of the withdrawal literature characterize the promotion-turnover relationship as consistently negative (Porter & Steers, 1973), moderately negative (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Mobley, 1982), weakly negative (Price, 1977), and inconclusive (Mobley et al., 1979).

A number of empirical studies suggest a negative relationship between turnover and promotion (Carson et al., 1994; Saporta & Fajourn, 2003). Carson et al. (1994) use a meta-analysis on numerous such studies and show that actual promotion rather than promotion satisfaction or promotion opportunities reduces turnover. Similarly, Saporta and Fajourn (2003) used longitudinal data on a single firm and found a similar result. They found that the number of promotions reduced turnover rates for both professional and managerial workers. Also, to retain employees, departments must offer career advancement opportunities, failing which they may find it difficult to retain qualified employees (Taylor, 1997).

Satisfaction with Supervision

Winston and Creamer (1997) defined supervision in higher education as a management function intended to promote the achievement of institutional goals and enhance the personal and professional capabilities of staff. Employees usually do not quit their companies, they quit their bosses instead (Smith, 2000). Le Blanc et al. (1993) found that satisfaction with supervision was negatively related to
Research demonstrates that a positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and supervision (Koustelios, 2001; Peterson et al., 2003; Smucker et al., 2003). Supervision plays a pivotal role in determining job satisfaction in terms of the ability of the supervisor to provide emotional and technical support and guidance with work-related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003). Supervisors guide their subordinates so that they produce the desired quantity and quality of work within the desired time (Saif-ud-Din et al., 2010).

According to Ramsey (1997), supervisors contribute to high or low morale of employees in the workplace. Previous research has shown that the availability of organizational work-life benefits, in conjunction with a supportive supervisor and an organizational climate promoting their utilization, aids organizations in attracting and retaining human resources (e.g. Casper & Buffardi, 2004). Bradley et al. (2004) investigated the impact of human resource management practices related to job satisfaction. The study reaffirms that there is a positive association between quality of supervision and job satisfaction. Similarly, it was noted that supervisors that are high on employee relationship building behavior have a strong impact on employees' job satisfaction (Graham & Messner, 1998).

Wech (2002) supports this view by adding that supervisory behavior strongly affects the development of trust in relationships with employees. The author further postulates that trust, in turn, have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. Likewise, Laschinger (2007) found a significant and positive correlation between supervision and job satisfaction. Sagas and Cunningham (2004) found that people satisfied with their supervision reported greater job and career satisfaction.

New professionals encounter a host of issues with entry into the profession (Ellis, 2002; Hamrick & Hemphill, 2002; Marsh, 2001) and need orientation and socialization both to their field of work and to their employing institution (Amey, 2002; Katz & Tushman, 1983). An effective model of supervision that provides the necessary orientation and socialization is one way to reduce the attrition of new professionals. The success or failure of new professionals has been attributed to the social support that is received within the organization (Amey, 2002; Katz & Tushman,
1983; Scher & Barr, 1979). Creamer and Winston (2002) stated that one of the principal factors for attrition is the quality of supervision received in the first one or two jobs. New professionals' intentions to turnover have been attributed to their level of job satisfaction (Bender, 1980; Klenke et al., 1990; Lorden, 1998) and job satisfaction has been linked to quality of supervision received (Amey, 2002; Arminio & Creamer, 2001; Schneider, 2002).

Wayne et al. (1997) found that supervision is positively related to perceived organizational support, which contributes to employee satisfaction (Matzler & Renzl, 2006) and satisfying employees' socio-emotional needs (Cohen & Prussak, 2001). It has also been found to enhance work motivation (Lagace et al., 1993) and employees' well-being at work (Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008). In a longitudinal study of 116 new executives, Bauer et al. (2006) found that satisfaction with supervision is negatively related to new executive turnover intentions as well as actual turnover. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that satisfaction with supervision was highly inversely related to turnover. The employees have a tendency to leave their jobs when they have poor supervision (Keashly & Jagatic, 2000), poor training (Poulston, 2008) and low wages (Martins, 2003).

Satisfaction with Work-schedule Flexibility

Many organizations have begun to offer flexible work arrangements to help employees balance work and family demands (Galinsky et al., 2008). An emerging definition of work flexibility (Kossek & Van Dyne, 2008) further subdivides this concept into duration, timing, and place flexibility. Formal family-friendly policies and benefit availability can reduce work-family conflict and enhance employee job outcomes (Anderson et al., 2002; Behson, 2005). Intention to quit is a commonly studied job related outcome in the work-family conflict literature (Anderson et al., 2002; Shaffer et al., 2001).

Research has suggested that organizational work-life benefits and a supportive work climate are linked positively to employee job satisfaction, motivation and reduced employee stress (Allen, 2001; Anderson et al., 2002; Behson, 2005; Casper & Buffardi, 2004; Thompson et al., 1999). Job satisfaction is one of the central variables
in work and is seen as an important indicator of working life quality (Aryee et al., 1999; Cohen et al., 2007). For the same reason, the relationship of job satisfaction with work life quality is another aspect of working life that is often investigated by researchers (Saad et al., 2008). Work-family balance has been listed as one of the top five factors determining job satisfaction for employees in the service sector such as the hospitality/tourism industry (O’Leary & Deegan, 2005). Employees who perceive their organization to be more family supportive report greater job satisfaction (Anderson et al., 2002; Thomas & Ganster, 1995).

De Carufel and Schaan (1990) showed that implementation of alternative work schedules reduced absenteeism and overtime, while increasing employee job satisfaction and productivity. A meta-analysis on alternative work schedules showed decreased positive effects over time associated with flextime as it related to absenteeism, productivity, and job satisfaction (Baltes et al., 1999). Many researchers have studied the relationship between perceived organizational support and work-life quality of workers and have found it to have a positive impact on organizational commitment, employee performance as well as job satisfaction (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Dixon & Sagas, 2007).

Hill et al. (2001) found support for the positive impact of structural changes and increased flexibility. According to their study, individuals who perceived more timing flexibility than their counterparts, given the same workload, were able to work longer hours before their workload negatively impacted their work-life balance. Similarly, women who perceived more flexibility within their organization reported higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Aryee et al. (1998) found a significant positive correlation between satisfaction with work flexibility and organizational commitment and intentions to stay. Employee perceptions regarding the family supportiveness of their organization are related to intentions to leave the organization (Allen, 2001; Anderson et al., 2002; Thompson et al., 1999). Among a variety of variables that have been found to predict turnover, a significant one is poor or inflexible work schedule (Simons, 2008).
Organizations need to respect employee’s desires to have more time off to pursue their own interests. Implementing work-family policies helps to ease family demands, and by doing so, reduces employee absenteeism and turnover (Landauer, 1997). Initiatives may include telecommuting, flexi time, job-sharing, shorter work weeks and on-site child care centers (Baltes et al., 1999).

2.5 Teacher Turnover and Retention: Global Scenario

Globally, more than any other profession, the teaching profession has recently gone through rigorous deliberation and analysis (VSO, 2002). Internationally, the profession is continuously beset by several serious problems. One of the most serious problems in the teaching profession is teacher turnover. There are numerous reports of high teacher turnover in several developed countries such as United States (Guin, 2004; Herbert & Ramsay, 2003); United Kingdom (BBC Online 18 January 2001); Scotland (Finlayson, 2003); and Portugal (Jesus & Conboy, 2001). But in developing countries, the problem is comparatively serious. Reports in countries such as South Africa (Xaba, 2003), Zambia, Papau New Guinea and Malawi (VSO, 2002) indicated that the problem had almost reached a catastrophic stage. The situation is worse in India, where there is an acute shortage of B-school teachers and adding to that very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied and committed to their jobs (Mistry, 2010).

Within the teaching profession there are several factors that cause turnover. Xaba (2003) concluded that the causes of teacher turnover can be attributed to organizational factors. He further asserted that these could be categorized into “commitment to the organization, long-term prospects, and job satisfaction” (p. 287). Further analysis was also made by Herbert and Ramsay (2003). Although the findings by Herbert and Ramsay (2003) related to teacher turnover in Texas in United States, they accurately tallied with findings in several other countries. Herbert and Ramsay (2003, p. 2) while acknowledging the fact that “decisions about whether to enter and remain in teaching are ultimately personal ...according to individuals’ needs and circumstances”; they attributed turnover among teachers to several factors such as
salaries and incentives, working conditions, induction and professional development, and assignments. Some of the causal factors cited by Shaw (1999) were similar to those also raised by Herbert and Ramsay (2003). Shaw (1999) added that factors such as recruitment and selection practices, the work itself, compensation, career opportunities and the work environment contributed to turnover.

2.5.1 Determinants of Teacher Turnover

Ingersoll (2001) defines teacher turnover as—the departure of teachers from their teaching jobs. Luekens et al. (2004) further distinguishes between three groups: Stayers, Leavers, and Movers. Stayers remain in their schools from year to year, Movers transfer or migrate to other schools, and Leavers make the decision to turn to other careers instead of teaching. During the past many years, substantial empirical research has focused on determining which kinds of teachers are more prone to leave teaching and why (e.g., Bobbitt et al., 1994; Chapman & Green, 1986; Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Grissmer & Kirby, 1987, 1992, 1997; Hafer & Owings, 1991; Haggstrom et al., 1988; Heyns, 1988; Marso & Pigge, 1991; Mumane, 1981, 1987; Mumane et al., 1991; Mumane et al., 1988; Rumbergor, 1987; Schlechty & Vance, 1981, 1983; Weiss & Boyd, 1990).

Several research studies have identified a variety of reasons why teachers leave their profession entirely. These include personal reasons such as raising a family/taking care of family (Stinebrickner et al., 2000; Wayne, 2000), or organizational reasons like salary and benefits (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Flowers, 2004; Ingersoll, 1999; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Prince, 2002; Voke, 2003), poor working conditions (Hanushek et al., 2004), job dissatisfaction (Rhodes et al., 2004) related to students' behavior, lack of support from school administration (Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Egley, 2003; Flowers, 2004; and Woods & Weasmer, 2004) and professional development expectations (Inman & Marlow, 2004).

Table 2.5 illustrates some of the teacher turnover studies (global) and the factors identified as responsible for teacher turnover.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Country of Research</th>
<th>Factors Responsible for Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edgar &amp; Pair (2005)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Personal reasons, school staffing actions, to pursue another job, dissatisfaction with their positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert &amp; Ramsay (2004)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Salary &amp; incentives, working conditions, induction and professional development, and assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll (2001)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Retirement, personal reasons, school staffing actions, to pursue another job, dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenblatt et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Ethical climate, organizational climate, tendency to misbehave, &amp; organizational climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narimawati (2007)</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Work satisfaction &amp; organizational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Job security, good location of other organization, organization support, higher education opportunities, good children education, &amp; reputation of pull organization (Pull Factors), small size organization, social status, working environment, employees conflict, lack of promotion, life-work balance, and no fairness/justice in present organization (Push factors) and personal factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyfarth and Bost (1986)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Compensation, growth &amp; security, social integration, safe &amp; comfortable work environment, use and development of human capacities, and constitutionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zey-Ferrell (1982)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Personal traits, occupational status, personal values, support for collective bargaining, early childhood socialization, higher education socialization, general attitude, professionalism, turnover intention and dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali (2007)</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work, &amp; communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the Researcher
Poor salary is probably one of the most common causes of high teacher turnover (VSO 2002). Beardwell and Holden (2001, p. 514) explained that the salary of a particular job reflected “beliefs about the worth of jobs... based on scope, level of responsibility, skill requirements, nature of duties, commercial worth and strategic relevance”. Studies indicate, additionally, that one of the leading causes of teacher attrition is lack of administrative support (Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Certo & Fox, 2002; Eggen, 2002; Hunt & Carroll, 2002; Ingersoll, 1999; Ingersoll, 2001; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Krueger, 2000; Lucksinger, 2000). Citing a National Survey of Teachers, Herbert and Ramsay (2004) specified that, among those dissatisfied with teaching, 61 per cent cited poor salaries, 32 per cent poor administrative support, and 24 per cent student discipline problems. It was also argued that schools that gave their teachers higher salaries, adequate administrative support, and experienced fewer cases of student discipline the teaching staff were less likely to leave.

Ingersoll (2002) found five main areas, viz. retirement, school staffing action, family or personal, pursuit of other jobs and dissatisfaction as reasons cited for turnover and attrition. His findings well supported the earlier findings of Catalyst (1999), Finn (1997) and Osborne (2002). Borsuk (2001) found that attrition appears to be influenced by a number of personal and professional factors that are prone to change across the life span and career path. Duffrin (1999) cites working conditions as reason for high turnover especially among teachers leaving within the first five years of being in the profession. Specifically, Ingersoll (2002) estimated that during the first 5 years of their careers, 45% of teachers leave the profession. Kirby and Grissmer (1991) also suggested that the decision to accept and keep a teaching job depends on life cycle factors related to one's existing family status and changes in one's family status. Similarly, Wayne (2000) maintained that individuals are more likely to leave teaching for family and personal reasons than because they are dissatisfied with their job. Decisions to leave the profession during the later stages of a career may be explained by factors that are distinct from those that are prominent during the earlier years of teaching (Harris & Adams, 2004).

The characteristics of teachers’ work conditions are salient for predicting attrition (Chaika, 2002). Celep (2003) maintained that lower commitment to the organization
affects both the effectiveness of the institute and causes teachers to be less successful or to leave the profession. Ingersoll (2001) draws from theories advocating teacher turnover as a function of ageing and increasing student numbers. He postulates that teacher turnover can be understood by examining the institutes' characteristics and conditions. His exposition asserts that improvement in organizational conditions such as salaries, increased support from administration, reduction of student discipline problems and enhanced teacher input in decision-making would all contribute to lower rates of teacher turnover.

Jackson and Schuler, (2000) noted that organizational factors are critical in teacher turnover. These factors include the teaching job itself, career development, advancement and employment security, supervision, incentives and rewards, which relate to compensation and recognition, poor job performance, which relates to lack of skills, low motivation, bad performance and lack of resources. Ingersoll (2001a, 2001b) argued that organizational factors, including lack of support from administrators, student discipline issues, and lack of input and decision-making power, cause teachers to leave the profession. Other researchers, including Harris and Adams (2007), have continued to provide evidence suggesting that early retirements are the key problem and have speculated that this problem is exacerbated by a pension and salary structure that rewards early retirements.

Chaika (2002) identifies the lack of teacher mobility, inadequate induction programmes, poor working conditions and a growing salary gap between teachers and other college graduates as sources of teacher turnover. Low salary has often been found to be a significant predictor of teachers' intent to leave (Liu & Meyer, 2005). Teachers' starting salaries lag behind those of other professionals in business and industry, and the teacher compensation system lacks differentiation by expertise and work quality (Grissmer & Kirby, 1992). Thus, teachers capable of developing skills for other careers may tend to leave.

With respect to extrinsic factors of job satisfaction, a study by Justus et al. (2011) revealed that teachers felt salary increases might lead to job satisfaction. Markandan (1984) and Chan (1995) found Malaysian teachers to be dissatisfied with salaries.
Bradford (1981) also found that inadequate leadership by the principal contributed to teachers' job dissatisfaction. According to Blooland and Selby's (1980) review of the literature, salary appears to be an important factor associated with the career changes of male educators, but not female educators. Besides that, Skrapits (1986) found that administrators who were friendly, relaxed, attentive, open-minded, and better communicators contributed to greater teacher job satisfaction. Sergiovanni (1984) found that teachers attributed job dissatisfaction to poor relations with colleagues, students and/or parents. His findings were supported by Barnard and Rodgers (1998) who confirmed that the relationship between poor interpersonal relations and job dissatisfaction. Beyond personal and family factors that can affect new teachers' career decisions, another reason new teachers leave is that teaching, as a profession, has been slow in developing a systematic way to induct beginners into highly complex jobs (Gordon & Maxey, 2000; Moskowitz & Stephens, 1997).

2.5.2 Consequences of Teacher Turnover

High teacher turnover has the potential to seriously undermine a positive sense of community among families, teachers, and students that has long been considered by education researchers to be one of the most important gauges and conditions of successful schools (Ingersoll, 2001). High employee turnover, as a consequence of quick career advancement and multiple job opportunities, has come to be known as a negative "spill-over effect" of industrial growth (Sahu & Gupta, 1999). Ingersoll (2002) postulates that staffing problems are created when employees leave the organization and have to be replaced, especially since teacher turnover is highest among new teachers — mostly within the first five years (Mills, 2001).

One cost of teacher turnover is financial (Boe et al., 2005). Turnover costs can include separation costs (e.g., exit interviews), hiring costs, vacancy costs (hiring substitutes), and training costs (Ondrich et al., 2008). A study (Texas Center for Educational Research, 2000) used detailed information on Texas school districts to estimate the cost of replacing one teacher and total costs for current turnover rates and found estimated costs per teacher equal to at least 25 percent of salary and benefits. As
reviewed by Johnson, et al. (2005), estimates of turnover costs vary widely and depend on many variables. Minarik et al. (2003) noted that annual expenditures for recruiting and replacing teachers usurp funding that could otherwise be used for classroom resources, teacher salaries, and facilities. Overall, high rates of teacher turnover have direct monetary costs and alter the distribution of teacher experience and skill across districts (Ondrich et al., 2008).

An additional consequence of high employee turnover is its negative effect on organizational coherence, stability, and morale. This is felt more acutely in education, in that extensive interaction is required between teachers, students, and families, thus making coherence, continuity, and cohesiveness critical (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Studies have also explored organizational consequences of turnover, including its impact on organization members who remain (Baron et al., 2001; Mobley, 1982; Staw, 1980; Steers & Mowday, 1981). For instance, Krackhardt and Porter (1986) explored how the departure of some employees influenced the attitudes of the employees remaining in an organization based on their relational embeddedness. Teacher turnover also affects the distribution of experienced teachers across schools. New teachers are not as effective as teachers with more experience, suggesting that students in schools with more inexperienced teachers will learn less than students in schools with a greater percentage of experienced teachers, all else being equal (Rivkin et al., 2005). Therefore, high teacher turnover can lower student performance. Lankford et al., (2002) found that teacher moves increase inequities in teacher qualifications across schools.

Duffin (1999) points out that it is difficult to fill the vacancies created by educators who leave the profession. He further maintained that about 90% of newly hired teachers are simply replacements for recent departures. To address this situation, the temptation is reportedly the lowering of standards and compromising entry requirements into teaching (Chaika, 2000; Kelleher, 1999). Teacher turnover has significant implications for the education profession because it contributes to organizational instability and high levels of uncertainty in educational settings (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). The most severe consequence of high teacher turnover is its negative effect on teaching quality and student achievement.
Evidence suggests that teacher ability is the single most important factor affecting student achievement (Curran et al., 2000; Geringer, 2000). Moreover, the continuity of school reform efforts is highly sensitive to teacher stability (Fullan, 2001). There is also strong evidence that teachers who leave the profession early are often among the best and the brightest (Henke et al., 2000; Lankford et al., 2002; Podgursky et al., 2004). Because teacher quality is one of the most significant predictors of student achievement (Greenwald et al., 1996; Verstegen & King, 1998), this trend is alarming. High teacher turnover has the potential to seriously undermine a positive sense of community among families, teachers, and students that has long been considered by education researchers to be one of the most important gauges and conditions of successful schools (Ingersoll, 2001).

2.6 Teacher Turnover and Retention: Indian Scenario

A high quality teaching staff is the cornerstone of a successful society. Attracting and retaining high quality teacher is a primary requirement for an educational institution (Sharma & Jyoti, 2006) and for the development of quality teachers one has to understand factors associated with it. Job satisfaction is one of those important factors (e.g. Sharma & Jyoti, 2010). Naseema (1994) studied teaching competency of secondary school physical science teachers in relation to their satisfaction of teaching the subject.

Amit (1994) and Shan (1998) found a positive correlation between job satisfaction and teaching effectiveness. Similarly, Shibu (2011) noted that if faculty members are not satisfied with their profession they will not be able to increase their performance. Teachers’ job satisfaction is considered as a multifaceted phenomenon by Sharma and Jyoti (2006), which is critical to absenteeism and turnover (Locke & Latham, 2000), commitment (Snif-ud-Din et al., 2010), and school effectiveness (Sharma & Jyoti, 2010). Sudhira (1994) investigated teacher job satisfaction and its link with job stress of secondary school physical education teachers. Abraham (2000) studied the link between job satisfaction and teacher effectiveness of college teachers. Godiyal and Srivastava (1995) made a study of teachers’ work involvement, job involvement and
their job satisfaction. It is found that teachers working in institutes providing professional education are frequently changing the institution. It happens because of lack of job satisfaction which ultimately affects teaching and teachers' involvement in institution (Khanale & Vaingankar, 2006).

In order to stop the attrition rate of teachers, universities should make it mandatory to follow a set of binding rules for recruitment, selection, remuneration and other administrative aspects which would be commonly applicable to all colleges. They should pursue the performance appraisal and should take relevant measures for increment and promotion of the teaching staff under them (Kannan & Pillai, 2008). Khanale and Vaingankar (2006) found that ad hoc teachers were satisfied with their jobs mainly because of their favorable attitude towards the teaching profession, financial consideration and the facilities which they were getting for further studies; marital status, age, experience and gender did not affect their level of job satisfaction; leadership qualities of heads of institutions promoted job satisfaction, and group goals and objectives were essential parameters in determining the job satisfaction of teachers.

The importance of teachers' roles cannot be ignored in high quality education of manpower. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction in teachers' works affect their performance. In this regard, identification of teachers' job satisfaction level is important (Demirtaş, 2010). Teachers' job satisfaction is one of the key factors in institutional dynamics and is generally considered to be primary dependent variable in terms of which effectiveness of an organization's human resource is evaluated. Thus, the understanding of factors affecting teachers' satisfaction at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system (Sharma & Jyoti, 2010). In India, very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied in their jobs (Mistry, 2010). The nature of job satisfaction of college lecturers and its relationships with management support, salary and promotion opportunities still remain ambiguous and need to be investigated further (Ch'ng et al., 2010).
Kumar and Patnaik (2004) studied the organizational commitment, attitude towards work and job satisfaction of post-graduate teachers. The correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is moderate which showed that the teachers who were more committed towards organization are more satisfied with their job. A teacher feels fully committed only when he/she works in conducive environment, which includes scope for career pursuits, recognition and acknowledgement, satisfactory salary, incentives, multi-dimensional rewards and self esteem (Kannan & Pillai, 2008). Kumar and Giri (2007) examined the relationship among organizational culture, organizational commitment and job satisfaction and found positive correlation between them. The study revealed that organizational climate works as the mediating variable enhancing the relationship of organization commitment with job satisfaction. Furthermore, Kannan and Pillai (2008) noted that higher salary packages leads to higher organizational commitment. The same study also propounds a positive correlation between commitment of teachers and their level of education, hierarchical level and married status respectively.

2.7 Problem Areas and Research Gaps

The demand for management education has risen sharply in India (Agarwala, 1995) and a phenomenal growth in it had been recorded by National Knowledge Commission (2006-2009) as well in its 'Report to the Nation'. It can be observed that the parameter 'Intellectual Capital and Faculty' is given the highest weightage while evaluating the quality of these management institutions and thus, there exists a need for a mechanism to capture, preserve, retrieve and make visible this intellectual capital of the management institute (Doctor & Ramachandran, 2008). The importance of teachers' roles cannot be ignored in high quality education of manpower; in fact, fostering organizational commitment among faculty members has important consequences and implications for educational institutions (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). In India, very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied and committed in their jobs (Mistry, 2010). Higher education is not immune to the problem of low job satisfaction; in fact, educational leaders have increased the number of research studies that try to identify factors that affect job satisfaction (Davis, 2001; Grace & Khalsa,
In addition to educational leaders and community leaders, other offices and stakeholders within higher education have concern about the financial impacts that job satisfaction and faculty departures have on the institution (Malik et al., 2010). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is very crucial now-a-days because people now often do not prefer to stay with the same organization for long. It has become hard for the organizations to exercise influence on the employees for retaining them (Warsi et al., 2009). Therefore, the understanding of factors affecting teachers' satisfaction and commitment at the workplace is of paramount importance for a successful educational system (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009).

Indian B-schools are facing acute shortage of teachers (National Knowledge Commission's `Report to the Nation', 2006-09) due to sharp rise in the demand of management education and opening up of new management institutes/B-schools in considerably large numbers. In such a situation teacher turnover can drastically add to the misery and trouble of such B-schools. Though there have been some studies on Indian teachers in the past that examines the issue of faculty satisfaction and commitment, the researcher did not come across any study that comprehensively investigated the issue of teacher turnover or retention in detail. Therefore, a huge gap in the body of knowledge can be identified as far as understanding of the whole mechanism of teacher turnover and retention in the context of Indian B-schools is concerned. Also, after a thoughtful and close examination of relevant literature available to the researcher, as discussed in above sections, certain research gaps were identified.

Research Gaps

Following are the research gaps that were identified after a thorough review of the related studies on turnover; both general and in the context of teachers. The gaps that were found relate to both theoretical and practical aspect of the concerned area and apply to both global and Indian studies.
The field of voluntary employee turnover has received much attention over the past decades. Research has centered on both conceptual developments (Lee & Mitchell 1994; Steel et al., 2002) and empirical analyses of various turnover antecedents (Griffeth et al., 2000). However, studies have primarily addressed individual-level predictors of turnover whereas the examination of organizational determinants has been mostly neglected (Shaw et al., 1998).

Importantly, although turnover is associated with negative effects on organizational functioning (Glebbeck & Bax 2004), research has traditionally focused much more on what prompts people to leave rather than stay, to the extent that the field of employee retention remains under-researched (Holtom et al., 2008). Most of the previous studies (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Mitchell et al., 2001; Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002; Steel et al., 2002) focus more on employee turnover than retention. Studies like that of Stovel and Bontis (2002) considered employee turnover in isolation while paying less attention to the issues of retention.

The analysis of organizational turnover determinants focuses on organization-level conditions that prompt members to stay or quit, rather than on more immediate work-related factors such as job satisfaction (Griffeth et al., 2000). Though job satisfaction is one of the most researched topics in the field of organizational behavior (e.g. Spector 1997; Applebaum et al., 2000 etc.), job satisfaction of knowledge workers is one area that further needs to be researched upon (Narang & Dwivedi, 2010). Furthermore, the nature of job satisfaction of college lecturers and its relationships with management support, salary and promotion opportunities still remain ambiguous (Ch'ng et al., 2010) and therefore, need to be investigated further.

Many studies concerning employee retention have been conducted in mainly U.S and Europe to determine the main factors that contribute to their satisfaction and motivation to exist, few of these researches have conducted in developing countries. Replication of such studies in other regions is highly justifiable. Limited studies have been conducted on job satisfaction, organizational
commitment and turnover intentions among employees in universities from developing or less developed countries (Tetty, 2006). In India, the retention of employees has not been fully addressed. Many questions related to employee retention have not been reported yet.

- Although the proposed negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover has received wide empirical support (Mael & Ashforth 1995; Wan-Huggins et al., 1998; Van Dick et al., 2004; Riketta 2005), it is less clear which organization-level factors will influence turnover in general and the commitment-turnover relationship in particular. Also, it was maintained that most of the research on organizational commitment has been done by industrial organizational and occupational psychologists (Mueller et al., 1992), whereas very little research on organizational commitment has been conducted within educational settings (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006).

- Very few researchers have studied teachers' career behaviors. Most researchers have examined existing populations of current teachers to determine their intent to leave as a proxy for attrition (e.g., Billingsley & Cross, 1992; Cross & Billingsley, 1994; Gersten et al., 2001; Littrell et al., 1994; Singh & Billingsley, 1996; Westling & Whitten, 1996; Whitaker, 2000). The study of intent allows investigators to consider the relationship of teachers' career plans to a range of variables without the expensive and time-consuming task of finding those who left. The intent variable is controversial, with some questioning whether it is related to attrition behavior (Boe et al., 1997; LeCompte & Dworkin, 1991). Although some might argue that there should be a greater focus on the examination of attrition than on intent to leave, others have noted that there is a positive relationship between career intentions and later decisions (Boe et al., 1999; Gersten et al., 2001). However, more needs to be known about the strength of this relationship.

- It was found that, generally, Indian studies on higher education (technical and management) teachers were suffering from lack of thorough empirical investigation, which includes having a relatively small sample size base for
Several studies on employee turnover have listed cross-sectional research design as one of their study limitations as it does not capture the impact of situational variables nor the effect of stages in the relationship development. Since, a longitudinal study is more likely to suggest cause-and-effect relationships than a cross-sectional study by virtue of its scope it can establish sequences of events. Therefore, additional studies that use longitudinal or field experimental design to account for more rigorous tests of causality are required.

Many of the studies on employee turnover generated a low response rate. Low response rate not only results in wastage of efforts but it also adversely affects the number of final usable responses undertaken for any statistical analysis. The response rate is as low as 17.4 percent (Pare & Tremblay, 2000), 35 percent (Carmeli, 2005), 42 percent (Khilji & Wang, 2007), 43.5 percent (Anafarta, 2011), 40.8 percent (Malik et al., 2010), 49.2 percent (Koustelios, 2001), and 48 percent (Joe & Park, 2010) in some studies on employee turnover. Also, it has been reported that postal/e-mail surveys in India generate a very low response rate (Budhwar & Sparrow, 1997). Therefore, it was felt that there is some gap, as far as technique for data collection goes, which should be bridged to achieve a relatively higher response rate.

Only a few researchers have asked educators why they left or solicited their views on their work lives (Billingsley et al., 1992; Billingsley et al., 1995; Brownell et al., 1994–1995; Brownell et al., 1997; Morvant et al., 1995). Although these studies requested information in an open-ended manner, most studies gathered data at only one point in time — usually, soon after teachers left their positions. Very little attention has been paid to problems within a school, descriptions of what these problems mean to teachers on a day-to-day basis, or
how certain problems and issues contribute to decisions to leave over time. Moreover, an in-depth analysis of stayers would provide a better understanding of why some special educators remain involved and committed.

A lot of research gaps, in employee turnover literature, were identified in the Indian context. Researchers have argued that there has been a paucity of research examining level of job satisfaction and commitment of teachers in India, on account of which very little is known as to how far the teachers are satisfied and committed to their jobs (Mistry, 2010). Rajadhyaksha and Smita (2004) indicated that there are very few research studies examining work schedule and family related issues from an organizational perspective. Also, it was found that only few researches were conducted on higher education teachers' turnover in India, and that too suffered from lack of thorough empirical analysis based on a reliable and valid instrument.

The demand for management education is constantly rising in India and consequently there is a swift increase in the number of Institutes/Universities/Business Schools offering such education. In the middle of all this, one thing which worries most of the Business schools and also hampers the quality of management education imparted in India is voluntary quitting of teachers. Retaining and managing a satisfied talented workforce (teaching) has become a daunting task for a majority of such institutions. Despite obvious challenges of dealing with teaching staff turnover, there is still a paucity of research addressing this issue and the resulting implications for Indian business schools. The researcher did not come across any Indian study that comprehensively investigates this issue. Also, it was felt that a huge gap does exists in the body of knowledge as far as teachers' turnover and retention in the context of Indian Business schools is concerned.