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REVIEW LITERATURE

The review on Job Involvement, job satisfaction, and organization commitment and turnover intention is based on the objective of the study.

In their recent review of the literature, on job involvement Robinowitz and Hall (1977) suggested that progress has been made in our quest to understand who are psychologically involved in their jobs. After describing the “conceptual confusion and proliferation of terms” that have plagued definition of job involvement, this review identified two classes of definitions that have guided past research: (a) Job involvement as a performance - self-esteem contingency, (b) Job involvement as a component of self-image. Rabinowitz and Hall specified three theoretical perspectives: (a) Job involvement as an individual difference variable, (b) Job involvement as an individual situation interaction.

As Rabinowitz and Hall acknowledged, multivariate studies, are necessary for investigating the relationship of job involvement with different variables.

Recent studies by Schuler and Rabinowitz, Hall and Coodel (1977) did adopt multivariate strategies; Schules used stepwise multiple regression analysis to determine whether job involvement variance was better explained by a combination of individual variables (age, ability to lead, the organization, relevant education and perceived participation and decision making) or a combination of organizational variables (Participatory leadership, role ambiguity and task repetitiveness). Both combinations accounted for about the same amount of job involvement
variance (approximately 33%). Schuler also stated that the inclusion of additional individual (seniority education level, relevant work experience and authoritarianism) and organizational (task-independent, organizational level and role conflict) predictor variables resulted only in trivial increases in the percentages of job involvement variance explained (less than 2%) Rabinowitz et al (1977), who also used a stepwise multiple regression procedure to explain job involvement variance, reported similar results. Their data revealed that individual differences and “job scope” (an unweighted linear sum of Hack man and Lawler (1971) measures of four core job characteristics predictive of job involvement variance.

Herman and Hullen (1972), Herman Danham and Hulen (1975) and Newman (1975) conducted more sophisticated multi variety analysis in their attempts to identify the relative amounts of common variance shared by a combination of personal and situational variables. Job organization characteristics were more powerful than combinations of personal characteristics in the context of explaining individual differences in combination, of job related attitudes the apparent inconsistencies among the findings of Schules and Rabinowitz et al (1977) on one hand, and those of herman and Hulen, Herman et al and Newman on the other, suggest that first of Rabinowitz and Hall’s (1977) conclusion may be premature.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) suggested that work out comes (Satisfaction, performance etc.) are closely related to job involvement as are personal and situational variables. A related consideration is that the absence of an involvement - performance relationship may be pragmatically (although not theoretically) irrelevant. If we accept Gooding (1972) conception of the “Job revolution” where in contemporary workers are becoming more
concerned with the context and personal relevance of their jobs and less impressed with the traditional concerns of pay and security, the study and understanding of psychological job involvement becomes important.

The treatment of job involvement as a topic is not extensively dealt with in the two published handbooks of organization (Dubn, 1976; Dunnette, 1976) presumably for two reasons:

1. It appears that the term job involvement is still in quest of an identity as a variety of other terms, namely, attachment to work, central life interest, commitment to work, intrinsic motivation, ego involvement, morale etc. have been used to describe job involvement.

2. Researchers differ a great deal with respect to the definition of job involvement. It is either conceptualized as the degree to which a person identifies himself psychologically with his work (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965, Lawler & Hall 1970), or the extent to which his self-esteem is affected by his perceived level of performance (Vroom, 1962, Gurn, Veroff and Feld, 1960), or both (Maurer 1969). Salet and Hosek have added an additional dimension to the conceptualization of job involvement by concluding that a job involved person takes active participation in his job. “It is, therefore, a complex concept based on cognition, action and feeling” (Saleh and Hosek, 1976).

Psychology research on job involvement is in a state of positive acceleration, while sociologists concern, with work alienation seems to have reached a plateau. Rabinowitz and Hall draw the following important conclusions from their evaluation of research on job involvement.
1. Job involvement is related to three classes of working variables: personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes. The situational variables appear to have greater effect on the attitudes of low job-involved persons than on high-job involved person. Taken together, the tentative profile of the job involved person which emerges is that he is a believer in protestant ethic, is older, has internal (Vs external) Locus of control, has strong growth needs, has a stimulating job (high autonomy, variety, task identity and feedback), participates in decisions affecting him, is satisfied with the job, has a history of success, is less likely to leave the organization" (Rabinowitz and hall, 1977):

2. Even major job redesign may not increase job involvement of major organizational stress may not decrease involvement.

3. Job involvement appears to be both a cause and effect of job behaviour.

4. The data are more consistent with the psychological identification with work "definition of job involvement than with "self-esteem affected by perceived level of performance" definition.

Recently, Rao and Sheth (1977) have systematically reviewed the psychological and the sociological research, respectively, with respect to the various correlates of work in the Indian context. It is clear from these two sources that research on job involvement in India is sketchy.

Internal v/s external locus of control : Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) have concluded that internality and involvement go hand in hand. Chandhuri (1975) divided 28 bank officers in to four groups in terms of this scores on a locus of control measure and their evaluation of the organization in
which they worked. He found external with high organizational evaluation (O.E) to have more favourable attitude to work (ATW) and low job tension as compared with internals with high O.E: the date base of this study is too meager to lead to any generalization. Moreover, the dependent measured did not strictly focus on the attitude aspect of job involvement.

With regard to the degree of participation in decision making Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) on the basis of results from several studies have concluded that job involvement and participation on decision making are positively and significantly cooperated. There is no direct evidence to support this conclusion in the Indian context. However a study by Bhatnagar (1977) showed that workers in her sample were not so keen to participate, in the first place. She studied the workers desire for participation in a textile and a fertilizer factory with respect to six categories of decisions. (1) Decision related to one’s work, (2) Safety (3) Technical decisions (4) Personal decisions, (5) Welfare decisions and (6) Managerial decisions. She found that workers’ desire for participation decreased from first to last decisional categories. Workers in technologically advanced fertilizer factory demanded greater participation than those in the textile factory with traditional technology. In the textile factory with its ling history of established trade unionism workers desired greater union involvement in personal and welfare decisions. This is contrary to Patchen's contention (1970). Therefore, macro level participation schemes to foster job involvement are likely to be less fruitful than selective approach to participation. De’s case studies on participation redesigning of work systems conducted in three of the largest Indian organizations (a heavy electrical engineering industry, a service industry and another service industry run departmentally by the
government of India) do not clearly show that whether the employees in these organizations demonstrated greater job involvement. Empirical studies, on the other hand, have demonstrated that even major job involvement (Lawler, et al 1973) and major organizational stresses were not sufficient to decrease involvement (Hall and Mansfield, 1971).

Kanungo (1977) has proposed a motivational framework to study alienation and involvement which operationally defines the concept of work involvement as “a generalized cognitive (or level) state of psychological identification with work”, in so far as work is perceived to have the potentiality to satisfy one’s salient needs and expectation. Likewise, work alienation is defined as, “a generalized cognitive (or belief) state of psychological separation from work, in so far as work is perceived to lack the potentiality for satisfying one’s salient needs and expectations”. But this approach limits itself to the individual level only.

Five key assumptions are made in Kanungo’s motivational framework to study alienation and involvement, they are as follows:

1) Terms “alienation” and involvement are the opposite poles of the same phenomena; they are continuous variables. Employees are either more involved (less alienated or less involved (more alienated) in their job situation, rather than being simply involved (alienated) or not.

2) Specifically, behaviour in work situation springs from need satisfaction of salient needs.

3) Salient needs in the individual are influenced by socializing factors such as group, cultural and organizational norms.
4) The individual will apply himself to the job or off the job activities with devotion to the extent depending on where his salient needs are more likely to be satisfied.

5) The individual infers from his experience about his own job involvement or alienation.

Kanungo, Misra and Dayal (1975) explored the relationships between attitude to job involvement and need importance and need strength on the basis of data from two Indian organizations. Significant difference was found between the high scores and the low scores on Lodahl and Kejner job involvement scale in terms of their perceived need important. In terms of Maslow’s theory of need hierarchy, the low involved groups considered the social and physiological needs to be of treated importance than the high involved group.

The job involvement scale used in the present study was developed by Umesh N Agarwal. Three main scales (Lodahl and Kenkjer, 1965, Patchen, 1970, Polz and Andrews 1966) have been used to index job involvement. The Lodahl & Kejmer scale has been used extensively in the U.S. This attitude scaly may be inadequate in India because studies carried out in India on work values, dimension of work motivation and job satisfaction provide a picture different from that in the west. In India, the central meaning of work is that is provides the where with al to pursue other real life interest. Work values internalized during the socialization process militate against industrial values. In a typical Indian organization personal relationship is given priority over of five hours, duties and responsibilities. It provides more satisfaction than constructional work relationship (Sinha & Sinha 1974). Indian managers do not rank responsibility as an important factor. This denotes their escapist
tendencies. Willingness to work above free-time activities thus becomes an important indicator of job involvement in the Indian context.

Many industrial firms in India are owned by the government (public sector) unlike as in U.S. Thus we can expect marked difference in the reward system in public and private firms that would affect job involvement. Agarwala's (1978) study showed that the obtained job involvement promotion expectancy relationship in private forms is consistent with what one would expect in the U.S. where most firms are privately owned and job involvement is valued, a significant correlation (.34) between job involvement and promotion expectancy (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965) supports this contention.

The importance of studying the job attitudes of satisfaction intrinsic motivation has been noted by different people (Calder & Staw, 1975, Deci, 1971, Lodahl and Kejner, 1965, Notz, 1975, Porter, 1962, Schwyhart & Smith 1972, Smith, Kendall and Hulen, 1969, Wanons and Lawler, 1972, Weissaberg and Greenfeld, 1968), Lawler and Hall (1970). Through the use of factor analysis, measured satisfaction, job involvement and intrinsic motivation. The study showed these variables to be relatively independent. The subjects were 96 male blue-collar workers employed in a large forging company. The average age was 41.2 years and their average seniority in the company was 16.4 years.

1) The six items of job satisfaction were similar to those developed by Porter (1962) to assess the degree to which the needs are actually satisfied on the job, on a seven point scale.

2) The six items of job involvement were those recommended by Lodahl and Kejner (1965) as the best measures of job involvement,
the degree to which the job situation is central to the person and his identity on a seven point, likert-type scale.

3) Another four items of Intrinsic motivation were intended to measure intrinsic motivation as developed by Lawler and Hall (1970) the degree to which attaining higher-order need satisfaction is contingent upon performance.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON JOB SATISFACTION

The study of job satisfaction started with Mayo’s study of productivity at the Western Electric Hawthorne Plant in Chicago in 1933 (Hodson, 1991) Since then, many researchers have studied the various aspects of job satisfaction including Mobley et al. (1979); Price and Mueller (1981a, 1981b, 1986); Bluedorn (1982); and Mowday et al. (1982) among others. Job satisfaction is defined as the extent of the positive affective orientation towards a job (Blegen and Mueller, 1987). Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as the liking (satisfaction) or disliking (dissatisfaction) behavior of the employees towards their job. Thus, it is the employee’s emotional bond to their jobs.

Job satisfaction is often seen as a concept that concerns only an employee’s overall feelings about the job, not the employees’ behavior towards the job i.e., lateness, absenteeism etc, (Smith et al., 1969 and Blegen and Mueller, 1987). Porter et al., (1974) view job satisfaction as the sum total of an individual’s met expectations. Some researchers have attempted to measure the global job satisfaction. Careful analysis of these dimensions in an organizational can bring more depth to devising strategies to enhance the job satisfaction of employees. Some of the traditional factors that contribute to job satisfaction are co-workers, pay, job conditions, supervision, nature of the work, and benefits.
In today's competitive world, originations are trying their best to recruit, select, and retain talented, committed, useful and performing employees. With the ever increasing mobility of employees, keeping employees satisfied in their jobs, is most important to ensure reasonable employees retention. Job satisfaction is necessary to promote functional employee behaviors in the organization. Job satisfaction has been found to produce many favorable outcomes, such as high performance; reduced absenteeism and turnover; increased motivation and citizenship behavior; and organizational commitment (Hacket, 1989; Wright and Cropanzano, 2000; Judge et al., 2001; Kinicki et al., 2002 and Wright and Bonett, 2007).

In addition to producing organizationally relevant outcomes, job satisfaction has been found to affect the personal life of employees. Research in the field of management and industrial/organizational psychology has shown that job satisfaction is related with the employee's health and psychological well-being (Gechman and Weiner, 1975; Koen and McDonald, 1982; Chandraiah et al., 2003; Ho and Au, 2006; and Oliver et al., 2006).

The term job satisfaction refers to the general attitude of an individual towards his/her job (Robbind, 2003). Job satisfaction is the result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important by them. According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction denotes the degree to which people like their jobs. Locke (1969) gives a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction, which involves cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions or attitudes towards the job. He has defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state that results from an individual appraisal of one’s job. Job satisfaction means achieving or facilitating one’s job value (Locke, 1969, p. 316).
Although the construct of job satisfaction has been criticized the theoretical analysis as being too narrow conceptually (Bussing et al., 1999), there are three generally accepted dimensions to job satisfaction (Luthans, 2005). According to the first dimension, job satisfaction is an emotional response to a job situation. It means that job satisfaction cannot be observed directly but only inferences can be made about it from the behavior of the employees. The second dimension of job satisfaction signifies that it is determined by the extent to which employees’ needs or expectations are fulfilled by their job. Finally, job satisfaction represents several related attitudes.

In the literature on job satisfaction, it has been defined either as the overall or general job satisfaction of an employee as the satisfaction with certain facets of the job such as the work itself, co-workers, supervision, pay, working conditions, company policies, procedure and opportunities for promotion (Smith et al., 1969). Based upon these two viewpoints of job satisfaction, it may be measured either as the general or overall satisfaction of an employee with the job or it may be measured as the satisfaction of an employee with the various work facets. For the present study, the former view of job satisfaction has been adopted.

Job satisfaction represents a person’s evaluation of his/her job work context (Weiss & Corpanzano, R, 1996); really a collection of attitudes about facets of the job (Locke, E, 1976); a feeling which is a function of the perceived relationship between all that one wants from his job/life and all that one perceives as offering or entailing (Saleh, S, 1981); is determined by the discrepancy between what people expect to receive and what they experience (Lawler, EE, 1973); a pleasurable, or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job provide those things which are viewed by then as important (Luthans, 1989).
In an organizational, several factors are responsible for job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Factors which lead to job satisfaction are democratic leadership (Foels, Drisksell, Muller and Sales, 2000); active jobs with high demand and high control (Jonge, Dollard, Dormann and Lebianc, 2000); company’s investment in employees well being (Taylor, 2000); trust and design of work (Cunningham and Macgrego, 2000); interdependence, autonomy and team working (Sprigg, Jackson and Parker, 2000) promotion and quits (kallenberg and Mastekaasa, 2001); value attainment (Hochwaterter, Perrewre, Ferris and Brymer, 1999). On the other hand, factors which lead to job satisfaction are perceived over qualification (Jhonson and Jhonson, 2000); perception of organizational policies (Vigoda, E., 2000); role conflict and role ambiguity (Yousef, 2000); instigation and incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams and Langhout, 2001); different types of perceived discrimination (Ensher, Grant and Donaldson, 2001); temporary working (Ellingson, Gruys and Sackelt, 1998); work stress and internal control (Lu, Tseng and Cooper, 1999); production uncertainty (Wright and Cordery, 1999), work-family conflict (Perrewre, Hochwater and Kiewitz, 1999); considerate voice and loyalty (Hagedoorn, Van Yperen, Van deVleer and Buunk, 1999).

Job satisfaction is directly related with increased productivity (Vroom, Laffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985); self-esteem, self efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability (Judge and Bono, 2001); life satisfaction (hart, 1999); organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff, Mackenzie and Hui, 1993); helping attitude beyond their normal duties (Bolon, 1997). On the other hand, job dissatisfaction is directly related with intention to leave (Bra, Field and Crockett, 1977 and Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino 1979); employees’ engagement in deliberating stealing sabotage company products and an act of violence against their supervisor or co-
workers (Spector, 1992); aggressive voice, exit and neglect (Hagedoorn, Van Yperen, Van deVleert, Bunnik, 1999).

Review Literature on Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has received considerable attention from industrial and organizational psychologists, management scientists and sociologists. Large number of studies had been done on organizational commitment. Much of the interest in analyzing organizational commitment stems from concern for the behavioral consequences that are hypothesized to result from organizational commitment. Among other topics, organizational commitment have been shown or argued to be related to productivity, attendance at work, turnover, retirement, participation, labor militancy, sympathy for unions, and psychological withdrawal from work.

Analysts have also given much consideration to identifying, often with an eye to manipulating, the antecedents of organizational commitment (Loher, Noe, Moeller and Fitzgerald, 1985). In fact, most of the research conducted treats organizational commitment as the ultimate dependent variable.

Not all analysts though agree that organizational commitment is useful for predicting organizationally relevant behaviour, such as turnover. Hodson, for one, argues that the concept of job satisfaction is severely flawed because "it lacks behavioral referents, its connection with productivity is based on a naive theory of human behaviour, it is a summary measure of worker's complex cognitive structures, and it is too individualistic" (Hodson, 1991 : 273). Hodson claims that commitment is a step in the right direction as it expresses behavioral intentions (the intention to remain with the organizational being primary), but it too
suffers the problems that beset job satisfaction. Hodson moving away from research based on attitudes to more behavioral research.

Even researchers who generally favor organizational commitment cannot agree on the relative merits of organizational commitment for explaining behavioral outcomes. Analysts often treat only one or the other in their analyses. Many researchers place emphases on organizational commitment rather than job satisfaction.

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) hypothesize that differences in organizational commitment of Japanese and American workers are due to differences in organizational structures and strategies of Japanese and American firms rather than cultural differences in attitudes toward work. While their results are not unequivocal, Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) do generally find support for their theoretical position that organizational commitment accounts for much of the difference in organizational behavior noted between American and Japanese workers and that organizational commitment is facilitated by differences in organizational structures and practices among American and Japanese Employers.

On the other hand, Roznowski and Hulin (1992) maintain that well constructed, validated scales of job satisfaction are "the most informative data an organizational psychologist or manager can have for predicting organizationally relevant behaviour in individuals. Roznowski and Hulin maintain that low levels of job satisfaction create one (or a combination) of four types of undesirable behaviour. First, dissatisfied individuals may attempt to increase job outcomes by stealing, using work time to pursue personal tasks, or by moonlighting. Second, they may withdraw from the job psychologically as manifested in such behaviour as not attending meetings, drinking on the job, or wandering about tying to look busy. Third, dissatisfied employees may practice behavioral withdrawal from
the job as in absenteeism, turnover, or early retirement. Finally, employees may undertake specific change behaviours that attempt to alter the work situation. This may include remaining in a particular job and trying to affect changes through union or other activity, or it may involve attempts to change the locus of the job through transfer or demotion (Roznowski & Hulin, 1992: 126-130).

Most studies of the behavioral outcomes of organizational commitment (Randall, 1990: 371) have focused on white collar, professional workers. The current study expands the analysis to a wider spectrum of workers and helps address this imbalance while also building upon the related research of those interested in the organizational commitment of workers employed in correctional settings (Saylor & Wright, 1992, Cullen, Link, Wolf, & Frank, 1985, Jurik & Halemba, 1984, Jurik, Halemba, Musheno, & Boyle, 1987, Plecas & Maxim, 1991, Rogers, 19991, Wright & Saylor, 1991).

Commitment to the organization is a research subject quite established for the last 20 years in the Anglo-American environment (Griffin & Bateman, 1986). Already at the beginning of the 90s, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) produced a meta-analysis. Even looking at the younger literature (Meyer, 1997) the interest in the subject not only seems to stay even, but increase. In the German-speaking environment this ideas seem to proliferate since the end of the 80ties (Moser, 1996; Schmidt et al., 1998). In the Spanish-speaking environment one will find more recent works about the facto-rial structure of the organizational commitment (De Frutos et al., 1998; Gonzalez & Anton, 1995; Tomas & Espejo, 1994).

Unfortunately, many approaches have been developed around the construct in a parallel manner and different measure scales have proliferated. Therefore, it has been difficult to obtain precise conclusions.
However, during the last ten years some integrated propositions appeared. They should help to organize the diversity of ways the commitment study has taken (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995).

Traditional Perspectives

The first division in the literature about organizational commitment refers to the perspective, which deals with the construct. This can be an attitudinal or a behavioral perspective. The first one has concentrated primarily on the study of the antecedents and outcomes of commitment. The second one has been centered on the analysis of the conditions under which organizational commitment behavior tends to reappear and the attitudinal changes it causes.

There also exists a third and much examined perspective, which dwells on the importance of moral values and their strength and continuity for the commitment to the organization (Wiener & Vardi, 1980). Loyalty and fidelity originate when the respective norms are internalized.

In the attitudinal perspective the best representation is maybe the work of Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) who define organizational commitment as an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization. This implies a strong acceptance of the goals and values of the organization, a willingness to exert the necessary efforts to achieve the organizational objectives and the desire to maintain membership in the organization. This author developed the OCQ (Organizational Commitment Questionnaire) that has been used in many studies because of its psychometric qualities (Morrow, 1983). The questionnaire consists on 15 items where the employee expresses his/her agreement or disagreement level in a Likert scale of seven points.
The attitudinal approach coincides with was called the affective dimension of commitment. It is defined as an attitude, which expresses the emotional link between the person and his/her organization (De Frutos et al., 1998). Commitment is considered an affective or emotional attachment to the organization such that the strongly committed individual identities with, is involved in, and enjoys membership in the organization.

This view was taken by Kanter (1968) who described "cohesion commitment" as "the attachment of an individual's fund of affectivity and emotion to the group" and later by Buchanan (1974) who conceptualized commitment as a "partisan, affective attachment to (1) the goals and values of the organization, (2) to one's role in relation to the goals and values, and (3) to the organization for its own sake, apart form its purely instrumental worth" (Mowday et al., 1979)

In regard of the behavioral perspective, the main focus is around the "side bets" theory developed by Becker (1960). In this theory commitment is described as a disposition to engage in "consistent lines of activity" as a result of the accumulation of "side bets" that would be lost if the activity were discontinued. The line of activity refers to the collaboration of the employee with the organization by achieving its objectives and also maintaining membership.

With the time employees accumulate investments that could be lost if he or she leaves the organization. Changing his/her position suppose scarifying the investments made (de Frutos et al., 1998). It is the cost of loosing these investments what makes the employee develop this line of action that characterizes organizational commitment. This dimension is called calculated or continuance commitment.
There are many ways that lead to accumulation of investments. In this connection age and tenure has been analyzed, however, others should also be considered like salary, position, marital status and the perception of alternatives (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995). The investments made by the employees are also varied, for example time or efforts the employee devote in the organization, development of organizational-specific skills or event friendly relationships with work colleagues. The investments might include contributions to nonvested pension plans, status, use of organizational benefits such as reduced mortgage rates, and so on.

The perceived cost of leaving may be intensified by a perceived lack of alternatives to replace the foregone investments. At any rate, it is the fear of loss that commits the person to the organization (Meyer & Alien, 1984). At the same time McGee and Ford (1987) discuss the composition of the calculated dimension. They consider it as being sub-composed by two factors: One component of "high personal sacrifice" (associated to the cost of leaving the organization) and a second factor of "lack of alternatives" (related to the scarcity of alternatives or lack of possibilities of finding a job that represent a current alternative). This aspect has been empirically studied by Meyer, Alien and Gellalty (1990) and Hackett, Bycio and Hausdorf (1994). However, there are still some critical elements around this proposition and the one-dimensional version of the calculated dimension is still frequently used Not all of the investigators agree considering both commitment perspectives (calculated and attitudinal) as different types of commitment.

Jaros, Jermier, Koehler and Sinsich, 1993 (cited by Gonzalez & Anton, 1995) mention that organizational commitment is a disposition that suppose recognizing the cost associated with leaving a line of activity.
Contrary to the attitudinal commitment perspective, where exists a broadly accepted and utilized scale of measure, in the behavioral commitment perspective the instruments were not that generalized and broad utilized. Cost-induced commitment has typically been assessed using a measure developed by Ritzer and Trice (1969), and modified by Hre-bmiak and Alutto (1972), that requires respondents to indicate the likelihood that they will leave the organization given various inducements to do so (e.g. increases in pay, status, freedom, promotional opportunity). It is doubtful, however, that this measure actually reflects cost-based commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1984; Stebbins, 1970). Indeed, the fact that high scores on the scale reflect an unwillingness to leave the organization, in spite of attractive inducements to do so, suggests that it may measure affective attachment rather than, or in addition to, cost-induced commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1984).

The "side bets" theory was not always confirmed empirically. The Decker's hypotheses were evaluated by interrelating factors like age and tenure with the scores in 1961 "Hrebinia and Alutto scale. Age and tenure both imply the accumulation of investments and therefore, organizational commitment induced by the cost of abandonment (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995) Meyer & Alien (1984) support Becker's theory in the extent they assert that the above mentioned scales measure attitudinal and behavioral commitment. A high score in them suppose a tendency to stay in the organization more than leaving it, although the good alternatives presented. Therefore, failures in regard of the scale validation may be due to a scale contamination and not to the theory itself.

Finally, a less common but equally viable approach has been to view commitment as a belief about one's responsibility to the organization.
Wiener (1982) defined commitment as the "totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests", and suggests that individuals exhibit behaviors solely because 'they believe it is the "right" and moral thing to do'. "The only measure of this obligation-based commitment in the literature is the three-item scale used by Wiener and Vardi (1980). Respondents are asked the extent to which they feel "a person should be loyal to his organization, should make sacrifices on its behalf, and should not criticize it" (Wiener & Vardi, 1980). Other than internal consistency, the psychometric properties of the scale are not reported (Meyer and Allen, 1984).

The Meyer and Alien Conceptualization

Both authors start from an initial distinction between two types of organizational commitment: one affective and the other calculated or continuance. Both of these match two of the three traditional perspectives, as mentioned above (Meyer & Alien, 1984). Lately the authors develop a unique organizational commitment concept, with many components. The change to this proposition of various components ends with the incorporation of the third component: the normative commitment based on the work of Wiener (1982).

Alien and Meyer (1990) argue that like many constructs in organizational psychology, however, commitment, has been conceptualized and measured in various ways. Common to all the conceptualizations of commitment found in the literature is a link with turnover; employees who are strongly committed are those who are at least likely to leave the organization. Perhaps more important than this similarity are the differences between the various conceptualizations of commitment.

These differences involve the psychological state reflected in commitment, the antecedent conditions leading to its development, and
the behaviors (other than remaining that are expected to result from commitment). Not surprisingly, confusion surrounding the conceptual distinctions is reflected in attempts to measure the construct.

Indeed, relatively little attention has been given to the development of measures of commitment that conform closely to the researcher's particular conceptualization of the commitment construct.

Like mentioned before, one of the characteristics of commitment research is the fragmentation of the investigations and the use of instruments that not always match with the theory frame since they are proposed (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995). Alien and Meyer (1990) where responsible for bundling up these three ideas into an integrated concept. Their three-component-model integrates affective commitment, i.e. the commitment of the employees surges from the wishes and wants, calculating commitment (continuance commitment), i.e. their commitment is based on a rational consideration to stay in the organization and normative commitment, i.e. the employees believe they have to respond to social and ethical norms. This integrated concept includes the behavioral point of view inside the basic attitudinal concept of organizational commitment but enhancing his multidimensional characteristics. The three dimensions (affective, continuance and normative) characterize the relationships between employees and the organization and on the other side affects the decision of collaborating and maintaining membership in the organization (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995).

To measure these three components Meyer and Alien have developed a commitment-scale containing 24 items. The three dimensions of their model were repeatedly confirmed empirically (Meyer, Alien & Smith, 1993; Hacket, Bycio & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer & Alien, 1997; Irving, Coleman & Cooper, 1997).
Alien and Meyer (1990) based their integrative approach on the assumption that all three forms of commitment could appear at the same time and in different degrees. Each component of the commitment develops from the different work experience of the employees and have different effects on their behavior in the organization. This differentiation is of quite practical importance when possible ways of increasing the commitment are viewed. There is, for example, quite a high risk of employees leaving for a more attractive offer if they are only bound to the organization by a calculating commitment. The organization and their leaders should then try to increase the affective commitment by changing the work-tasks and -conditions. In this case Meyer and Alien (1997) talk about an active commitment-management. Meyer and Alien (1997) continue their idea by proposing to generalize their model for other areas. They start from the thesis that their model, being a universal commitment model, can also be applied to the commitment on the activity, the profession, the team, etc. Already Meyer, Alien and Smith (1993) mentioned that it can also be used in the commitment to the task or the profession (occupational commit-ment) and proved it empirically. This generalization was also confirmed in a more recent work of Irving, Coleman and Cooper (1997) cited in Felfe 2002.

Antecedents And Outcomes of Commitment

In the last couple of years, the concept of organizational commitment (OC) has grown in popularity in literatures of industrial/organizational psychology and organizational behavior. The concept has been subjected a great amount of empirical studies both as a consequence and as an antecedent of other work-related variables of interest. As a consequence, organizational commitment has been linked to several personal variables, role states, and aspects of the work environment ranging from job
characteristics to dimensions of organizational structure. As an antecedent, organizational commitment has been used to predict employee's absenteeism, performance, turnover, and other behaviors. In addition, several other variables of interest, perhaps best referred to as correlates (job involvement and job satisfaction), have demonstrated relationships with organizational commitment (Morrow, 1983; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reichers, 1985; and Steers, 1977).

Mowday et.al. (1982) have suggested that gaining a greater understanding of the processes related to organizational commitment has implications for employees, organizations and society as a whole. Employee's level of commitment to an organization may make them more qualified to receive both extrinsic (e.g., wages and benefits) and psychological (e.g., intrinsic job satisfaction and relationship with coworkers) rewards associated with membership. Organizations value commitment among their employees, which is typically assumed to reduce withdrawal behaviors such as being late and turnover. In addition, committed employees may be more likely to engage in "extra role" behaviors, such as creativity or innovativeness, which are often what keeps an organization competitive (Katz & Kahn, 1986). From a larger perspective, a society as a whole tends to benefit from employee's organizational commitment in terms of lower rates of job movement and perhaps higher national productivity or work quality or both.

**Antecedents**

Commitment has been studied and a large amount of empirical and theoretical literature has been dedicated to an exploration of the antecedents (or correlates) of organizational commitment. At least three, more- or- less distinct classifications of antecedents variables have been identified: a) psychological variables, such as job satisfaction and
identification with organizational goals and values (Reichers, 1985); b) behavioral variables that cause individuals to make the attribution that they are committed, for example, the irrevocability and volitionality of job choice (Reichers, 1985) and c) structural variables associated with long-term organization membership such as non portable benefits and sunk costs (Reichers, 1985).

The antecedents of commitment can be roughly classified as psychological (expectations, challenge, conflict), behavioral (volitional, irrevocable acts) and/or structural (tenure in the organization, accumulated investments/sunk costs), these three classes of antecedents (correlates) may not all operate in the same way at the same point in time. That is, commitment to an organization may develop over a long period, and each class of antecedent variables may be primarily associated with early, mid or late career commitments (Mowday et.al., 1982). First employees become the psychological attachments to the organization, then the behavioral linkages and finally over the time the structural variables such as investment and lack of opportunity elsewhere, may combine to cement the individual's attachment to the organization. That's why only a longitudinal approach can be particularly meaningful for an understanding of the antecedents of organizational commitment (Reichers, 1986).

On the other side, the three dimensions proposed by Alien and Meyer (1990) develop as a function of different antecedents and also have a different impact on the behaviour of employees. It has been suggested that the antecedents of affective attachment to the organization include personal characteristics- age, gender, organization tenure, educational level etc-, organization structure characteristics - organizational centralization and formalization etc- (Gonzalez & Anton, 1995; Meyer & Alien,
1991, Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). The continuance component will develop on the basis the magnitude and/or number of investments made by the employees, the costs perception and the perceived lack of alternatives (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Finally, it is proposed that in regard of the antecedents of normative commitment, which study currently is more theoretical than empirical, employees develop an obligations feeling to continue in the organization as a result of a familiar/cultural and organizational process (Wiener, 1982).

Later Meyer and Alien (1997), proposed a specific model for the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. The model establishes two main blocks of variables that can be considered as antecedents for the construct, and classified as proximal and distal. Distal variables are those associated with the characteristics of the organization (e.g. size, structure), personal characteristics, socialization experiences (e.g. cultural, familial), management practices (e.g. recruiting, training), and environmental conditions. The main clusters of variables considered as proximal antecedents are: work experiences (e.g. support, justice), role states (e.g. conflict, overload) and psychological contracts.

In spite of the fact, that some organizational characteristics such as policies and structure, or some personal characteristics as values, tenure, and gender have been studied as antecedents of affective commitment, no consistent results of causality have been found. On the contrary, it seems that work experiences are the most consistent predictors of affective commitment according to the main cited reviews of the variable (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Alien, 1997). Among the work experiences that leads to affective commitment are: job challenge, degree of autonomy, variety of skills used by the employee, knowing the role that the employee plays in his or her company, and also, the relations of the
employee and his or her co-workers and supervisor (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Outcomes

In the last years, one of the main reasons for the interest in organizational commitment is its presumed relationship with important organizational outcomes such as turnover, performance, and absenteeism. (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Research evidence has demonstrated significant relationships, particularly between organizational commitment and turnover (Lee & Mowday, 1987; Porter, Steers, Mow-day & Boulian, 1974) and between organizational commitment and other behavioral outcomes such as performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin & Jackson, 1989; Wiener & Vardi, 1980) and absenteeism (Parrel & Peterson, 1984; Steers & Rhodes, 1978). However, much of the literature, based on quantitative summary of findings (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Randall, 1990), argues that, in general the relationships between commitment and its outcomes have produced few large correlations. Because the overall magnitude of the relationships between commitment and outcomes were found to be relatively weak, researchers began to question the importance of organizational commitment as a research subject and as an organizationally desirable attitude.

One explanation for the relatively low commitment-outcomes correlations might be that these relationships are not simple or direct, but moderated by other variables (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Quite surprisingly, however, in the literature there is little empirical material on the conceptual models of any moderating effects on the relationships between organizational commitment and its outcomes. However, career development and organizational commitment development theory (e.g.,
Mowday et al. (1982) does suggest that career stage may moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and its outcomes.

These theories include career development models forwarded by Super, 1957, Super, Zelkowitz and Thompson, 1981, and Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee, 1978 (cited by Cohen, 1991), and organizational commitment development model forwarded by Mowday et al. (1972), and Reichers (1986). Super (1957) and Levinson et al. (1978, argue that people, no matter what their occupational background, pass through specific career stages characterized by various crucial activities and psychological adjustments. Individuals need both to master work activities and resolve important psychological issues at each point in their career. According to Super's (1957) theory, there are three stages in a person's vocational career (age 25-65): exploration, establishment, and maintenance. Levinson et al. (1978) identified four 'life areas': childhood (0-20 years), early adulthood (20-40), middle adulthood (40-60) and late adulthood (over 60). Despite some differences, both of these career development models posit that career stage will influence the strength of the relationship between commitment and outcomes (Cohen, 1991). While age is the most common career stage indicator, the organizational commitment development models also employ tenure as a career stage indicator. Mowday et al. (1982) developed a conceptual framework that proposes three stages in the development of organizational commitment: a) the pre-entry stage, which deals with the influencing of job choice on commitment; b) the early employment stage; and c) the middle and late career stages in the organization. A slightly different model which excludes the pre-employment stage was suggested by Reichers (1986) who concentrated on three stages of development early, mid and late career stages. These categories, partially correspond to
the exploration, establishment, and maintenance stage Super's (1957) theory and similarly to the 'entering the adult world' stage (early), 'thirties transition' and 'setting down' stages (mid), and 'middle adulthood' stage (late) of Levinson et. al.'s (1978) typology (Cohen, 1991)

REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON EMPLOYEES VOLUNTARY TURNOVER & TURNOVER INTENTION

The literature review as contained in this chapter will not be complete without discussing turnover intention, which is the dependent variable in the study. Over the last two decades, considerable effort has been spent on developing predictive models of voluntary turnover, with organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention among the most commonly proposed antecedents. The findings generally support the hypothesized linkages among turnover and some key variables such as job satisfaction and commitment. For example, Bluedorn (1982) and Hollenbeck and Williams (1986) have shown that satisfaction and organizational commitment are negatively related to turnover intention. Equally interesting is the finding that turnover intention is the strongest cognitive precursor of turnover (Lee and Mowday 1987; O'Reilly and Caldwell 1981).

Turnover intention is defined as one's conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization (Tett and Meyer 1993). To measure turnover intention correctly, a specific interval such as over the next six or twelve months has to be set up. Turnover intention is believed to be the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognition, a set to which thinking of quitting and intent to look for alternative employment opportunities also belong. Mobley (1977) suggested that the job satisfaction-turnover intention linkage is mediated by thoughts of quitting and intent to search for opportunities. For the sake of parsimony, most researchers try to combine different
variables related to withdrawal with turnover intention to form an index of withdrawal cognition (Blau and Boal 1989; Mitchel 1981).

The discussion on turnover intention is always linked to organizational commitment and job satisfaction and three main theoretical perspectives in this area may be identified, each carrying different conceptual and research implications. One school of thought suggests that commitment to the company develops from job satisfaction and such commitment mediates the effects of satisfaction on withdrawal variables. This so-called satisfaction-to-commitment mediation model reflects Porter et al.'s 9741 claim that since organizational commitment takes a much longer time to develop, it is usually more stable than job satisfaction. As a result, job satisfaction is expected to have an indirect and weaker influence on turnover intention.

The second view is diametrically opposite to the first one and could be called the commitment-to-satisfaction mediation model. Under this model, commitment to the organization will bring about positive feeling towards the job and employees will leave or stay with the organization based on how they feel about their jobs (Salancik and Pfeffer 1978). This model suggests that changes in organizational commitment will have only indirect effects on turnover intention. It is interesting to note that the findings from past research are quite controversial because some studies lend support to the hypothesis (Bateman and Strasser 1984; Dossett and Suszko 1989) whereas others do not (Curry et al. 1986; Meyer and Allen 1988).

The final school of thought suggests that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment play their own distinctive role in the turnover process. This independent-effects model proposes that job satisfaction and organizational commitment, albeit related, are
absolutely unique constructs. According to the proponents (Farkas and Tetrick 1989), any study should focus on how attitudes toward the job and company combine and interact to influence the turnover intention.

The three models described above are marked with different contributions in the understanding of the turnover process and no conclusive observation can be made yet. One of the reasons why a study on the turnover process has been conducted is to determine whether organizational commitment plays a unique role in affecting the turnover intention of marketing executives in foreign securities firms in Hong Kong and what recommendations can be put forth to management to address the employee turnover issue.

Turnover is generally defined as labor movement with geographic, occupational or industrial boundary. To be more narrowed defined, turnover represents the inflow and outflow of employees in organizations. Normally, the latter turnover is what scholars and organizations concern more. Turnover according to Huaug (2000) can be detailed defined as flow within organization, accession (inflow) and separation (outflow). Turnover commonly used mainly indicates separation. Separation can be viewed as voluntary as well as involuntary and voluntary separation is most discussed. Hsu et al. (2003) defines turnover as the termination of employment or membership with an organization.

Turnover is the last employees' withdrawal behavior and breaches the relationship between an individual and an organization. Human resources management consistently seeks means to increase employee retention rate so as to avoid the separation consequences as possible. The turnover consequences both incur to employee and organization. Employers need to suffer financial losses, such as the cost of separation, recruitment, and
re-training, and the loss of specific human capital, such as embedded knowledge, and experience. Also, high turnover rate may reduce the morale among remaining employees. The costs for separated employees are opportunity cost and job searching. (Cascia 1991; Lum et al., 1998) The National Productivity Board (1988) reveals two-third organizations express the high turnover rate results in greater than 10 per cent of productivity loss. Also, it brings lower service, product quality and high cost of recruitment.

Since organizations and human resource management place much concern on employee turnover, scholars focus on analyzing the motivation of turnover which is regarded as the disaffection of the individual with some aspect of the work environment including job, co-worker or organization. (Mobley 1982; Mowday et al., 1982) According to the researchers, a number of affective responses to the organization and the job, such as organizational commitment and job involvement have an impact on turnover intentions.

Mobley (1977) asserts job attitudes have significant direct influence on actual turnover behavior. His model shows between job satisfaction and turnover decision making process there are several intervening variables.

In Price's model (1977), he classifies turnover antecedents into structural, economic and social psychological variables (job satisfaction). A causal relationship is investigated in his study. The causal process begin with five antecedents of job satisfaction: pay, integration, instrumental communication, formal communication and centralization. The level of job satisfaction varies individual's turnover.

Subsequent research is the Porter, Steer and Mowday (1974) model. They present that job expectation affects personal affective responses which
master individual's desire and intention to retain in or leave the organization. Individuals assume with their expectations to the work environment and compare the expectations with the reality. Attitude and satisfaction are the outcomes of discrepancy. Employees increase their attachment to organization when their expectations correspond with actual situations.

How are employees' attitudes / behaviors affected and lead to outcome, such as less commitment and turnover? Morrison & Robbinson (1997) explain the connection between employee's attitudes / behaviors and organizational factors. The psychological contracts are invisible existing in employees' perceptions which make them believe the certain obligations between organization and individuals. When organizations fail to perform the obligations, employees relatively reduce to complete their duties by showing absenteeism for example.

Many researches have confirmed satisfaction, commitment and intention to quit are the variables highly associated with turnover. Among them, intention to quit is regarded as the most important antecedent. (Mobley et al., 1979; Mitchel 1981; Bluedorn 1982)

Bluedorn (1982) and Price & Mueller (1981) stated that diverse factors affecting turnover cause difficulty to accurately predict turnover behaviors. Turnover intention or intention to leave is verified to be the best and immediate predictor of turnover. Researches have successfully demonstrated intention to leave is consistently correlated with turnover. (Mobley et al. 1978; Newman 1974; Bedeian et al. 1991) Compared to job search behavior, turnover intention is a more successful turnover antecedent. (Kopelman et al. 1992: Vandenberg et al. 1994) Fishbein &
Ajzen (1975) posit that 'the best predictor of an individual's behavior will be measure of his intention to perform that behavior.'

Turnover intention is defined as the psychological conscious and willfulness to leave the organization. (Tett and Meyer 1993) It also represents the series of thoughts of quitting the job or searching for new opportunities. Individuals estimate the possibilities of terminating the membership of the organizations at some point in the near future. (Mobley 1982)

Demographic factors have been found stable relations with turnover intentions. Scholars confirm age, tenure and pay level having negative relation with turnover intention while education shows positive relation with turnover intention. Namely, individuals receiving higher educations tend to change job more often. (Berg 1991; Arnold & Feldman 1982) Also, non-management employees are found to quit than management. (Wai & Robinson 1998)

Randy K Chin et al. (2003) conducts an investigation of dispositional traits (PA-positive affectivity; NA- negative affectivity) as the antecedent of turnover intention (TI) and job satisfaction and affective commitment as the mediating role. The survey is done with target of managers from mainland China and results signify PA is negatively related to turnover intention and job satisfaction and affective commitment mediate the relations of PA and TI. However, NA is found no any significant relation with TI.

Jovan Hsu et al. (2003) conduct an investigation regarding the relationships of leadership styles and turnover intentions in the Chinese context. House and Dessler's Path-Goal leadership model is adopted by the study. The results show that three leadership styles- instrumental
leadership, supportive leadership, and participative leadership, are negatively related to turnover intention.

Theories of Turnover

Over the years, proponents of various models of turnover have made significant contribution towards the study of quitting behavior. Some of the most renowned social scientists have contributed to this literature (March 1958; Sorokin 1932). In fact, the literature is so voluminous that some researchers have been conducting reviews on literature (Mobley 1979; Mowday 1979; Wanous 1980).

To highlight the determinants of turnover in a more systematic way, the following review is organized into sections on economic, psychological and sociological theory.

Theories From Economics

The basic principle of demand and supply determines the behavior of individuals. From there, researchers have set up various models of employee turnover, which are basically derived from utility maximization, dual labor market and human capital theories. Utility maximization models of employee turnover are based on the assumption that workers are rational human beings who would maximize their utility or satisfaction through the earnings of wages in the labor market. Instead of creating the working environment, workers are believed to be reacting to the economic conditions of employment. As such, changes in the working conditions and environment help explain turnover (Utgoff 1983). One natural conclusion is that the turnover rates of the economy tend to move with the cycle (Price 1977). In other words, when job opportunities are abundant during economic booms, workers can look for better packages, leading to higher turnover. When
economies go into downturns, employers get the upper hand and
turnover rates tend to decrease. The shortcoming of this model is the lack
of explanation on why some quit and some stay on jobs under similar
economic conditions.

Dual labor market theory posits that the economy is divided into two
labor markets -the primary and secondary (Averitt 1968). The
primary labor market offers employees nice working environment,
attractive pays, excellent promotion opportunities and reasonable job
security. The opposite prevails in the secondary labor market. It is
interesting to see how dual labor market theory helps explain
phenomenon such as gender and race income differentials (Howell and
Reese 1986), industry wage differentials (Krueger and Summers
1987), employee loyalty (Doeringer and Piore 1971) and quit rates
(Armknecht 1972; Cornfield 1985). Apparently, employees have
found work conditions in the primary sector more encouraging
(Braverman 1974; Hodson 1985). In particular, employees are open to a
vast number of opportunities within the organization (DiPrete 1987) - a
condition that will induce them to stay on the job (March and Simon
1958; Todor 1986). These findings suggest that factors other than pay
and compensation affect the quitting decisions of employees.

One of the major contributions of dual labor market theory is the
proposition that employees in jobs with poor work conditions and low
wages tend to have higher voluntary quit rates than employees in
primary sector organizations. Their findings also suggest that pay scale
for the same job could vary across sectors (Ippolito 1987; Leonard 1987;
Perloff 1971; Utgoff 1983).

While dual labor market models offer valid explanations on turnover
within the structure of organizations or industries, they fail to link up
how employee attributes or job characteristics common to firms across sectors affect employees' decisions to leave organizations or transfer within organizations. In addition, dual labor market theory offers no valid explanation on the timing of turnover among individuals and they also do not provide a valid description of the types of employees who are at risk of quitting (Mobley 1982).

The other version of the economic model of employee turnover is the human capital theory (Becker 1975). Human capital refers to employees' skills, education, training, experience, exposure, etc. Workers will then trade their "human capital" with employers for pay, benefits, working conditions and career. Employees who are better equipped in their human capital will be more capable and obtain better employment opportunities. While there are conflicting evidence on the validity of the human capital model (Distefano Jr. 1982; Greenhalgh 1980), employees who are well equipped on human capital tend to invest more in their jobs and become more specialized. Since specialized skills are less transferable, employees who invest more in their jobs tend to stay longer (Farrell and Rusbilt 1981).

Utility maximization, dual labor market and human capital models of turnover highlight that economic conditions, economic structures and the human capital owned by workers affect their decisions to stay or quit. These models hint that differences in pay and compensation packages are the primary determinants of employee turnover. Other things being equal, the higher the wages, the less likely will the employees quit.

It is interesting to note that individual worker usually assesses his contributions to the work, the rewards in both financial and qualitative terms from the organization and how the overall package compares to
other individuals both inside and outside the organization. Frustration will arise when an individual perceives significant deviation in his package which includes pay, promotion, fringe benefits and promotion prospects relative to his background and effort in comparison with others in similar organizations. This will lead to job dissatisfaction (Miner 1980) that will prompt an individual to look for ways to reduce the inequity. Such measures may include modifying the inputs and outcomes to narrow the deviations.

In summary, the major contribution of economic models is in identifying how economic conditions distribute opportunities among workers. Employees with more opportunities are usually more mobile. The shortcoming of economic models is the failure in explaining how individuals perceive and capitalize on employment opportunities. Research shows that some employees have been able to change jobs even under very depressed market conditions (Granovetter 1973), suggesting that non-economic factors such as personal contacts, market awareness and opportunity, may affect quitting decisions.

Theories From Psychology

The basic assumption of the turnover theories from psychology anchors on the arguments that individuals attribute positive and negative qualities to work conditions. The development of attitude and value formation, of course, is based on experience, which in turn will affect the quitting behavior (Berger 1968; Hall 1970; Hill 1981; Shaw 1970).

In the study of turnover, reinforcements refer to the work conditions that either increase or decrease the probability that individuals will stay on the job, depending on whether they are positive or negative reinforcements. Positive performance appraisals, pay raises and
additional fringe benefits are usually construed as positive reinforcements. On the other hand, public reprimands, demotions and pay reductions are regarded as negative reinforcements. However, it should be noted that the same work conditions do not reinforce all individuals uniformly and organizations that offer more positive reinforcements are likely to have lower quit rates (Berger 1968; Shaw 1970).

One of the basic assumptions underlying the psychology models is that the formulation of work attitudes is consistent with the principles of learning theory (Doob 1967; Lott 1985; Rhine 1967; Rosenberg 1967; Smith 1967; Staats 1967). Although evidence of the exact nature of their relationship is inconclusive, findings generally support that attitudes affect behavior that in turn modifies attitudes.

Two major models have been derived from the behavior school of thought. The first one deals with the correlation between job satisfaction and turnover. The general assumption is that the higher the job satisfaction, the lower will be the turnover (Koch 1978; Mobley 1979; Rusbult 1983). However, the degree of correlation between satisfaction and turnover is generally low (Lock 1976; Mobley 1979; Waters 1976). Related studies which consider how employee commitment to the organization affects their turnover, have led to inconclusive findings (Koch 1978; Mobley 1979; Mowday 1979; Price 1981; O'Reilly 1986).

Another school of thought examines the relationship between behavioral intentions and turnover (Mobley 1982; Spector 1986; Weisberg 1993). While research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and turnover generally favor the argument that behavioral intentions are the best predictors of behavior, the results are not compelling (Steel 1984; Youngblood 1983).
Theories From Sociology

Sociological theory on employee turnover focuses on the impact of the work situation on the turnover intention of employees. Under this approach, job or organizational characteristics are expected to be better predictors of job satisfaction and commitment than individual factors (Agho 1993; Glisson 1988; Graham 1992; Koch 1978; Kohn 1981; Kohn 1989; Mueller 1992; Mueller 1994; Price 1977; Saunders 1992). In fact, the study of the relationship between situational variables and turnover is exactly where psychology and sociology merge. The classic sociological explanation of employee turnover comes from Price's (1977) model, which describes the relationship between several characteristics of jobs, satisfaction, opportunity and turnover. Price (1977) suggests that while situational variables affect the level of employee satisfaction, employee turnover is generally negatively correlated with satisfaction. One important variable is the level of opportunity, which modifies the relationship between satisfaction and turnover.

One of the interesting features of the theory from sociology is that the relationships are not quantifiable and the contributions or sacrifices made today are expected to be compensated at some unspecified points in the future. These relationships, which have been referred by Blau (1964) as the social exchange theory, are based on mutual trust and support (Keller 1995; Konovsky 1994; Rousseau 1993). Blau (1964) further commented that "only social exchange tends to engender feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust; purely economic exchange as such does not" (p.94). Central to the theory of social exchange is the concept of reciprocity which forces people to reciprocate on favorable treatments received from others (Blau 1964; Cotterall 1992).
As Gouldner (1960) said, the norm of reciprocity is based on two assumptions: a) people should help those who have helped them and b) people should not injure those who have helped them. In fact, the concept of social exchange and the norm of reciprocity have been used extensively to account for employees' loyalty to organizations (Eisenberger 1986; Scholl 1981). It has been found that in some cases, subordinates value reciprocity so much that they strive to perform duties which are beyond the requirements in the normal employment contract (Honold 1997).

According to Setton, Bennett and Liden (1996), there are two major ways that the social exchange theory has been conceptualized. At the corporate level, there is a global exchange relationship between employees and the organization. Employees will form a basic perception on how the organization values their contribution and forms the basis of compensation. Simultaneously, depending on how employees value the compensation, a sense of obligation will be developed to repay the organization whenever, the needs arise. This forms the basis of organizational commitment, which is defined as the bondage between the organization and the individuals.

At the individual level, there is a direct bilateral relationship between supervisors and subordinates, which could form the basis for leader-member exchange (Sparrowe and Liden 1997). It has been shown that positive actions by the organization and supervisor will always create the sense of obligations on the part of the subordinates in terms of reciprocal actions (Eisenberger 1986; Settoon 1996; Shore 1993).

One of the drawbacks of psychological research on employee turnover is the failure to analyze how employees and work conditions interact to modify work attitudes and quitting behavior. This arises from the fact
that employees have different attitudes about the same work conditions and it is important to study how employees and work conditions interact to impact on work attitudes and quitting behavior. Studies of interaction effects show that opportunity (Carsten 1987), behavioral intentions (Steel 1984; Youngblood 1983), performance (Orpen 1986), tenure (Werbel 1984), and personality variables moderate the relationship between satisfaction and turnover and between commitment and turnover (Archer 1979; Krecker 1994; Mobley 1979; O'Reilly III 1986; Sims 1976; Spector 1986; Tziner 1984; Werbel 1984).

While it has been found that each set of theory has its own shortcoming, the economic models are most restrictive in its application. Observations that workers are rational economic actors are not enough to explain why some workers react differently under the same working conditions. Knowledge of work attitudes and values which form the foundation of psychological theory offers better prediction of employee turnover than economic theories. In other words, attitudes of individuals prompt them to look at work conditions to decide whether they will change job or not.

Although the literature on sociological theory is relatively scant, sociological and situation models offer interesting observations on job characteristics that may promote turnover. Findings suggest that situational models are useful in predicting satisfaction while disposition models are related to commitment (Colarelli 1987, Glisson 1988, Koch 1978). In essence, the major difference between economic, psychological and sociological theory on organizational behaviour seems to be the nature of the question that each theory of turnover addresses. Economic theories focus on the interaction between economic conditions, organizational structure and employee skills and