Abstract

The objective of this research is to determine the variables associated with turnover intention. I presented a literature study and as a result of this process, 23 articles are included and then examined the bibliographical references to check the validity of the inquiry. I identify several variables that affect turnover intention and affected by it
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Introduction

Turnover intention, the inclination and deliberate willingness to quit one’s job or one’s profession (Meyer & Tett, 1993), has been shown to be the strongest predictor of turnover itself (Griffeth et al., 2000). Employee turnover has been a critical managerial issue in the hospitality industry (J. Park & Min, 2020). Organizational cynicism is a negative attitude characterized by distrust, frustration, and hostility (Dean et al., 1998). Negative shocks are likely to enhance employees’ organizational cynicism (Chiaburu et al., 2013). Such resource depletion leads to employees using various coping strategies to manage resource losses and/or to regain resources (Halbesleben et al., 2009). There are two common coping strategies used in these situations (Tziner & Birati, 1996): (1) harboring negative cognitions and showing hostile attitudes while remaining in the existing organization (i.e., protecting their current resources – conservation); (2) withdrawing from the organization in order to gain new resources in other beneficial contexts (i.e., acquiring new resources – acquisition). Literature on conservation of resources posits that dispositional characteristics influence an individual’s resource conservation processes (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Traditionality as an individual adherence to organizational values or hierarchical role relationships, influenced coping strategies to negative shocks (Farh et al., 1997). Employees with high levels of traditionality tend to exhibit lower levels of organizational cynicism (C. Yang et al., 2020).

Literature Review

Many studies have shown that organizational commitment, defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization, was another important predictor of turnover intention (Mowday & Steers, 1979), especially in young employees whose organizational commitment haven’t completely formed (Meyer & Tett, 1993). According to the three component model of organizational commitment, organizational commitment consists of three dimensions: affective, continuance and normative commitments, affective commitment is based on employees’ emotional bonds to the organization established by their positive work experiences, normative commitment is based on employees’ perceived obligations to the organization, such as reciprocity norms (Zhou et al., 2020). Continuance commitment is based on the perceived socio-economic costs of leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Most of young teachers haven’t got enough time to establish strong emotional bonds to the organization and haven’t been trusted with crucial responsibilities by the organization because of the lack of teaching experience (Zhou et al., 2020). In addition, they might perceive lower cost of leaving than older teachers who would lose a good pension plan and have poor job alternatives if they resign (Mohanty, 2018).

Lee & Mitchell (1994) put forth a radical turnover theory known as the “unfolding model”, which portrays employee turnover as a complex process whereby individuals assess their feelings, personal situation, and work environment and, over time, make decisions about staying or leaving an organization, and specifically, the unfolding model not only illustrates four distinct turnover paths, but also introduces “shocks” or jarring events as the only reason for driving those paths. A shock is a disruptive, novel, and critical event that generates information or meaning about one’s job, and must be interpreted and integrated into the individual’s system of beliefs (C. Yang et al., 2020). Shocks can be (a) personal events that are external to the job, such as winning the lottery, having a spouse transferred, or losing a loved one, (b) personal events that are job-or work-role related, such as being passed over for promotion or receiving a job offer, or (c) organizational events, such as corporate takeovers, scandals, or downsizing. All three of these categories can be positive or negative (C. Yang et al., 2020).

Turnover intention is an immediate precursor to actual turnover (Y. Yang et al., 2020). It is defined as the probability that an individual will leave his or her job within a certain time period, as perceived by the individual (Takase, 2010). Some studies have reported that many factors may influence turnover intention, such as job satisfaction (Liu et al., 2012; Shields & Ward, 2001), work experience (Shader et al., 2001),
education (Roberts et al., 2004), and marital status (Shader et al., 2001). Job satisfaction was considered to explain most of the variance in intention to leave (Larrabee et al., 2003; Morrell, 2005). Calling is the belief that one is pursuing a particular line of work due to an external summons that is within one's broader sense of purpose in life, and that it has a prosocial orientation (Dik & Duffy, 2009). As an inner and deep psychological structure, calling can arouse an employee's enthusiasm for work (Xu et al., 2020). Employees with stronger calling are more likely to have positive work attitudes and responsibilities, and they will devote more time to their work; in contrast, employees with weaker calling are likely to have negative emotions such as remorse, not working to the best of their abilities, or even leaving the profession (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007).

**Result and Discussion**

**Result**

This research using a literature review method (Artha & Jufri, 2021; Ho & Njindan Iyke, 2017; Khairi et al., 2021) to present variables that associated with turnover intention. The results presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Result(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2018)</td>
<td>work environment, hospital affairs, resource adequacy, age, professional title, year(s) working, employment type, education level</td>
<td>work environment, hospital affairs, resource adequacy, age, professional title, year(s) working, employment type, education level associated with turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang &amp; Shen (2018)</td>
<td>family-supportive organizational work environment, work-life enrichment, trust</td>
<td>family-supportive organizational work environment, work-life enrichment, and trust affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrague et al. (2018)</td>
<td>age, education, organizational commitment</td>
<td>Age and education affect turnover intention; organizational commitment negatively affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers et al. (2019)</td>
<td>perceptions of interprofessional teamwork, the availability of administrative workers and the availability of speech therapists</td>
<td>perceptions of interprofessional teamwork and the availability of administrative workers, socket team, and the availability of speech therapists affect turnover intention; shared reflection and decision-making have no affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Heijden et al. (2018)</td>
<td>job demands, job resources, experience</td>
<td>job demands affect turnover intention; job resources and experience negatively affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al. (2019)</td>
<td>social media usage</td>
<td>social media usage affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Jiang et al. (2019)</td>
<td>innovation performance</td>
<td>turnover intention affects innovation performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li et al. (2019)</td>
<td>workplace violence, job satisfaction</td>
<td>workplace violence affects turnover intention; job satisfaction negatively affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyu et al. (2019)</td>
<td>abusive supervision</td>
<td>abusive supervision affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Pierce (2020)</td>
<td>transformational leadership</td>
<td>transformational leadership negatively affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu et al. (2019)</td>
<td>career adaptability</td>
<td>career adaptability negatively affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma &amp; Stol (2020)</td>
<td>onboarding success</td>
<td>onboarding success affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back et al. (2020)</td>
<td>emotional labor, overload in customer service, and conflicts in customer service</td>
<td>emotional labor, overload and conflicts in customer service affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Califf &amp; Brooks (2020)</td>
<td>burnout</td>
<td>burnout affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. J. Park et al. (2020)</td>
<td>job stress</td>
<td>job stress affects turnover intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryu et al. (2020)</td>
<td>organizational climate, emotional labor</td>
<td>organizational climate and emotional labor affect turnover intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The results above show the variables that associates with turnover intention. There are some variables that affect turnover intention and just a variable that affected by turnover intention, namely professional identity. Given the significant results from turnover intention studies, it would also be interesting to investigate variables that affected by turnover intention (e.g., organizational conflict history, job performance, employees’ situational perception, human resource management practices and work engagement). Future studies should explore variables that affected by turnover intention to investigate the link between those variables and turnover intention.

Conclusion

The results show the variables that associates with turnover intention and some variables that affect turnover intention, but just a variable that affected by turnover intention, namely professional identity. Future research should investigate about variables that affected by turnover intention.
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