

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

## A Study of the Impact of Workplace Relationships on Turnover Intentions

**Dr. Anu Singh Lather**

Professor, Dean, International Affair, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Dwarka, Delhi, India

**Archana Singh**

Research Scholar, University School of Management Studies,  
Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Dwarka, Delhi, India

### **Abstract:**

*Workplace relationships are the binding force which can combine all employees with emotional thread to work towards organizational goals. The strength of workplace relationships (measured in terms of superior- subordinate relationships and coworker cohesion) and its influence on employee turnover intentions was investigated in this research. Workplace relationships were hypothesized to be non-linear. Hypotheses were tested on two samples of employees in supervisory (n = 22) and non-supervisory (n = 58) roles. In sample one of supervisory employees, hypothesis for superior-subordinate relationships was supported. In sample two of non-supervisory employees, hypothesis for superior-subordinate relationship was not supported. However the relationship between superior and- subordinate relationships and turnover intentions were found to be inverse and linear. Hypotheses for coworkers in both the samples were not supported i.e. we could not find any support for the relationship between coworker cohesion and turnover intentions. Limitations and directions for future research have been discussed.*

**Keyword:** workplace relationships, emotional thread, superior-subordinate relationships, coworker cohesion, turnover intentions, nonlinear

### **1. Introduction**

Over the years the reasons for employee turnover has been a topic of enthrallment for researchers, academicians and organizations, and have attributed multiple variables that drive employees to leave. Turnover predictors were identified as age, experience, job satisfaction, commitment, job characteristics and delegation (Mossholder et. al., 2005; Afza, 2005; Jha, 2004; Tai et al., 1998). Similarly a literature review by Hayes et. al. (2006) revealed that organizational characteristics such as workload, work autonomy, promotion opportunities, employee empowerment and management styles and some socio-demographic factors namely younger age, inexperience, fewer years of the job, higher qualification and kinship responsibilities are main predictors of turnover intentions. But these are the underlying factors and not the root causes of the problem which the organizations are facing these days.

After going through whole host of articles, workplace relationships (Brunetto et. al., 2013; Morrison, 2004) was found to be a potential root cause. Workplace relationships are something that is experienced by each and every employee in their work settings. The presence of harmonious superior – subordinate relationships and perceived coworker cohesions are infectious phenomenon that help employees to build a strong association not only with seniors and peers, but also with their organization and consequently having negative/inverse impact on turnover intentions (Brunetto et. al., 2013; Adebayo, 2011; Kim et. al., 2010, Mossholder, 2005; Harris et. al., 2005; Michael). Presence of frictional relationships among employees may result in employees with greater dissatisfaction and hence increased tendency of looking elsewhere for employment. According to Ackroyd et al., (2007), workplace relationships act as buffer between organizational demands and professional workplace expectations. Thus, where at one place cordial workplace relationships are necessary for organizational growth; on the other hand discordant relationships are a curse to the long term association of individuals with a particular organization.

As compared to actual turnovers, employees with high turnover intentions cause perennial damage to organizational values and systems as such employees contaminate other employees with whom they interact and spread all possible negative thoughts about management and organization as a whole, thereby hampering organizational growth (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner, 2000). Therefore, in the present paper the main focus, as also suggested by Harris et. al. (2005), is on turnover intentions rather than actual turnover. Thus the present paper examines the theoretical links of workplace relationships (superior – subordinate relationships and coworker cohesion) with employee turnover intentions.

## 2. Literature Review

In organizational context, workplace relationships refer to the care and consideration that individuals receive from their superiors and peers. Supervisor – subordinate relationship is a vertical relationship between employees and their supervisors and Co-worker cohesion is the horizontal and informal relationship among employees.

Turnover intention is a complex phenomenon that depends on various factors (Randhawa, 2007) and has been notably a matter of discussion in recent organizational turnover literature. Turnover intention is defined as an employee's intent to find a new job with another organization within the next year (Medina, 2012). A conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organization is defined as turnover intention (Guimaraes, 1997) and the actual separation of the employee from organization is turnover (Naumann, 1992).

### 2.1. Workplace Relationships and Employee Turnover Intentions

Differences in key employee outcomes such as performance, commitment, decision making, and job satisfaction are indeed affected by the degree of support they receive from their superiors and peers. In line with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), high workplace relationships are expected to result in greater emotional bonding and feeling of obligation towards superiors and coworkers. According to this theory, superiors support their subordinates by providing opportunities to make decisions, to change or modify their job and subordinates to reciprocate by performing as per the requirement of organizational goals (Jha, 2004). Without forming social exchange relationships may result into a psychic loss thereby making withdrawal personally costly to individuals (Mossholder et. al., 2005).

Although workplace relationships are related to a variety of important work – related attitudes and outcomes but the major issue as directed by literature is to try to establish and understand relationship between workplace relationships and turnover intentions.

The study by Adebayo and Ogunsina (2011) investigated the influence of supervisory behavior and job-induced stress on job satisfaction and turnover intentions of 350 police personnel in Ekiti State, Nigeria. Data analysis revealed a significant influence of supervisory behavior on job satisfaction and turnover intentions. The researchers in their study found that police personnel under participatory and democratic supervision will exhibit lower intentions to quit than those who are under strict and autocratic style of supervision.

Kim, Lee and Carlson (2010) investigated the nature of the quality between LMX quality and turnover intentions of employees in the South Korean hospitality industry. The primary finding of this study was that employees who perceive their relationships with managers as low have high intent to leave as compared to those who perceive their relationships to be strong enough. Researchers found a U – shaped curvilinear relationship between superior – subordinate relationship and turnover intentions for non – supervisory employees but a linear relationship for supervisory employees.

Harris et. al. (2005) in their study proposed that the relationship between superior – subordinate relationship quality and turnover intentions is curvilinear as opposed to general notion that this relationship is linear. Researchers used two samples of employees under supervisory and non – supervisory roles. According to results both samples reported negative relationships between superior – subordinate relationship quality and turnover intentions. On the contrary to other studies, this study provided evidences that there can be negative consequences of high quality relationships as the employees in high quality relationships would be pulled away from organization as they are best positioned to receive better opportunities that produce turnover.

In a study on 124 employees of a large hospital in Auckland, Morrison (2005) found that cohesiveness and opportunities for friendship were significantly related to increased job satisfaction and commitment but decreased turnover intentions. Findings further indicated that women in particular perceive opportunities for friendships at work to be an essential aspect of their work life.

In a study on 215 respondents, Mossholder et. al. (2005) tried to find whether relational variables (network centrality, perceived coworker support, felt obligation toward coworkers, and interpersonal citizenship behavior) can predict turnover intentions. Using survival analysis over a five year time frame, researchers found that network centrality and interpersonal citizenship behavior predicted turnover.

The presence of informal relationships and the degree of cohesiveness perceived by individuals are related to increased job satisfaction and increased commitment and decreased turnover intentions (Morrison, 2004).

Michael in a research on a sample of 243 supervisor-subordinate dyads investigated the intervening role of supportive superior communication between leader – member exchange and employee job attitudes and performance. Results of this study revealed a direct, negative influence on employees' turnover intentions and a direct positive influence on employee job satisfaction, interpersonal felicitation and job dedication. He also found that job satisfaction has a direct negative impact on turnover intentions.

## 3. Hypotheses

Based upon above literature, following hypotheses have been framed and tested:

### 3.1. Primary Hypotheses

- H<sub>1a</sub>: Relationship between superior – subordinate relationships and turnover intentions for supervisory employees will be non – linear.
- H<sub>1b</sub>: Relationship between superior – subordinate relationships and turnover intentions for non – supervisory employees will be non – linear.
- H<sub>2a</sub>: Relationship between coworker cohesion and turnover intentions for supervisory employees will be non – linear.
- H<sub>2b</sub>: Relationship between coworker cohesion and turnover intentions for non-supervisory employees will be non – linear.

### 3.2. Secondary Hypotheses

- H<sub>3a</sub>: Mutual respect & trust, professional respect, professional help, performance evaluation & feedback, and communication will be inversely related to turnover intentions for employees in supervisory role.
- H<sub>3b</sub>: Mutual respect & trust, professional respect, professional help, performance evaluation & feedback, and communication will be inversely related to turnover intentions for employees in non – supervisory role.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Variables

Hierarchical multivariate analysis was used to measure superior – subordinate relationships and co-worker cohesion as the independent variables and employee turnover intentions as the dependent variable. Control variables include subordinate age, education, gender, and superior/subordinate tenure to help rule out alternative explanations.

The independent variables are superior-subordinate relationship and coworker cohesion such as mutual respect and trust, professional respect, professional help, communication, performance evaluation and feedback.

### 4.2. Sampling

To adduce the findings with empirical data, the survey was conducted using a structured questionnaire. The subjects for the study were selected using simple random sampling technique. The sample consisted of eighty (80) responses from service and manufacturing industries in the National Capital Region (NCR), India.

The final sample (n = 80) contained 58 percent males and 42 percent females; 78.5 percent married and 21.5 percent single. The respondents represented different levels of educational background with highest being postgraduates (63 percent). Respondents with undergraduate degrees were 18.5 percent and 18.5 percent were with doctoral degree. Out of total sample 11.6 percent were from senior management, 73.9 percent from middle management and 14.5 percent from lower management. Approximately 74 percent of respondents have less than 10 years of experience whereas 9.2 percent have working experience of more than 21 years.

### 4.3. Measures

Keeping in mind the objectives and research design of the study a structured questionnaire with closed ended questions was developed by the researchers. Questionnaire consisted of following four sections:

#### 4.3.1. Socio – Demographic

Data concerning name, designation, age, gender, qualification, income, experience, ethnicity, and marital status

#### 4.3.2. Superior – Subordinate Relationship

This section of questionnaire has 24 items. Responses were measured on five point Likert scale ranging from 5 – strongly agree to 1 – strongly disagree. These items were used to assess the subordinates' perception of their relationship with immediate superiors. These statements were to evaluate the superior – subordinate relationship if there is mutual respect and trust, professional respect and help, effective communication in place and efficient performance evaluation and feedback system. This section of survey form has five subscales namely Mutual Respect and Trust, Professional Respect, Professional Help, Communication and Performance Evaluation and Feedback. The total score on this scale can vary between 24 and 120. 72 was a midpoint between strongly agree and strongly disagree.

#### 4.3.3. Co-Worker Cohesion

This section of questionnaire has 4 items measuring the perception of employee relationship with their coworkers. Responses were measured on five point Likert scale ranging from 5 – strongly agree to 1 – strongly disagree. The total score on this scale can vary from 4 to 20.

#### 4.3.4. Employee Turnover Intentions

Employee turnover intentions were measured using 3 – item scale. Responses were measured on five point Likert scale ranging from 5 – strongly agree to 1 – strongly disagree.

### 4.4. Procedure

The present study was conducted in three stages.

#### 4.4.1. Stage I – Drafting Questionnaire

The items in draft questionnaire were derived from the relevant literature. The initial draft of the questionnaire contained 31 items on six subscales namely Mutual Respect and Trust (4 items), Professional Respect (4 items), Professional Help (6 items), Communication (5 items), Performance Evaluation and Feedback (4 items), Coworker Cohesion (4 items) and turnover intentions (4 items).

#### 4.4.2. Stage II – Standardization of Tool

A pilot survey was conducted on 50 respondents. In order to standardize the questionnaire content validity, face validity and construct validity were established.

Content validity of the questionnaire was estimated by taking comments from eight experts from industry and academia in order to ascertain that items of questionnaire cover a wide range of attributes under study. The relevance of each item was independently rated by each expert on a two point scale (1 – relevant and 2 – not relevant). Face validity was assessed after the content validity. Construct validity was assessed using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on a sample of 50. Cronbach's alpha and split – half reliability tests were administered to examine internal consistency of the tool.

#### 4.4.3. Stage III – Administration of Standardized questionnaire

The standardized questionnaire was distributed to 100 employees. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study. Respondents were promised about their anonymity and that the data would be used only for the research purpose. Participation in the research was on voluntary basis and instructions about filing a questionnaire were provided on one – to – one basis.

### **5. Results**

#### *5.1. Factor Analysis*

The acceptable value of KMO as recommended by Kaiser (1974) is  $\geq 0.5$ . He described values between 0.5 and 0.7 as mediocre; 0.7 and 0.8 as good, 0.8 and 0.9 as great, and  $> 0.9$  as superb. He recommended that if KMO value is below 0.5, then do not do a factor analysis. The KMO value of 0.8 (Table 1) ensures that the sample size is adequate for the factor analysis to be undertaken.

Factor analysis was carried out using the principal component matrix with varimax rotation. In total six factors have emerged in this process explaining a total variance of 69.82%. This indicates that atleast 69% of variance in the superior –subordinate relationships could be explained by these six common factors and this variance, as suggested by Field (2013), is considered to be reasonable. All factors of loading more than 0.4 are reported in the table 2. Items number PR4, EF4 and RCW3 do not form cluster with their respective factors may be dropped. Since their factor loading is high, these items may be retained for independent analysis. Thus the standardized scale for the assessment of superior – subordinate relationship has 23 items with six factors and explains 68.27% variance.

#### *5.2. Internal Consistency Reliability*

Cronbach's alpha was calculated for the standardized tool and it was found to be 0.93. The alpha values for each subscale are also  $\geq 0.7$  and are reported in table 3.

#### *5.3. Superior - Subordinate Relationships and Employee Turnover Intentions*

Table 4 shows the zero order correlation matrix, between factors of valued work relationships (Superior- Subordinate relationships for supervisory and non – supervisory employees), age, gender, qualification, tenure and employee turnover intentions at 0.01 and 0.05 level of significance. Table values revealed a significant negative correlation between senior – subordinate relationships and turnover intentions. All of the four control variables, age, gender, qualification and tenure had no meaningful relationship with either workplace relationships or turnover intentions, but this association is negative, can give a direction of relationship.

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in order to assess the form and magnitude of relationship between workplace relationships and turnover intentions. Since literature has suggested this relationship to be non – linear (Kim et. al. 2010, Harris et. al 2005) squared and cubic values of independent variables are used. Non-linearity or curvilinear relationship can be observed by adding quadratic and cubic terms to the linear model and values of their coefficients are investigated. A significant negative value of regression coefficient indicates a concave relationship between dependent and independent variables, whereas a significantly positive value indicates a convex relationship (Ganzach, 1997). Values of independent variables are centered before computing the squared and cubic terms in order to reduce multicollinearity among the three terms (Kim et. al., 2010).

##### 5.3.1. Supervisory Employees

Results of hierarchical regression analyses for supervisory employees are shown in table 5. In step 1, qualification and tenure were negatively related to turnover intentions. In step 4, qualification ( $\beta = - 0.760, p<0.05$ ), tenure ( $\beta = - 0.680, p<0.05$ ), SS (Superior – subordinate relationships) ( $\beta = - 0.202, p<0.05$ ), and  $SS^2$  ( $\beta = - 0.007, p<0.05$ ) produced significant negative relationships with turnover intentions whereas,  $SS^3$  produced a significant but positive relationship ( $\beta =0.001, p<0.05$ ) with turnover intentions. Linear term explained an additional 11.5% variance as compared to step 1. Addition of  $SS^2$  term in step 3, explained an additional variance of 6.9% of the variance as explained in first two steps.  $SS^3$  term in step 4 explained a very high variance 35.5% in addition to variance explained by other terms in step 3. This indicated a non-linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables and hence the hypothesis  $H_{1a}$  is satisfied. These results are in line with the other studies investing non – linear or curvilinear relationships (Harris et. al, 2005; Kim et. al., 2010).

A multiple regression analysis between factors of superior – subordinate relationships and turnover intentions are presented in table 6. In case of employees in supervisory role, among five factors only professional help is significantly and negatively ( $\beta = -.676, p<0.05$ )

related to the turnover intentions i.e. there is an inverse relationship between professional help and turnover intentions. Higher the level of professional help perceived by the employees, lower will be the turnover intentions and vice versa. Hence the hypothesis H<sub>3a</sub> is partially supported.

### 5.3.2. Non-supervisory Employees

Results of hierarchical regression analyses for non-supervisory employees are shown in table 5. In step 1, none of the control variables are related to turnover intentions. In step 2, the addition of linear SS term showed a significant negative ( $\beta = -0.047$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) impact on turnover intentions. The addition of this term to the control variables in the regression equation explained an additional variance of 16.3% as compared to the step 1. However, in subsequent steps addition of squared and cubic terms were not able to produce any significant relationship. This indicated that in case of non-supervisory employees the relationship between superior-subordinate relationships and turnover intentions is linear but inverse. Thus hypothesis H<sub>1b</sub> is not supported.

A multiple regression analysis between factors of superior – subordinate relationships and turnover intentions are presented in table 6. In case of employees in non-supervisory role, among five factors only communication is significantly and negatively ( $\beta = -0.257$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) related to the turnover intentions i.e. turnover intentions are inversely related to quality of communication between superior and subordinate. Put in other words, better the quality of communication between superior and subordinate, lower will be the turnover intentions and lower the quality of communication, higher will be the turnover intentions. Hence the hypothesis H<sub>3b</sub> is partially supported

### 5.3.3. Coworker Cohesion and Employee Turnover Intentions

Results of correlations and multiple regression analyses for supervisory employees and non-supervisory employees are shown in table 7. From table 7 it is clear that the correlations are not significant (for supervisory:  $r = -0.350$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; for non-supervisory:  $r = -0.103$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) between coworker cohesion and turnover intentions for both the cases of supervisory and non-supervisory employees. For both the samples results are found to be non-significant (for supervisory:  $\beta = -0.154$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ; for non-supervisory:  $\beta = 0.078$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ) i.e. employee turnover intentions are not affected by their relationships with coworkers. Thus hypothesis H<sub>2a</sub> and H<sub>2b</sub> are not supported.

## 6. Discussion

The present study was an attempt to investigate the relationship between work relationships (defined in terms of superior – subordinate relationships and coworker cohesion) and turnover intentions using data from employees in supervisory role as well as non-supervisory role in India. Correlation, hierarchical and multiple regressions have shown that in case of superior – subordinate relationships, dependent variable is explained by independent variables; though in case of coworker cohesion this is not the case.

Among supervisory employees, the study indicated that there is a non-linear relationship between superior-subordinate relationship and turnover intentions, thereby supporting the hypothesis H<sub>1a</sub>. This non-linear relationship can be predicted in the sense that if an employee perceives his/her relationships with superiors to be low has high intentions of turnover because of his/her dissatisfaction in terms of mutual trust, professional help, communication or fairness in performance evaluation. This may lead them to seek better job opportunities outside the organization and hence increasing the turnover rate. On the contrary, in case of strong or high superior-subordinate relationships, the strong bonding between the two provides better opportunities for upward or outside mobility since strong-bonded subordinates may get extra professional or non-professional benefits in terms of higher performance ratings, increased attention, and sharing of their social networks (Harris et. al., 2005), mutual respect and trust, professional help, communication etc.

A linear inverse relationship was found between superior-subordinate relationships and non-supervisory turnover intentions. Unlike the supervisory employees, employees in non-supervisory roles with high superior-subordinate relationships have not shown to have high levels of turnover intentions. The potential reason could be attributed to this finding is that high quality relations entrap employees within a relational web that makes them free from suspicions of dislodging from their organization (Mossholder, 2006) thereby protecting them against shocks that lead people to consider withdrawal (Mitchell & Lee, 2001). Kim et. al. (2010) noted, employees value the relationship quality of their bosses and therefore, they are less likely to change their jobs. Furthermore, Graen et. al. (1995) considered high quality superior-subordinate relationships to be mature partnerships which are characterized by behavioural and emotional exchanges of loyalty and support. Also in such kind of relationships, subordinates have more opportunities for self expression, information exchange and emotional support since they share a kind of informal relationship with seniors. On the other hand, if relationships are of poor quality, the lack of trust, communication and other benefits to subordinates lead to negative feelings or lesser degree of attachment towards their seniors. These undesirable relationships force employees to think of leaving (i.e. higher level of turnover intentions) to avoid working in the conditions of discomfort and displeasure (Harris et. al., 2005). Harris et. al. further suggested that in order to have the benefits, which they are deprived off due to poor quality relationships, subordinates are essentially being pushed out of the organization, as they begin thinking about new job opportunities to lower the feeling of discomfort and to have better career options.

An inverse relationship between tenure and turnover intentions of supervisory employees is reflected in the study. This finding is in line with previous studies (Griffeth et. al., 2000; Mitchel, 1981). Usually employees in supervisory role spend extensive time with the organization before taking their current position, and hence they are less likely to look for new options and more likely to value the relationship with their seniors (Kim et. al., 2010). Similarly, qualification of employees was also found to be negatively related with turnover intentions. One reason for this may be that qualification gives a person maturity, stability and rational thinking. In case of

non-supervisory employees qualification has no significant relationship since in case of non-supervisory roles specific skill-sets are important rather than qualification.

Results of multiple regression revealed that employees in supervisory role considered professional help as to be the important predictor of superior – subordinate. The potential reason that can be attributed to this finding is that employees in the supervisory positions are in larger roles and responsibilities and are supposed to handle complex tasks like managing teams, handling clients and communicating to senior management. In order to have better output such employees may require professional help like training, resource adequacy etc. On the other hand, results of multiple regression revealed that employees in non-supervisory role considered communication as to be the important predictor of superior – subordinate relationship. Communication between superior and subordinates is a vertical (upward and downward) one. Communication is a vehicle that builds relationships between superiors and subordinates. Good quality of communication between superiors and subordinates provides a platform for self – expression and information exchange. In good quality communication superiors are open to ideas and also listening to problems of subordinates. In an environment where communication flows effectively from superiors to subordinates, superior listens patiently to subordinates, seeks suggestion from subordinates and allow them to participate in decision making. In an upward communication, subordinates follow superior's instructions and have courage to disagree with superiors (Bakar et. al., 2004). Positive superior-subordinate relationship is negatively related with turnover intentions (Michael). On the other hand, in case the communication is not that cordial, either superior did not listen patiently to their subordinates or superiors are not receptive to their ideas. These conditions are enough to entertain the thoughts of quitting and looking for other career options.

In both the samples (supervisory and non-supervisory), study findings indicated no relationship between coworker cohesion and employee turnover intentions. The potential reason for this may be that in non-supervisory cases the employees are in their early stages of career. In the initial stages of their career employees are mainly concerned about self, career and family.

### **7. Limitations**

No research is perfect and there is always a possibility of error and bias in examples such as sampling and in measurement (Keyton, 2006). Sample representativeness of population is very important in case of quantitative researches (Creswell, 2009). With a small sample size the representativeness of sample may not be guaranteed. Also the biasness of sample can also not be tested since it is difficult to determine whether the respondents have given true responses or not. Researchers must be cautious and try to minimize as much bias as possible (Polston-Murdoch, 2013). This study is conducted on a small sample size; therefore, the results may not be universally generalized. Polston-Murdoch further suggests that quantitative studies are based on only to the limited questions and answers presented within survey tool as compared to rich data obtained through qualitative methods such as interviews or open-ended questions. Also, this study measures the perceptions of employees about superior-subordinate relationships and their coworkers. The perception of one employee may differ from that of the other. The other limitation of present study may be that variables other than those studied here may influence the relationship between dependent and independent variables. Common method bias may also be a matter of concern since a common questionnaire is administered to respondents.

### **8. Managerial Implications of the Study**

Based on findings, there are some useful implications those can be used to address the issues of turnover intentions. Some directions for future research have also been given. Employees with high turnover intentions are a matter of concern for organizations since such employees are not only under performers but they also affect other employees by spreading negative feelings and thoughts among peers. Thus, a primary implication of this study is that superiors should be attentive to their relationships with subordinates so that a preventive measure can be taken at early stages of building relationship. The relationship between superiors and subordinates should be continually evolving (Jha, 2004) so that this bond is always strengthened which in turn produces better results. A better understanding of psychological and organizational factors which encourages or control employee turnover intentions should be carefully considered and a model and strategies that help in controlling employees' discontent and discomfort with organization should be developed.

This study has helped in having an understanding of workplace relationships and its impact on turnover intentions. Present study has identified some potential areas of research. In today's age of fierce competition, where the turnover rates are very high, the field of workplace relationships is one that needs greater attention. Examination of superior-subordinate relationships and coworker cohesion is a step towards understanding employee turnover intentions in work setting. .

## 9. References

1. Adebayo, S. O. and Ogunsina, S. O. (2011). Influence of Supervisory Behaviour and Job Stress on Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention of Police Personnel in Ekiti State. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 2(3), 13-20.
2. Ackroyd S., Kirkpatrick I. and Walker R.M. (2007). Public Management Reform in the UK and Its Consequences for Professional Organization: A Comparative Analysis. *Public Administration*, 85, 9–26.
3. Afza, M. (2005). Superior-Subordinate Relationships and Satisfaction in Indian Small Business Enterprises. *Vikalpa*, 30(3), 11-19.
4. Bakar, H. A., Mohamad, B. and Herman, I. (2004). Leader-Member Exchange and Superior-Subordinate Communication Behaviour: A Case of Malaysian Organization. *Malaysian Management Journal*, 8(1), 83-93.
5. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
6. Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A. Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S. and Dienger, J. (2013). The Impact of Workplace Relationships on Engagement, Well-being, Commitment and Turnover for Nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(12), 2786–2799.
7. Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
8. Field, A. P. (2013). *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. London: Sage.
9. Ganzach, Y. (1997). Misleading Interaction and Curvilinear Terms, *Psychological Methods*, 2 (3), 235-247.
10. Gouldner, A. W. 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161–178.
11. Graen, G. B., and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership over 25 Years: Applying a Multilevel Multi-domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
12. Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., and Gaertner, S. (2000). A Meta-analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463–488.
13. Guimaraes, T. (1997). Assessing Employee Turnover Intentions before/after TQM. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 14(1), 46 – 63.
14. Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M. and Witt, L. A. (2005). An examination of the Curvilinear Relationship between Leader – Member Exchange and Intent to Turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 363-378.
15. Hayes, L. J., O'Brien-Pallas, L., Duffield, C., Shamian, J., Buchan, J., Hughes, F., Laschingerg, H. K. S., North, N. and Stone, P. W. (2006). Nurse Turnover: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 43, 237-263.
16. Jha, S. (2004). Determinants of Delegation: A Study in Five Star Hotels, *Vikalpa*, 29(4), 43-55.
17. Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity *Psychometrika*, 39 (1), 31-36.
18. Keyton, J. (2006). *Communication Research: Asking Questions, Finding Answers* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
19. Kim, B. C., Lee, G. and Carlson, K. D. (2010). An Examination of the Nature of the Relationship between Leader – Member – Exchange (LMX) and Turnover Intent at Different Organizational Levels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 591-597.
20. Medina, E. (2012). Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intention: What does Organizational Culture Have To Do With It? retrieved from <http://qmss.columbia.edu/storage/Medina%20Elizabeth.pdf>.
21. Michael, D. Supportive Supervisor Communication as Intervening Influence in the Relationship between LMX and Employee Job Satisfaction, Turnover Intentions and Performance. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, retrieved from <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/111002.pdf> on 22/12/2013.
22. Mitchel, J.O. (1981). The Effect of Intentions, Tenure, Personal and Organizational Variables on Managerial Turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(4), 742-751.
23. Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2001). The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover and job Embeddedness: Foundations for a Comprehensive Theory of Attachment. In B. M. Staw & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 23, 189–246. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
24. Morrison, R. (2004). Informal Relationships in the Workplace: Associations with Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(3), 114-128.
25. Morrison, R. K. L. (2005). Informal Relationships in the Workplace: Associations with Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions. A Doctoral Thesis submitted at Massey University, Albany, New Zealand, retrieved from [http://muir.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1666/02\\_whole.pdf?sequence=1](http://muir.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1666/02_whole.pdf?sequence=1) on 21/12/2013.
26. Mossholder, K. W., Settoon, R. P. and Henagan, S. C. (2005). A Relational Perspective on Turnover: Examining Structural, Attitudinal, and Behavioral Predictors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 607-618.
27. Naumann, E. (1992). A Conceptual Model of Expatriate Turnover. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23(3), 499-531.
28. Polston-Murdoch, L. (2013). An Investigation of Path –Goal Theory, Relationship of Leadership Style, Supervisor-Related Commitment, and Gender. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 6(1), 13-44.
29. Randhawa, G. (2007). Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: An Empirical Analysis. *Indian Management Studies Journal*, 11, 149-159.
30. Tai, T.W.C., Bame, S.I., Robinson, C.D., (1998). Review of Nursing Turnover Research, 1977–1996. *Social Science and Medicine*, 47 (12), 1905–1924.

## Appendix I

|  |                    |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.800              |          |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity                    | Approx. Chi-Square | 1080.664 |
|  | Df                 | 325      |
|  | Sig.               | .000     |

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Items                                      | Factor 1               | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Factor 6 |
|--|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>Mutual Respect and Trust (MRT)</b>      | <b>Factor Loadings</b> |          |          |          |          |          |
| MRT1                                       | .676                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| MRT2                                       | .697                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| MRT3                                       | .569                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| MRT4                                       | .423                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>Professional Respect</b>                |                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| PR1  |                        | .768     |          |          |          |          |
| PR3  |                        | .679     |          |          |          |          |
| PR2  |                        | .661     |          |          |          |          |
| PR5  |                        | .586     |          |          |          |          |
| PR6  |                        | .536     |          |          |          |          |
| PR4  | .788                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>Professional Help</b>                   |                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| PH3  |                        |          | .857     |          |          |          |
| PH6  |                        |          | .793     |          |          |          |
| PH1  |                        |          | .647     |          |          |          |
| PH2  |                        |          | .647     |          |          |          |
| <b>Performance Evaluation and Feedback</b> |                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| EF2  |                        |          |          | .726     |          |          |
| EF1  |                        |          |          | .676     |          |          |
| EF4  |                        | .516     |          |          |          |          |
| <b>Communication</b>                       |                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| C1   |                        |          |          |          | .747     |          |
| C3   |                        |          |          |          | .716     |          |
| C2   |                        |          |          |          | .676     |          |
| C5   |                        |          |          |          | .622     |          |
| C4   |                        |          |          |          | .619     |          |
| <b>Coworker Cohesion</b>                   |                        |          |          |          |          |          |
| RCW2                                       |                        |          |          |          |          | .740     |
| RCW4                                       |                        |          |          |          |          | .681     |
| RCW1                                       |                        |          |          |          |          | .596     |

Table 2: The results of the Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation

| Subscales                           | No. of items | $\alpha$    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Mutual Respect and Trust            | 4            | 0.70        |
| Professional Respect                | 5            | 0.77        |
| Professional Help                   | 4            | 0.824       |
| Performance Evaluation and Feedback | 2            | 0.75        |
| Communication                       | 5            | 0.82        |
| Coworker Cohesion                   | 3            | 0.72        |
| Total                               | <b>23</b>    | <b>0.93</b> |

Table 3: Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)



|                    | 1      | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5      | 6     | 7     | 8      |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| 1. TI              | ---    | -.420** | .332*   | -.390** | .074   | -.082 | .126  | .216   |
| 2. SS              | -.446* | ---     | -.570** | .829**  | -.085  | -.011 | .149  | -.153  |
| 3. SS <sup>2</sup> | -.512* | .548**  | ---     | -.824** | .058   | -.199 | -.295 | .245   |
| 4. SS <sup>3</sup> | -.370  | .908**  | .730**  | ---     | -.049  | .145  | .290  | -.207  |
| 5. Age             | -.028  | -.224   | -.142   | -.202   | ---    | -.016 | .191  | .864** |
| 6. Gender          | .203   | -.083   | -.112   | -.184   | .077   | ---   | .173  | -.101  |
| 7. Quali           | -.143  | .040    | .244    | .195    | .164   | .149  | ----  | .133   |
| 8. Tenure          | -.125  | -.045   | -.029   | -.015   | .884** | .193  | .076  | ---    |

Table 4: Zero order correlation Matrix

Note: \*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ; \*,  $p < 0.05$ 

Correlations below the diagonal are for supervisory employees.

Correlations above the diagonal are for non – supervisory employees

|                 | Regression Coefficients<br>(Supervisory employees) |        |        |        | Regression Coefficients<br>(Non-Supervisory employees) |        |        |            |
|-----------------|--|--------|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|------------|
|                 | Step1  | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4 | Step 1   | Step 2 | Step 3 | Step 4     |
| Age             | .891   | .345   | .190   | 1.025  | -.746  | -.645  | -.580  | -.587      |
| Gender          | .870   | .671   | .543   | 1.445* | -.141  | -.217  | -.187  | -.191      |
| Quali           | -.439  | -.321  | -.151  | -.760* | .313   | .467   | .507   | .501       |
| Tenure          | -.541  | -.293  | -.222  | -.680* | .595   | .465   | .412   | .416       |
| SS              |  | -.042  | -.025  | -.202* |  | -.047* | -.041* | -.044*     |
| SS <sup>2</sup> |  |        | -.003  | -.007* |  |        | .001   | .001       |
| SS <sup>3</sup> |  |        |        | .001*  |  |        |        | 1.106E-005 |
| R <sup>2</sup>  | .174   | .289   | .359   | .713   | .118   | .281   | .286   | .286       |
| ΔR <sup>2</sup> | .102   | .115   | .069   | -.355  | .088   | .163   | .005   | .000       |

Table 5: Hierarchical Regression Analysis Linear and Non-linear Superior – Subordinate Relationships Predicting Turnover Intentions

Note: \*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ; \*,  $p < 0.05$ SS= Superior-subordinate relationship, SS<sup>2</sup> = Squared values of SS; SS<sup>3</sup> = Cubic Values of SS

|                           | Regression Coefficients |       |        |       |        | R <sup>2</sup> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|----------------|
|                           | MRT                     | PR    | PH     | PEF   | Com    |                |
| Supervisory Employees     | .158                    | .310  | -.676* | -.151 | -.109  | 0.612          |
| Non-supervisory Employees | .154                    | -.070 | -.013  | .119  | -.257* | 0.346          |

Table 6: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis between Factors of Superior – Subordinate Relationships and Turnover Intentions

Note: \*\*,  $p < 0.01$ ; \*,  $p < 0.05$ 

MRT = Mutual Respect and Trust, PR = Professional Respect, PH Professional Help, PEF = Performance Evaluation and Feedback, Com = Communication

|                           | r     | β     | p-value | R <sup>2</sup> |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------|----------------|
| Supervisory Employees     | -.350 | -.154 | p>0.05  | .142           |
| Non-supervisory Employees | -.103 | .078  | p>0.05  | .029           |

Table 7: Correlations and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis between Coworker Cohesion and Turnover Intentions