CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Enormous information in the form of voluminous data is available on the topic of employee turnover in the extant literature but, is limited to voluntary turnover of scientists and group job-hopping phenomenon. This section with a key focus on the topic of research & phenomenon of study restricts to relevant literature thereby, employee turnover research & models, job-hopping phenomenon & turnover culture, and motivating & retaining (managing) of scientist fraternity in R & D organizations.

2.1 Overview

Decades ago, March and Simon (1958) introduced their landmark theory of organizational equilibrium, positing that job satisfaction reduced the desirability of moving, thus reducing employee turnover (Peterson, 2011). A new theory did not emerge until Porter and Steers (1973) developed the Met – Expectations Model. They argued that employees have individual sets of expectations; when those expectations are unmet, the result is dissatisfaction, leading to turnover. Most of the models focus overwhelmingly on the characteristics of the individual, such that they do not adequately address the magnitude of the role of the organization in contributing to the individual’s decision to stay or leave (Dougherty et al., 1985; Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Throughout those decades of theory building, there was widespread and rigorous support for these theoretical models that focused on the individual characteristics of satisfaction, commitment, and intention as the key antecedents to employee turnover. Schneider (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition Model raised questions about the significance of person-organization fit in determining employee retention. Lambert et al. (2001) found work environment factors (role conflict, task variety, relations with co-workers, and autonomy) were found to be more important than demographics in shaping job satisfaction.

Kale & Stephen (2010, p. 2) cited that; the experience of leading firms from developed countries and also newly industrializing countries shows that human mobility within or across firms has played a very important role in transferring knowledge and knowledge building capabilities (Ettie, 1980; Leonard-Barton, 1995). However, given the tacit and complex nature of most valuable knowledge, its acquisition can be difficult (Kogut and Zander, 1992). A significant portion of knowledge that organizations seek to acquire is embedded in individuals. When these individuals move between organizations, they can apply this knowledge to new context, thereby
effectively transferring knowledge across firms (Argote and Ingram, 2000). Thus, human mobility play an important role in knowledge building processes of hiring firms, especially where knowledge tends to be sticky and remains localized within firms, regions and countries (Szulanski, 1996).

Song et al. (2003) proposed that, human mobility served as a crucial mechanism for acquisition of knowledge for newly industrializing countries firms. The extent to which firms can assimilate externally sourced knowledge is determined, in part, by the nature of the knowledge to be sourced (Kogut and Zander, 1992) and in part by a firm’s absorptive capacity (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Even within-firm, tacit knowledge is sticky and does not necessarily flow easily unless the individual possessing the tacit knowledge also moves (Szulanski, 1996). If the movement of within-firm tacit knowledge is difficult, its transfer across firms is likely to be even more challenging. Firms use several mechanisms to access external knowledge, including strategic alliances, co-location in technology intensive regions, and foreign direct investment. However these mechanisms have limitations in acquisition of tacit and non-codified knowledge. Therefore, hiring of Scientists can play an important role in acquiring tacit and complex “human embodied” knowledge (Ettie, 1980). The authors in the article stress upon the transfer to the tacit knowledge by poaching of the overseas or cross border mobility of Scientists. But, the challenges still remain toward the diffusion of this tacit or human embodied knowledge within the firm or at the organizational level. Some of the top firms poached the overseas Scientists and failed in to disseminate the knowledge and has its own limitations of, firms and individuals’ attributes play a vital role.

In a review of turnover and retention research; Lee (2008, p. 240) cited that, organizational culture was proposed to influence turnover through the development of a unique turnover culture in which employees engage in sense-making and social information processes that trigger withdrawal cognitions (Abelson, 1993). Lee (2008, p. 247) further added that, an alternative theory was needed to explain how and why people leave organizations. The major components of the unfolding model include shocks, scripts, image violations, job satisfaction and job search (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). In one of the concluding remarks by Hom and Griffeth (2004) for the empirical research on turnover expressed their concern on turnover cultures thereof; despite of rich descriptions on turnover cultures Abelson (1993) leaves a key question unanswered, “How does a turnover culture actually influence individual’s decision to quit or stay?”
Mowday and Sutton (1993, p. 205) in the study of literature review on organizational behaviour cited that; a person’s location in the social context influences his/her contacts and experiences within the organization. The simple observation that organizational members do not feel, think, or behave in isolation helps to understand organizational behaviour (Pfeiffer, 1991). Mowday and Sutton (1993, p. 206) also cited that, Schneider (1987) emphasized on personality, values, and interests whereas; Pfeiffer (1983) emphasized similarity in demographic characteristics (age, education, tenure, and gender).

Schneider (1987) notes that dissimilar people will either be excluded from selection or driven out after selection and was primarily concerned with the individual-level process of attraction to similar others as a determinant of homogeneity in organizations. The processes of attraction, selection, and attrition increase homogeneity in organizations because those inside the organization attract and select others like themselves and those who differ from most others in the organizations tend to leave. They further added that, Schneider (1987) was primarily concerned with group- and organizational-level explanatory variables such as homogeneity, cohesiveness, and interaction patterns. Pfeiffer (1983) argues that an organization composed of dissimilar people will experience high levels of conflict and turnover, and that individuals in such organizations will have less positive attitudes.

2.2 Employee Turnover Research

One of the most critical issues facing organizations today is how to retain the employees they want to keep. Employees leave organizations for all sorts of reasons. The employees either quit their respective organizations or are fired from the organizations. The topic of employee turnover has always interested the sociologists, psychologists, and economists. Each one has a different perspective toward understanding turnover. The turnover of employees can be well explained with the classification scheme (Refer to the Figure – 2.1). First important distinction in turnover is between voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary turnover is initiated by the employee; for example, a worker quits taking another job. Involuntary turnover is initiated by the organization; for instance, a company dismisses an employee due to poor performance or an organizational restructuring. Voluntary and involuntary turnover require markedly different management techniques. This research study focuses on voluntary turnover. To manage voluntary turnover one needs an in-depth understanding of why employees leave or stay with organizations in general, as well as strategies for managing turnover among valued workers in the organization (Allen, 2008, p.2).
Another important distinction is between functional and dysfunctional voluntary turnover. Dysfunctional turnover is harmful to the organization and can take numerous forms, including the exit of high performers and employees with hard to-replace skills e.g. departures of CRT (Chemical Research Technology) professionals or Scientists. By contrast, functional turnover does not hurt an organization. Examples of this type of turnover include the exit of poor performers or employees whose talents are easy to replace. This distinction between functional and dysfunctional turnover is relative. What makes an employee valuable and difficult to replace will vary by job, organization, industry, and other factors (Allen, 2008, p.3).

Some voluntary turnover is avoidable and some is unavoidable. Avoidable turnover stems from causes that the organization may be able to influence. For example, if employees are leaving because of low job satisfaction, the organization could improve the situation by redesigning jobs to offer more challenge or more opportunities to develop their skills. Unavoidable turnover stems from causes over which the organization has little or no control. For instance, if employees leave because of health problems or a desire to return to school, there may be little the organization can do to keep them (Allen, 2008, p.3).

Allen (2008, p. 5) referred to the theory put forward by March & Simon (1958) viz. Theory of organizational equilibrium can shed valuable light on these matters. According to this theory, an
individual will stay with an organizational as long as the inducements it offers (such as satisfactory pay, good working conditions, and developmental opportunities) are equal to or greater than the contributions (time, effort) required of the person by the organization. Moreover, these judgments are affected by both the individuals desired to leave the organization and the ease with which he or she could depart. Allen (2008, p. 5) cited that, turnover is a complex process i.e. Although some individuals may quit a job on impulse, most people who leave spend time initially evaluating their current job against possible alternatives, developing intentions about what to do, and engaging in various types of job search behaviour (Mobley, 1977; Hom & Griffeth, 1991; Steel, 2002).

Allen (2008, p. 6) reveal that the comprehensive voluntary turnover model capture the process of leaving or quitting wherein, research shows that the specific turnover drivers affect key job attitudes such as satisfaction with ones role and commitment to the organization. Low satisfaction and commitment can initiate the withdrawal process, which includes thoughts of quitting, job searching, comparison of alternative opportunities, and the intention to leave. This process may lead to turnover if the organization fails to manage it effectively. Turnover drivers may also produce other work behaviours that suggest withdrawal, such as absenteeism, lateness, and poor performance, any of which may end in a departure without the person going through a job search, evaluation of alternatives, or extended consideration of quitting. The lesson is to proactively manage retention, organizations must monitor and adjust key aspects of the work environment that influence employees desire to stay or leave.

Allen (2008, p. 6) depicted the turnover drivers identified from the extensive studies on turnover research (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). They are given in the Figure – 2.3; as (+) increase so does turnover & (-) increases turnover decreases.
Figure – 2.2: Comprehensive Voluntary Turnover Model
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Source: Allen (2008, p.6)
**Figure – 2.3: Turnover Drivers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Thoughts of Quitting (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Search Intentions (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Search Behaviours (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Weighted Application Blank (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Organizational Commitment (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Relationship with Supervisor (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Role Clarity (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absentism (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Satisfaction (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of Alternatives to present Job or Company (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction of Expectations of Job or Company (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Performance (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion Opportunities (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Job Opportunities (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Scope (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Communication in Organization (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Group Cohesion (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-worker Satisfaction (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation in Decision making (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with Supervisor (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Overload (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Involvement (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pay (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Fairness (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Routinization of Job Responsibilities (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Responsibilities (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Pay Satisfaction (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Lateness (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Education (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Marital Status (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cognitive Ability (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Allen (2008, p.7)*
Given the development of new managerial approaches to retention, labour market dynamism, and evolution in research methodology and technology, it is not surprising that turnover continues to be a vibrant field of research despite more than 1500 academic studies addressing the topic. While strategic human resource researchers are still investigating the causal mechanisms between HR practices and firm performance (Collins & Clark, 2003; Hatch & Dyer, 2004), most include voluntary turnover as a critical component of the equation (Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005; Ulrich & Smallwood, 2005). Put differently, the topic of voluntary turnover is a vital bridge between macro strategies and micro behaviour in organizations. It is one variable that conceptually connects the experiences of individuals in organizations to critical measures of success for those organizations. According to Beatty, Huselid & Schneider (2003), emerging evidence suggests that as much as 30–40% of market value is attributable to intangible factors (e.g. strategy execution, managerial credibility, management experience, attracting and retaining talent, and compensation strategy).

Moreover, employee turnover has important implications for the individual leaving the job. Significant energy is expended on finding new jobs, and adjusting to new situations. In addition, giving up known routines and interpersonal connections at one’s previous place of employment can be very stressful (Boswell, Boudreau and Tichy, 2005). Thus, the topic of turnover is clearly relevant to managers, researchers and individuals (Zedeck and Mosier, 1990).

The most recent thorough reviews of the turnover literature were Hom and Griffeth (1995) and Maertz and Campion (1998). In 2000, Griffeth, Hom and Gaertner published a valuable turnover meta-analysis. Importantly, since the last major review there have been many theoretical advances including relational perspectives (e.g., network centrality, perceived co-worker support, interpersonal citizenship behaviour (Mossholder, Settoon, & Henagan, 2005), “overall job attitude” (e.g., combination of job satisfaction, organizational commitment) as a predictor of “integrative behavioural criteria” (focal performance, contextual performance, lateness, absence, turnover; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006), the unfolding model of turnover (Lee, Mitchell, Holton, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999), and job embeddedness (Mitchell, Holton, Lee, Sablynski, & Erez, 2001). Given the importance of turnover for researchers and practitioners and a number of compelling new turnover theories, there is a need for an extensive summary of the field coupled with recommendations for future research.
In short, there are many reasons to study voluntary turnover. It can be costly and disruptive to organizations. The acquisition, development and retention of talent form the basis for developing competitive advantage in many industries and countries (Pfeffer, 1994, 2005). And while it may appear to be easily predicted by macro-economic data, decades of research suggest that a rich understanding of individual behaviour under constantly evolving global and local conditions will require additional research effort.

The time period before 1985 witnessed the development of several key turnover models, which built the foundation for future research. The researchers who significantly contributed to the initiation of scientific turnover research in this time period were March and Simon (1958), Porter and Steers (1973), Mobley (1977), Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino (1979), Price and Mueller (1981, 1986), Steers and Mowday (1981) and Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro (1984). Their contributions will be briefly outlined below;

In their now-classic book “Organizations”, March and Simon (1958) introduced a general theory of organizational equilibrium, which emphasized the importance of balancing employee and organization contributions and inducements. The two factors that determine an employee’s balance are perceived desirability and perceived ease of leaving the organization; today these concepts are typically labelled as job satisfaction and perceived alternatives (e.g., Trevor, 2001). Both factors were proposed to independently operate to influence an employee’s motivation to leave the organization. March and Simon emphasized individual differences in ability and biodata such as tenure, gender, and age as key determinants of perceived ease of movement while organizational size and job satisfaction drive perceived desirability of movement. Note that organization size is a macro-level variable.

Porter and Steers (1973) introduced a model in which employees’ met expectations were the driving factor in influencing turnover decisions. While their model and other previous models focused on single antecedents to turnover, Mobley (1977) identified a more comprehensive withdrawal process and shed light on the sequence of steps employees go through before turning over. His intermediate linkages model proposed a set of withdrawal cognitions (e.g., thoughts of quitting, expected utility of withdrawal) and job-search behaviours (e.g., job search, evaluate alternatives) that link job dissatisfaction to actual turnover behaviour. In the expanded model, employee values, job perceptions, and labour market perceptions combined to influence withdrawal intentions via the linkages (Mobley et al., 1979).
Interestingly, Mobley et al. (1979) were among the first to identify potential moderating effects on the turnover decision. For example, it was hypothesized that the centrality of non-work values and the need for immediate gratification moderate the effects of job satisfaction and expected utilities on turnover and that impulsivity moderates the relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover. They also stretched our understanding by recognizing the impact of changes over time.

Based on Price’s (1977) earlier work, Price and Mueller (1981, 1986) developed a comprehensive structural model, which identified the antecedents of job satisfaction and intent to leave and added organizational commitment as a mediator between these two variables. Distal antecedents of turnover were, among others, the nature of the job (e.g., routinization), participation, distributive justice, and family ties (e.g., kinship responsibility). Price’s work represented a major shift in focus horizontally and vertically, by moving our analysis to the causes of job satisfaction. Steers and Mowday (1981) attempted to incorporate all prior “piecemeal” turnover models into a comprehensive process model of voluntary employee turnover. Finally, Hom et al. (1984) drew from Mobley’s process model to propose an alternative model that suggests two decision paths. Once employees think about quitting, intend to quit, and evaluate the expected utility of quitting, they either undertake a job search and compare their available alternatives to their current job or directly resign.

The models briefly outlined above have initiated and significantly advanced turnover research, and much of today’s research is still grounded in one or more of these traditional theories. A more unconventional turnover theory was introduced by Sheridan and Abelson’s (1983) cusp catastrophe model, incorporates two withdrawal determinants viz. organizational commitment and job tension which define a two-dimensional control surface with withdrawal behaviour as a third, vertical axis. The model made some unique predictions and suggested, for example, that employees with dissimilar commitment and tension levels may exhibit the same level of withdrawal behaviour. It was seen as “a provocative divergence from traditional linear thinking and was the first to model turnover as a dynamic process” (Hom & Griffeth, 1995). However, little subsequent research directly tested these specific ideas.

In the early 1980s, other researchers looked at a number of antecedents of turnover in isolation. For e.g. Graen, Liden, and Hoel (1982) found that the quality of the leader–member exchange relationship predicted employee turnover, and Pfeffer (1983) argued for the importance of
demographic fit. During this time period, researchers also attempted to identify the consequences of turnover. These early studies primarily focused on increased costs and organizational performance decrements following turnover (e.g., Dalton & Todor, 1979; Mirvis & Lawler, 1977; Mobley, 1982; Price, 1977; Staw, 1980). Special attention was also attributed to the relationship between individual performance and turnover with the majority of the empirical results confirming a negative linear relationship (e.g., Jackofsky, 1984). In summary, building on the foundation set by March and Simon (1958), the period prior to 1985 is characterized by considerable progress towards answering research questions focused at the individual-level of analysis. A number of influential models were developed with the intent of explaining the process a person goes through in leaving an organization.

2.3 Traditions of Turnover Research

Morell et al (2001) affirmed that, there exists a differentiation between two dominant perspectives or traditions related to turnover research. These are labeled as; economic (labour market) school and the psychological (affective accounts) school. This division enabled organization of literature on turnover research thereof, related models or theoretical accounts.

The psychological school is concerned with the issues related to affective accounts. Key studies in relation to this tradition of psychological school include several investigations as depicted below;

- Career development (Krau, 1981)
- Equity (Aquino et al, 1997), psychological contract (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Robinson, 1996)
- Job involvement (Blau and Boal 1987; Huselid and Day, 1991)
- Job satisfaction (Hom and Kinicki, 2001; Lee 1988; March and Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977)
- Organizational climate (DeCottis and Summers, 1987)
- Organizational commitment (Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, 1974)
- Professionalism (Bartol 1979; Price and Mueller, 1981)
- Pole stress (Kemery et al, 1985)

The economic school with a key focus on the decision dimension to turnover and analyse turnover with more emphasis on the interplay between externally determined variables such as opportunity. The economic school deals with issues viz. availability of job opportunities or
perceived alternatives, job search, labour supply and demand, reward and investment or costs, subjective expected utility and rational economic choice. Key studies in relation to this tradition include several investigations as depicted below:

- Alternative opportunities (Gerhart, 1990; Hulin et al, 1985)
- Expected utility (Bedeian et al, 1991)
- Job cost (Rusbult and Farrell, 1983)
- Job search (Bretz, Boudreau and Judge, 1994; Kanfer, Wanberg and Katrowitz, 2001; Laker, 1991)
- Labour market opportunities (Kirshenbaum and Mano-Negrin, 1999)
- Organizational demography (Haveman, 1995)
- Pay satisfaction (Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid and Sirola, 1998)
- Perceived alternatives (Griffeth and Hom, 1988)
- Unemployment (Carsten and Spector, 1987)

Social sciences have offered both, psychological (i.e., micro) and organizational and economic (i.e., macro) explanations to explain the phenomenon of employee turnover. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have mostly captured research interest on the micro side whereas, economic research on the macro side explain how market forces such as job supply and demand or unemployment rates affect the frequency with which people quit or leave their jobs (e.g. Banerjee & Gaston, 2004). Sociological research have also explored, how turnover affects and is affected by institutional changes within and across industries (e.g., Haveman, 1995), as well as organizational variables such as size (Price, 1977).
2.4 Employee Turnover Models

Since yester years researchers have put forward several models of employee turnover viz. March and Simon (1958) process model of turnover (Turnover decisions as a result of two major factors: perceived desirability of movement, and perceived ease of movement).

Farris (1969) put forward a predictive model of turnover and listed some of the core or key reasons toward turnover. They are listed below;

1. Turnover helps career
2. Perceived ease of turnover
3. Intensity of motivation
4. Performance
5. Income & Rewards
6. Status & social provision
7. Individual characteristics (Age, Technical maturity, Education, Time perspective)
8. Working environment

Porter & Steers (1973) met expectations model; (Employee’s met expectations were driving factor influencing employee turnover decisions).

Mobley (1977) intermediate linkages model (The judgement taken by the employees’ is based on one’s expectation-value-like decision process thereby, comparing the present job with the available job alternatives influence employee decision to quit/stay).

Price (1977) put forward a casual model of turnover (Social integration in the organization as a prime factor influencing turnover decisions).

Price & Mueller (1981, 1986) comprehensive structural model (identified antecedents of job satisfaction and intent to leave and added organizational commitment as a mediator between these two variables).

Price & Mueller (1981) identified seven exogenous variables leads to turnover; Opportunity - increased pay, power, and prestige (Bluedorn, 1976); Participation; Instrumental communication; Integration; Pay; Distributive justice; Promotional opportunity. Also emphasized on, Kingship responsibility (intent to stay) - local & pride; Risky decision - Risk perceptions (judgment) &
Risk propensity (situational); General training – human capital toward increasing productivity (Becker, 1964).

Steers and Mowday (1981) turnover model (incorporated all prior piecemeal turnover models into a comprehensive process model of voluntary turnover.

Graen, Liden, and Hoel (1982) found that the quality of the leader–member exchange relationship predicted employee turnover.

Pfeffer (1983) argued for the importance of demographic fit in relation to turnover.


Hom et al. (1984) alternate model from Mobley’s process model (model suggests two decision paths; once the employee intend to quit, either search job and compare with the present job or directly resign).

Jackofsky (1984) integrated process model (ability has an indirect effect on turnover through the intervening variables of ease of movement, desirability of movement, and intention to quit, and the moderator variable of task complexity).

Hom and Griffeth (1991) identified alternative linkages model of turnover (job dissatisfaction progresses into turnover).

Lee & Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model of voluntary turnover (modelled 4 distinctive decision paths for turnover; employees experience shocks which are categorized in four different types viz. employment-related, matching scripts, image violations, and disaffection).
Lee et al (1997) for their referent cognition model (highlight the impact of employee expectations of future job advancement on turnover-related responses).

Mitchell & Lee (2001) job embeddedness model (decisions to stay on job influenced by the web formed in relation to the social, psychological, and financial aspects related to the job factors, off job factors, etc…and loosing of lot more in terms of appreciation & relationships with respect to community & organization links, fit, and sacrifice after the quit).


Steel & Lounsbury (2009) reviewed the turnover process models and synthesized a conceptual literature on turnover and thereof, highlighted three standards “turnover-theory components”. They are listed; Employee morale; Labour market mechanisms; Intentions to quit/stay

2.5 Job-hopping
Researchers have used interchangeably the terms like job hopping, turnover, attrition, quitting, worker mobility (Rousseau et al., 2003), “protean career” (Hall, 1976); job shift; “willingness to change companies” (Finegold et al., 2003); work flows (Burgess et al., 2000; as cited in Saxena, 2012). Viewed from a broad perspective of Mobley et al. (1978), the process of job hopping commences with the dissatisfaction experienced by an individual with his present job (Griffeth et al. 2000, as cited in Boswell et al., 2005), followed by his search for alternatives, followed by a comparison of those options with his current job using an expected-value-like decision process, and, finally, the decision to leave if any of the alternatives is adjudged to be preferable than his current situation or position.

2.5.1 Influential Factors
Job hopping may be linked to broadly two parameters- extrinsic and intrinsic. The former include factors like pervasive job dissatisfaction, distrust and disengagement (Pfeffer, 2007). Mitchell et al. (2001) indicated that, job search and the consequent turnover intention, is not related to the employee dissatisfaction, as it is linked to job i.e. “shock” or jarring event, such as receiving an
unsolicited job offer or a family member’s addition or demise. It may be pertinent to note here that scholars have distinguished between “job searching” from “leverage-seeking search” in the sense that the former is linked to change of the jobs, the latter is indicative of available job alternatives as a leverage against the present employer such that his/her present organization shall strive to make a better counter-offer and make efforts to retain him/her (Boswell et al., 2004). Other extrinsic factors accountable for job hopping include low commitment, and prevalent job alternatives proposed by March and Simon (1958), as cited in Mitchell et al. (2001) and Trevor (2001). However, in some other studies conducted by Michael Spector (1982) derived from job search (e.g., perceived alternatives) contribute little to prediction models.

Apart from these, other factors which have been attributed to job hopping are availability of ample job opportunities in the market, due to company closure, feeling of job insecurity in the current job, technological obsolescence, higher pay offered by the rivals, better promotion opportunities with other employers, better perks associated with the future career options, perceived brand image of the competitors; “cohort effects” (Evetts, 1992, as cited in Finegold et al., 2002); Hobo syndrome (defined as the tendency of individuals to change jobs as a practice (Ghiselli, 1974, as cited in Boswell, 2004) and so on.

Factors like poor interpersonal relationship with the supervisor and/or peers, personal factors like work-family role conflicts (as cited by Mitchell et al., 2001 & Pfeffer, 2007); weather, amenities and general culture of the location (proposed by Mitchell et al., 2001); off-the-job events (like spouse relocation or an unsolicited job offer at hand (proposed by Lee et al., 2004); preference for a particular location, opting/possessing for higher education and knowledge upgradation (proposed by Maurer, 2002); age of the individual employee concerned, where the younger employees were more prone to initiate quitting rather than their older counterparts (cited by Finegold et al., 2002); little or minimal work-life balance being offered by the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990 as cited in Spreitzer et al., 2002).

Whereas factors like global downturn in the economy or in the specific sector per se; decision of the company to cut down the employee strength for the sake of sheer numbers; contingent staffing; electronic monitoring and variable pay (as cited by Batt et al., 2002); technological upgradation (which makes the number of heads required redundant); ongoing downsizing leading to uncertainty and demoralization (Batt et al.,2002); organizational restructuring, including mergers and acquisitions; size of the organization (as proposed by Balkin et al., 1990); number of females
in the organization and the number of employees with a college degree (stated by Batt et al., 2002); closing down of a particular unprofitable unit (a case in point is Hirschman's (1970) discussion of responses to organizational decline - exit, as cited in Rusbutl et al., 1988); saving costs for establishing a new unit or for introducing a new process or technology or foreign expertise; a reduction in organizational attachment (Mitchell and Lee, 2001); reconfiguration of the skill mix (Burgess et al., 2000); higher pay dispersion (Bloom and Michel, 2002); present work environment and organizational culture for the study conducted in the BPO/ITES sector in the Indian context by Bhatnagar (2007); perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al., 2002); Perceived Supervisor Support (which would decrease employee turnover (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Stinglhamber et al., 2003); poor person-job and person-organization fit (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1990; Chatman, 1991; Kristof, 1996 as cited in Boswell et al., 2005); lack of job compatibility (Villanova et al., 1994, as cited in Mitchell et al, 2001); linkage of perceived fairness of pay procedures and perceived fairness of pay amounts with satisfaction, and, therefore, negatively predicting employee turnover (Hom & Griffeth, 1995), as cited in Tekleab et al. 2005), and, so on.

Personal factors like performance of emotional labour, lack of organizational identification; greater loyalty towards the immediate workgroup rather than their employing organization (Cappelli, 2000; Feldman, 2000 as cited in Dess and Shaw, 2001); lack of self-esteem with the current job; lack of organizational commitment (especially when the job market is favourable (Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Griffeth et al., 2000 as cited in Bentein et al., 2005); lack of recognition and appreciation and lack of desired autonomy in the current profile; Organizational Affective Commitment (Meyer et al., 2004) and Affective Commitment to the Supervisor (Both, of these factors viz. Organizational Affective Commitment and Affective Commitment to the Supervisor) were found to have a negative correlation vis-à-vis turnover, in a study of Stinglhamber et al. (2003).

2.5.2 Effects of job-hopping on the organization
Researchers have established the effects of job-hopping in terms of turnover costs (Finegold et al., 2002; Bentein et al., 2005); retention costs, erosion of social capital and organizational skill banks, especially applicable for service and knowledge-based organizations (Dess and Shaw, 2001; Shaw et al., 2005); erosion of employees’ tacit or specialized knowledge, making them more distinctive and less easily replaceable (Guthrie, 2001), sunk costs like those incurred on
training and maintenance of the employees; high personal and organizational costs associated with turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001).

2.6 Turnover cultures

2.6.1 Definition of turnover culture (Beard, 2004, p. 56)
Abelson (1993) defines turnover culture as “the systematic patterns of shared cognitions by organizational or subunit incumbents that influence decisions regarding job movement” (p. 388). A turnover culture develops through the acceptance of turnover behaviour by peers, management and the organizational structure. It is more likely to develop in organizations where employees have strong work norms, a positive attitude on life and stress within their work roles. Finally, a turnover exists where turnover behaviour is regular, accepted as the norm and may be perceived to be beneficial to both employer and employee (Deery, 1999 p. 175). Social influence propels/drives turnover culture.

2.6.2 Development of a turnover culture (D'Annunzio-Green, 2002)
A turnover culture develops through the acceptance of turnover behaviour by peers, management and the organizational structure. It is more likely to develop in organizations where employees have strong work norms, a positive attitude on life and stress within their work roles. Finally, a turnover exists where turnover behaviour is regular, accepted as the norm and may be perceived to be beneficial to both employer and employee (Deery, 1999 p. 175).

2.6.3 Dimensions of turnover culture
The important dimensions of turnover culture influencing turnover are;

1. Turnover acceptance
2. Employee norms and values
3. Work difficulties
4. Role stress
5. Job mobility

2.6.4 Levels of operation
The level at which turnover culture operates has not been adequately addressed in management literature. They contend that it operates at four levels - organizational level, workgroup level, industrial level, occupational group level. Certain professional group’s skills will likely facilitate
the development of a turnover culture within a particular occupational group, such as technology professionals (Beard, 2004).

Turnover culture, a most important determinant of turnover decision followed by the variables of job search behaviour, job opportunity, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, negative affectivity, promotional opportunity (Beard, 2004). Occupational labour markets with low unemployment and many job opportunities would likely facilitate turnover culture (Sheridan, 1992). A study by Barnett & Feeley (1997) toward predicting turnover from communication network led to investigation of social network models viz. structural equivalence models; social influence model; erosion model. It was also found in a study of academic staff in territory institutions in Zimbabwe that, that leadership influences turnover intentions (Gwavuya, 2011).

2.6.5 Turnover Culture & Employee Individual Turnover Decision

Based on Schein’s (1985) model of organizational culture, Abelson (1993) proposed how a turnover culture may develop. First, employees individually perceive an organizations structural characteristics, human resource policies, leadership, and external environment. They respond to stories, symbols, and customs about turnover-related behaviour. These individual interpretations along with social information process lead to; individual cognitions, prototypes, scripts, and schemas regarding turnover behaviour.

Traditional turnover models examine individual perception of content issues such as individual staff commitment, satisfaction, job and role conflict/stress, and immediate supervision. These models examine other content issues as well, such as individual biographical information. Furthermore these turnover models focus on the process used by the individual to arrive at the decision to leave.

2.6.6 Study of Turnover cultures

An intensive study is conducted by Abelson (1993) on turnover cultures. ‘Turnover cultures are the systematic patterns of shared cognitions by organizational or subunit incumbents that influence decisions regarding job movement. A turnover culture is therefore, an organizational and subunit as well as an inter- and intra-organizational phenomenon’ (as cited by Abelson, 1993). Turnover cultures facilitate an understanding of how shared perceptions affect turnover decisions, may assist in gaining a better perspective of how to manage turnover on an
organizational level and, therefore, enhance more effective management of turnover on an organizational wide basis.

There exist organizational models of turnover (Abelson, 1986, 1992; Abelson & Baysinger, 1984; Bluedorn, 1982; Terborg & Lee, 1984) but, emphasis of turnover research is on the individuals within organization to decide on whether to quit or stay (e.g., Mobley, 1977, 1982; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Steers & Mowday, 1981), and content issues those, which are affecting individual decision (Mobley, 1982; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand & Meglino, 1979; Mowday et al., 1982; Muchinsky & Morrow, 1980; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Prize, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981, 1986; Porter & Steers, 1973).

The primary objective of turnover research is to improve management’s ability to effectively manage the availability of people necessary to enhance organizational performance (Mobley, 1982; Mowday et al., 1982; Price & Mueller, 1981, 1986). Turnover research has focused on meeting this goal through developing models of why individuals leave. Effectively managing turnover at this level has a positive effect on organizational performance through decreasing the turmoil associated with people leaving the organization (Abelson, 1986; Bluedorn, 1982; March & Simon, 1958).

Abelson (1993) stated that, “Turnover cultures differ from traditional turnover theory in several ways”. He proposed that:

1. Turnover cultures occur through a gestalt of individual factors that affect turnover decisions and not just a multitude of individual factors.

2. Turnover cultures are the result of shared cognitions (level two) and basis assumption (level three) that influence the individual turnover decision.

3. Turnover culture is an intra and inter-organizational phenomenon in that intra and inter-organizational opportunities and happenings affect intra and inter-organizational movement decisions.

Therefore, it is evident that, turnover cultures evolve through the same processes as organizational cultures evolve and are the outcome of shred perceptions influenced by intra and inter-organizational dynamics.
2.6.7 A Model of Turnover Culture

Abelson (1993) affirmed that, turnover cultures evolve through the same process as traditional organizational cultures evolve. The process begins as artefacts and creations are interpreted by individuals. Perceptions of creations such as leader behaviours, organizational issues (e.g., structures, information flows), human resource practices, and the organization’s interface with the external environment influence the creation of and combine with artefacts such as stories, myths, symbols, customs, and ceremonials. These artefacts, creations, and integrations of the two are interpreted by the individual as level two phenomena, such as individual cognitions, percepts’, prototypes, schema, and scripts. As level two phenomena are shared and communicated with other people, level three phenomena, such as basic assumptions, shared cognitions, and higher-order schema, results. This occurs through various mechanisms such as social information processing (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). The commonality of these assumptions develop in part because people escalate their commitment to the ideas (Staw, 1980), become more committed to perceptions associated with organizational membership (Mowday et al., 1982), and feel more attraction to the group because of common bonds (Pfeffer, 1985). The culture evolve further to where there are organizational and subunit systematic patterns of these relationships. The model proposes that identification of these systematic relationships and patterns facilitates understanding turnover cultures and prompts better management of turnover throughout the organization (Refer to Figure 2.4).

2.6.8 Evolution of Turnover cultures

As mentioned before, turnover cultures evolve through the same process as do other cultures. Level one artefact and creations are interpreted by individuals by means of level two phenomena (e.g., cognitions, percepts’, schema, and scripts). These perceptions are shared and those deemed appropriate eventually become level three phenomena (e.g., basic assumptions, shared cognitions, higher order schema). Level four patterns emerge to the extent some orderliness occurs surrounding perceptions regarding turnover. The evolution of ideas within and across groups regarding turnover perceptions, intentions, and behaviour is through the social information processes (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). As those perceptions evolve, people become more a part of the group and more committed to different levels of the turnover decision (Blau & Boal, 1989). Group cohorts and similarities further influence these turnover perceptions and actions (McCain, O’Reilly, & Pfeffer, 1983; Pfeffer, 1983).
Figure 2.4: Evolution of cultures process model
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifacts</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myths</td>
<td>Organizational Level Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbols</td>
<td>Human Resources Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>External Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonials</td>
<td>Interface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEVEL TWO

<table>
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<th>Cognitions</th>
<th>Schema</th>
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<td>Percepts</td>
<td>Schemas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototypes</td>
<td>Scripts</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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LEVEL THREE

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Shared Cognitions</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Axiomatic Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: Abelson (1993, p. 331)
2.6.9 Leadership & Culture

Leadership has a tremendous impact on the development of culture. Many suggest that a primary role of leadership is to create and manage culture (Kotter, 1988; Locke, 1991; Mintzberg, 1989; Schein, 1985). Schein (1985) stated that leaders affect culture through five different mechanisms;

1. What they pay attention to, measure, and control
2. Their reactions to critical situations and organizational crisis
3. Deliberate role modelling, teaching, and coaching
4. Their expectations and criteria for rewarding
5. The criteria they use for recruiting, selecting, promoting, retiring, and terminating employees

Katz (1974) suggested a different model of managerial roles that, which should include technical skills, interpersonal skills, and conceptual skills. The stronger their personal influence, the more likely their comments lead to the development of shared perceptions. In many instances, the leader is so strong that there is an identifiable match between the perceptions, assumptions, and values of the leader with those of the culture (Mitroff & Kilmann, 1975, 1976; Quinn, 1984). Once these develop, they frequently pass on to new employees as the “correct way of doing things”. The leader’s comments, perceptions, values, and assumptions, therefore, can take on a life of their own within the organization. Stories symbolic of the leader’s behaviour frequently live on even after the leader has left the organization.

Empirical studies examining the relationship between leader styles (e.g., consideration and initiating structure) and turnover decisions are consistent but not convincingly strong (Mobley, 1982; Mobley et al, 1979). There is evidence that leader behaviours, such as those presented by Katz (1974), Kotter (1988), Locke (1991), and Mintzberg (1988), do influence turnover decisions and other organizational outcomes. The leader’s or manager’s role is to help the subordinates satisfy their needs while the subordinate satisfactorily accomplishes the task (House & Baetz, 1979). The leader’s behaviour will affect how satisfied subordinate is regarding work-related issues (Mobley et al., Mobley, 1982).

2.6.10 Organizational Issues & Culture

Abelson (1993) stated that, various turnover models have proposed that organizational variables identified as various organizational structures issues (e.g., centralization, routinization, integration, and communication), policies and procedures, size, climate, and participation/job

### 2.6.11 Human Resource Management Practices & Culture

Human resource management (HRM) practices are a set of rules that affect everyone in the organization, and can be changed relatively in order to meet the needs of the organization. The HRM appraisal and reward system acts as a guide to promote behaviors valued by the organization. The appraisal and reward aspect of the HRM system has a significant effect on cultures in at least two ways:

1. It has an overt and accepted impact on changing behaviors
2. This process affects the perceptions of organizational incumbents regarding equity and fairness of the required change and appropriateness of the process used to facilitate that change

There is a wealth of research examining the relationship between HRM practices and turnover. Most HRM research related to turnover falls into four general areas as depicted below:

1. Staffing
2. Training and development
3. Performance appraisal and reward
4. Intra and Inter organizational movement.

### 2.6.12 External Environment & Culture

Competition, turbulence, and munificence of the environment may have an even stronger influence on the culture than does the economy. In competitive and turbulent markets, the available human resource and client demands constrain what an organization must do to effectively compete. In munificent markets the exact opposite occurs. The increasingly competitive and turbulent environment has forced some organizations to change their values and basic assumptions. Organizations take inputs from their environment, transform those inputs via the core technology, and then make the outputs available to the environment. The amount of value added to the inputs, compared to that available from other organizations, determines the success of an organization. Organizations compete for scarce resources, scarce quality
management of core technologies, and scarce client dollars. A value for high quality at all levels of the organization has forced many organizations to rethink the basic assumptions and values needed to effectively compete (as cited in Abelson 1993, p. 358).

2.6.13 Turnover Culture & Traditional Turnover

Turnover cultures differ from traditional turnover models in various ways. Traditional individual-level turnover models have been developed and tested as a set of individual factors that affect turnover decisions. Turnover culture proposes that turnover decisions occur as a gestalt of a sets of artefacts and creations. The turnover culture concept and the traditional turnover concept are dynamic processes that are perceptual in nature and that are affected by content issues/creations-artefacts. The relationship between them (Refer to Figure – 2.4) is depicted below;
Figure – 2.5: Relationship between turnover culture and traditional turnover models

Source: Abelson (1993, p. 365)
2.6.14 Value in Studying Turnover Culture

There are a number of reasons for examining turnover culture. We will now examine four of these reasons (as cited in Abelson, 1993, p. 369);

1. Understanding underlying values and assumptions will help us better understand turnover

Turnover is a very important factor that has significant outcome variables in organizational performance. Despite being one of the major outcome variables in organizational literature, our ability to predict employee turnover is still somewhat limited. Few models can account for more than 30% of the turnover variance. In fact, one of the major determinants of turnover is intent to turnover. By the time an organizational incumbent has reached this stage in the turnover process, it is relatively difficult to change their intentions and/or behaviour (Abelson, 1986).

2. Integrative organizational models may lead to a more comprehensive picture of turnover

Models that are both more comprehensive and include organizational issues have been suggested for some time (e.g., Abelson & Baysinger, 1984; Bluedorn, 1982; Mobley et al., 1979; Price, 1977) as potential means to improve our understanding, prediction, and management of turnover. Turnover culture suggests that numerous factors affect turnover decisions in the form of creations and artefacts and meanings associated with these artefacts and creations evolve through the social information process. The individual makes their own assessment from this information. The turnover culture suggests that underlying values and assumptions concerning turnover related issues should be examined to better understand and predict turnover.

3. More effective strategies to intervene and manage turnover may result

By examining intra-inter organizational movement as a process, with underlying values and assumptions, it may help focus on ways to identify which assumptions and values may be related to certain leaving behaviours once thought uncontrollable. Decreases in uncontrollable turnover may be the result.

4. This approach to examining culture may help in studying other organizational phenomena

Turnover model can be used to better understand other organizational issues. It may be just as useful in explaining phenomena such as organizational information processes and organizational effectiveness.
In summary, a turnover culture as a group phenomenon evolves through employees’ sense making and social information processes regarding common environment cues relating to turnover behaviour. Presumably, the resulting group phenomenon then reciprocally influences individual employee perceptions and interpretations that relate to turnover decisions. Patterns of shared norms and values regarding turnover comprise a turnover culture. These may be contingent or absolute. They are contingent if turnover behaviour is more or less encouraged under certain conditions. For instance, one should only quit for higher paying job or after promotion. They are absolute if norms & values favour or discourage turnover directly (Hom & Griffeth, 2004 p. 122).

2.7 Motivating & Rewarding Technical Professionals (Scientists & Engineers)

It found that, literature addresses managing of scientists & engineers jointly. This section with an emphasis on the studies conducted by researchers relate to literature on motivating & rewarding technical professionals working in R & D organizations.

A conceptual study conducted by Badawy (1998) is the summary of what is known about managing scientists and engineers. This study identifies and discusses four categories viz. human resources planning, rewarding scientists and engineers, appraising the performance of scientists and engineers, and career management toward the management of scientists and engineers. Managing human resources: technical professionals are not only an R&D organization's greatest asset but its most expensive investment as well Badawy (2007). In his article on managing human resources relating to that of, technical professionals concludes that; Effective human resource planning is the key to achieving innovation in technical organizations. This includes analyzing and determining staffing needs, recruiting, selecting, and hiring qualified people to do good R&D. He further adds; although it is management's responsibility to provide the organizational climate, support and development programs needed for effective career planning, it is the individual's responsibility to develop the knowledge and skills necessary for managing his most important investment -- his career.

Farris & Cordero (2002) further conducted a literature review which revealed more than hundred articles on the management of scientists and engineers with reference to the study of Badawy since 1988 till 2002. They further added six new ways impacting the management of “scientists” and engineers viz. Cross-functional teams, leading scientists and engineers, knowledge management, demographic diversity, electronic and other technologies, and outsourcing.
Allen & Katz (1986) conducted an empirical study on 2157 technical staff; 32.6% preferred the managerial ladder, 21.6% preferred the technical ladder, and 45.8% preferred to work in technically challenging projects irrespective of promotion. Preference for projects increased with age. In another empirical study by Allen & Katz (1992) on 2199 technical staff identified that Ph.D.’s prefer the technical ladder more than those with less education and are less interested in commercial success. Those in the technical ladder are likely to become decoupled from the rest of the organization.

Alpert (1992) anecdotal study identifies the work itself as the chief reward of engineers. Brainstorming allows brilliant ideas to come forth. Concurrent engineering puts a premium on communication skills. Many companies have created parallel dual ladders in recent years.

Amabile (1998) conceptual study emphasize on intrinsic motivation as more essential to creativity than extrinsic motivation. People will be most creative when they feel motivated primarily by the interest, satisfaction, and challenge of the work itself and not by external pressures.

Bailyn (1991) empirical study examined 4 career routes in the R&D lab: the managerial route, the technical route, the route from project to project, and the technical transfer route. The study proposes the idea of a hybrid career for technical staff.

Gomez-Mejia et al. (1990) conceptual study indicated that, traditional pay systems aim to achieve internal equity and consistency across different employee groups. These systems fail to motivate the technical staff. Flexible pay systems, however, are based on the individual’s contribution.

Kochanski & Ledford (2001) conducted a conceptual study on turnover and emphasize that; turnover is very costly for R&D laboratories. The employee value proposition i.e. the total set of rewards that the company offers in exchange for employment and effort is a key to understanding turnover.

Geraci (1994) conceptual approach indicated that, a meaningful reward for a technical professional is specific recognition for specific achievements from their colleagues and managers.
Hoppe (1993) looked at the work goals of international R & D Scientists. The top four were challenge, freedom, a good relationship with their manager and co-operation.

Katz (2005) toward motivating technical professionals today discusses the development of policies and procedures for dealing with motivational dualism within an ambidextrous organization to create highly motivated research and development professionals. Task characteristics that elicit high levels of intrinsic work motivation; Ways to examine the task characteristics; Tips for human resource professionals on how to address the motivational challenges of dualism.

Arnold (1997) found intrinsic rewards more important than extrinsic ones. The job challenge matters a great deal to people who choose to pursue specialist work as the main feature of their careers. It is the work itself and especially how demanding and interesting it is which really matters.

Suff and Reilly (2005) explore Newell’s (2000) model of six key requirements of knowledge workers. These are autonomy, achievement, keeping up to date, professional identification and participation in missions and goals.


Rumpel & Medcof (2006) emphasize on the total rewards as a promising approach to rewards management technology-intensive firms as IBM, Microsoft, AstraZeneca, and Johnson & Johnson. Total rewards take a holistic approach to rewards, going beyond the strong focus on pay and benefits which has been the hallmark of traditional compensation practice. Total rewards consider all the rewards available in the workplace, including opportunities for learning and development, and quality work environment. Because these rewards are a high priority for technical workers, as shown in the research reviewed in this article, total rewards offers an opportunity to tap the unrealized potential of the organization. Effectively managed rewards will ease the critical attraction, retention and motivation challenges faced by high-technology firms.

Jin & Shu (2004) emphasize on the compensation structure, perceived equity and individual performance of R&D professionals. They added that, in order for individuals to improve their
work performance they must be sufficiently motivated and compensation is the most important source of motivation for professionals. A major issue in designing a compensation structure for such individuals is the equity they perceive they are gaining. For this reason, this research discusses the relationship between compensation structure, perceived equity and individual performance. After surveying 258 R&D professionals from high-tech organizations in Taiwan, they put forward the argument that skill-based pay and job-based pay influence R&D professionals into believing they are receiving an enhanced equity which will then lead to a better performance on their part.

2.8 Role of Leadership in the Employee Withdrawal Process

The research conducted on employee turnover, has not led to an adequate understanding of the withdrawal process. Whereas, it is found that the process by which participants leave their organizations has been conceptualized using complex utility-decision frameworks (as cited by Graen, 1976; March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Vroom, 1964 in Graen & Liden, 1982) and thus, most empirical research has not captured this complexity. Mobley et al. (1979) stated that, although the relationships of economic market and job dissatisfaction variables to withdrawal are well established, these variables are "conceptually simplistic and empirically deficient" for understanding the withdrawal process (Graen & Liden, 1982). The study of withdrawal as a process requires a focus on job behaviours, a primary one being leadership behaviour (Krackhardt, McKenna, Porter & Steers, 1981 as cited in Graen & Liden, 1982).
### 2.9 Individual Turnover Decision

**Figure – 2.6: Key theorists**

| Turnover Intention | Turnover Decision | Krackhardt & Porter 
| Impact of Turnover Culture | Individual Turnover Decision | Hulin (1986) 
| Turnover Culture | | 
| Rothberg (2006) | Job Hopping | 
| Turnover Culture | | Khatri & Budhwar | 
| Turnover Culture | | Turnover Culture | 

**Source: Researcher – Literature Findings**

### 2.10 Gap identified in the literature: What are the key debates and what arguments & evidences the key Theorists have put forward?

In a study (Allen et al., 2008) on employee turnover decisions the role of risk was identified as a prime factor influencing the decision to stay or quit. But, in this group phenomenon of, job hopping in a cluster of an index individual involves little or no risk as the index individual is solely responsible for the well-being of every individual in his/her cluster (group). At the same time, there is no question of risk involved for the individuals out of cluster of the index individual as there doesn’t exist a second thought to stay as they are partially alienated from the work-group and, if at all they plan to stay they can’t continue to stay for a longer period due to the inducement of the job stress, and feeling of burnout. Therefore, this study on the role of risk
doesn’t apply fully to the job hopping phenomenon in a cluster of the index individual as the decision to quit is beneficial and devoid of risk.

Lee & Mitchell (1994) described 4 distinctive decision paths for the process of employee turnover; each decision path involves distinctive foci, psychological processes, and external events. Employees experience shocks which are categorized in four different types viz. employment-related, matching scripts, image violations, disaffection. This study will attempt to identify a rare cultural shock at workplace with highlight of work events, reward events, etc... Thus, attempt to provide information on dual culture formation at workplace viz. clannish culture (in-group phenomenon) and partially alienated culture (out-group phenomenon).

Ghiselli (1974) identifies job hopping as a hobo syndrome and describes it as internal impulsiveness of individuals to switch jobs and not an organized logical thought. But, the challenge remains to understand why & how do the individuals switch jobs; switching jobs on internal impulses is doubtful as many a times the decision taken is an organized thought with a conscious and deliberate approach (Tett & Meyer, 1993) on the basis of logic known to him/her toward the ease and desirability of movement (Mobley, 1978). No highlight of social influence or environmental factor viz. turnover culture on turnover decisions.

Khatri & Budhwar (2001) identified “Job hopping” as a key factor associated with employee turnover intention. But, the study lack the identification of job hopping in a cluster (group) of an index individual via clique formation from one employer to another and thus, lack the information related to the antecedents & consequences. They conducted a study related to the food & beverage, marine & shipping, retail, and banking industry in the Asian context. This study with an emphasis on the voluntary turnover of scientists relates to the research–technology & innovation-management organizations situated within the pharmaceutical industry.

Krackhardt & Porter (1986) identified turnover culture as an influence of communication network thereof, describing it as a snowball analogy. They studied the adolescent workers in the fast food industry and found that employees were likely to leave if they saw their peers quitting that, which informs/reveals of a form of social pressure. This is not true for all the peers/employees in an organization. The present study will attempt to confirm a social pressure exerted by the workplace clique on their peers and the existence of a dual culture (clannish & partially alienated) at workplace thereof, influence turnover decision as an effect of turnover culture.
A study conducted by Kirshenbaum & Levy (2003) indicated an influence of employee’s family developed inside and outside the organizations, concluded that social networks affect employees’ withdrawal decisions. The study lacks the highlight of the influence of the labour market thereof, employers poaching employees to sustain in the competitive market place. Thus, lack the highlight of the bond or social ties of the employers with the index individuals thereof, encouraging them to poach his/her group of people which, affect the employees’ withdrawal decisions leading to employee turnover.

Abelson (1993) described turnover culture as the shared cognition by organizational members that influence their decision regarding job movement and further added that, turnover culture makes job hopping an acceptable behaviour. If an employee has not changed his or her job for a long time, he or she feels increasing pressure to do so because of social influences or turnover culture. The study lacks the “How” of turnover decision and therefore, this study will attempt to fill this gap by not only understanding the How-process of turnover decision but, will add influential factors contributing to Why-content of turnover decision as an influence of cluster turnover culture.

2.11 Conceptual Map for the Study
This study with a qualitative and directional approach is guided by a conceptual map. The in-group & out-group phenomenon at workplace in the context of cluster turnover culture was thought important and applicable suitably for the study toward understanding of scientists’ voluntary turnover decision. Refer to the Figure – 2.7 for the diagrammatic representation of the conceptual map for the study.
Figure – 2.7: Conceptual Map for the Study – Diagrammatic Representation

Research-Technology & Innovation-Management Organization
"Research & Development Center"

R & D Chief
(Head of the R & D Center)

Scientists working in various departments viz. Synthesis, Quality Control, Analytical Development, Quality Assurance & Regulatory Assurance, Pilot-plant, Kilo-lab, Technology Transfer

Group of Scientists poached by the R & D Chief are loyal to the R & D Chief

In-group
Clannish Culture (Fully Participative)

Fair-treatment (Positive work, reward, recognition events)

Happy & Satisfied with a feeling of closeness & job-security

Voluntary Turnover decision to migrate along with R & D Chief to another employer

Previously existing Group of Scientists hired by the Organization are loyal to the Organization

Out-group
Partially Alienated (Partially Participative)

Mis-treatment (Negative work, reward, recognition events)

Un-happy & Dis-satisfied with a feeling of alienation & job-insecurity

Voluntary Turnover decision due to the R & D Chief’s Clique at workplace

Leads to Voluntary Turnover of Scientists

Source: Researcher