



International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 1 • 2017

Role of Collectivistic, Individualistic Approaches and Social Factors for Employee Retention: A Study on Selected IT Organizations in the NCR of Delhi

Indranil Mutsuddi¹ and Chandranshu Sinha²

¹ Research Scholar, Amity Business School, Noida

² Associate Professor, Amity Business School, Noida

Abstract: Cut throat competition and high volatility in the business environment had made it difficult for organizations to retain their key employees. The retention strategies adopted by organizations to cope with these challenges had varied immensely making it difficult for most Human Resource (HR) experts adopt any concrete model for retaining their talents. With the evolution of participative management in order to engage employees, collectivistic approaches had gathered momentum in order to foster employee involvement and team work. Over the years employee retention perspective had evolved from behavioral, individual differences and organizational predictors to contextual perspectives with people relationships gaining more importance in organizations. In this context, social perspectives influencing employee well-being in organizations started to emerge as important contextual predictors of employee retention.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the under-researched area of the role of individualistic, collectivist approaches and social variables on employee intention to stay in selected Information Technology (IT) organizations in the National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi.

The study used descriptive research design. Data was collected from 300 employees representing operational positions in various Information Technology (IT) organizations in and around the NCR of Delhi. The respondents were contacted by the use of personal networks. The samples were randomly picked from a list of probable respondents. Primary data were collected by using the “social variable-employee intention to stay” questionnaire. Data collected from the study were analyzed by using SPSS and AMOS applications.

The study had revealed that employee intention to stay is influenced by social factors. Individualistic and collectivistic approaches apparently had no influences on social factors and employee intention to stay. Among the social factors social network, co-worker relations, and trust & control mutuality had important roles to play for employee intention to stay in their organizations.

The study would open up scope of further research and new avenues for HR policies that would be more employee engaging in the long run having far reaching outcomes in terms of facilitating employee job satisfaction and retention.

Keywords: Collectivistic approach, Social factors, Intention to Stay, Employee Retention, IT Organizations, NCR of Delhi

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, retention of employees had become a major challenge for employers to sustain in the highly competitive global scenario. The Information Technology (IT) sector over the years had faced challenges to engage and retain their key employees in order to achieve sustenance and global competitiveness. The Indian IT sector had been no exception. HR heads and corporate think tanks in Indian IT companies had constantly found it difficult to manage their employees from leaving their organizations for greener pastures and prevent huge financial loss as well as loss caused by talent outflow.

Before going into a detailed understanding of the research theme, it is important for us to have an understanding of what is meant by employee retention. According to the definition prescribed by Zineldin, (2000) employee retention has been explained as the “*obligation to continue to do business or exchange with a particular company on an ongoing basis*”. Stauss, Chojnacki, Decker, and Hoffman (2001) on the other hand had defined employee retention as “*liking, identification, commitment, trust, readiness to recommend, and repurchase intentions*”.

Considering the brief argument placed above, it is well understood that retaining employees is an issue of strategic importance for HR professionals and also has immense significance from a researcher’s perspective. Employee turnover had remained an issue of strategic importance for organizations (Abelson, 1993). The importance of employee retention particularly in a turbulent business scenario can be well understood from the study conducted by Caplan and Teese (1997). This study indicated the importance of employee retention discussing issues like those of economic challenges and organizational restructuring. Rappaport, Bancroft and Okum (2003) had discussed similar opinion emphasizing the importance of retaining highly skilled employees. Mitchell (2002) on the other hand discussed the importance of motivating and retaining employees particularly when organizations ply in an uncertain business environment. Abbasi and Hollman (2000) had discussed that attrition in organizations not only leads to a negative impact on their performance, but this also leads to poor innovation, lack of service and several operational pitfalls. This claim is further established by the findings of the study conducted by Fitz-enz (1997). Fitz-enz (1997) showed that total turnover cost for attrition was dearer to most organizations in terms of their one year’s pay and benefits packages offered to the employees. Authors like Griffeth & Hom (1995, 2000, 2001), Ramlall (2003) in this context had emphasized the importance of employee retention as a strategy to enhance organizational competitiveness. The research conducted by Bridges (1991) supports a similar opinion.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Intention to leave has been identified as the best predictor of employee turnover by many researchers of recent times. Maertz (1998, 2003, 2004, 2007) and his colleagues in their study indicated that

“intention to quit” was identified as the most consistent bi-variate relationship to turnover behaviour. Previous studies conducted by scholars have mainly focused on the traditional aspects of employee satisfaction and commitment and had mainly made efforts to discuss distal turnover issues such as individual differences and the nature of the job done by employees in their organizations. Consideration of contextual variables, personal perspectives was gradually recognized to be important in employee retention research. In this regard, while studying the contextual variables they were initially studied as (1) organization/macro-level variables such as organizational culture and (2) individual–context interface factors with an importance on employee relations such as employee-supervisor relations. This was perhaps the beginning of a phase in retention research where thoughts were poured in that there might be something well beyond organizational, individual issues extending to what kind of support employees received from others. This theme could well be seen in the studies conducted by Milkovich and Boudreau (1997). While exploring antecedent factors leading to employee retention, research evidence had been identified concerning: problems with their manager (Pine & Gilmore, 1998); pay (Milkovich & Boudreau, 1997); lack of development opportunities and change (Baron, Hannon & Burton, 2001). Employee specific antecedents like career drivers, knowledge worker characteristics (Trevor, 2001) and family responsibilities (Milkovich and Boudreau, 1997) were also given due importance. Another wing of study emphasized on combining content and process models of turnover (Maertz and Campion, 2004). It is worth mentioning that Maertz and Campion (2004) identified turnover variables such as affective, calculative, contractual, behavioural, alternative, normative, moral, and constituent forces.

As discussed earlier, contextual and organizational variables influencing employee retention were also given due importance. The evidence of the same can be identified from the studies conducted by Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, (2002), McElroy, Morrow and Rude (2001), Koys (2001), Bloom and Michel (2002), Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski and Rhoades (2002). The study conducted by Eisenberger et al (2002) identified that perceived organizational support (POS) was an important mediator in perceived supervisory support on employee turnover. Sinha, C., Sinha, R., (2012) in a recent study have discussed various organizational approaches like “competence & relationship oriented”, “scholastic & futuristic oriented” and “developmental & reward oriented” initiatives for retaining employees.

However, despite the vast literature on employee turnover, which is aimed at identifying factors that cause employees to quit (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000), much less is known about the social antecedents that influence employees intention to stay. In-depth analysis of exclusively social factors or social antecedents has been ignored in existing management literature. Most of the researchers had made attempts to explain the role of individual social factors like social support (Lobburi, P., 2012, House, 1981; Karasek & Theorall, 1990; Mor, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; Um & Harison, 1998), social networks (McPherson, Popielarz & Dribnic 1992), socialization tactics (Allen and Griffeth 2001; Allen, 2006) along with other psychological antecedents and organizational issues to establish employee retention models. The present study considers this as a research gap and aims to identify and analyze the role of social antecedents influencing employee retention. The present study has been focused on the Indian Information Technology sector considering the peculiarity of high attrition figures and the involvement of highly intellectual and knowledgeable human resources.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several studies have indicated that there exists intent to leave and actual turnover have strong inter-relationships between them (Price & Mueller, 1981; Bluedorn, 1982; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). In this context, it is worth mentioning that the study of March and Simon (1958) had a noteworthy role in terms of developing conceptual frameworks and empirical models related to employee turnover. Similar contributions were made by Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, (1979); Muchinsky and Morrow, (1980); Steers and Mowday,(1981).

Recent studies on antecedents of employee turnover had been discussed by several authors like Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, (2000). Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, (2007) in another study had presented a discussion based on research findings – integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features influencing behavior and performance. Logan (2000) indicated that employee retention is influenced by many variables like organizational culture, communication, strategy, pay and benefits, flexible work schedule and career development systems.

Social Factors as one of the antecedents of employee retention

Although popular literature had emphasized on retention antecedents like organizational, psychological, very few had made any attempt to identify social factors as one among the major causal factors influencing employee retention. This justification can be supported by the works of Agrela, Carr, Veyra, Dunn, Ellis, Gandolfi, Gresham, King, Sims, & Troutman (2008). They indicated that various retention factors satisfying the aspirations of employees contributed to their job satisfaction, loyalty, and commitment (Boomer Authority, 2009). Although exclusive categorization of social factors in employee retention research is not available, yet evidence regarding the importance of the same could be identified from the studies conducted by several authors. Pichler, Varm & Budhwar (2012) had emphasized the importance of variables like Value Similarity, Collectivism, Social Support and Role Information as important antecedents of social categorization of expatriates working in India. In another study, Farmer, and Aguinis (1999) had discussed an empirical model depicting the role of Supervisor Personal Attribute and Supervisor Behavior on subordinate power perception. The term social antecedents had been coined in various sociological research studies (Schooler, C 1972, Fox, 1992; Young, K., 1930, Butler, Doherty and Potter 2007). Most of these authors had made attempts to describe social antecedents as factors related to the social environment of an individual which affects the person's behavior. The underlying review of research findings makes an attempt to understand various variables which may were considered as important social variables in the present study.

Social Support

Social support has been considered as an important variable influencing employee happiness in an organization. It can be described as an interactive exchange process in between people which is supported by emotional concern, support for others, instrumental assistance, and dissemination of information. Thoits (1995) had pointed out that social support had an important role in terms of managing relationships in between people and managing stress in organizations. Authors like Broman (1993), Buunk & Schaufeli (1993) in their studies had given importance on the role of co-workers and supervisors in the organization

as well as that of family members, and the society or the community at large. Baumeister & Leary (1995) had discussed the importance of interpersonal networks in between people as important components of human motivation. Researchers such as Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa (1986) and Levinson (1965) had emphasized on the role of supervisory support as one of the most important aspects of social support in organizations. This theory was further supported by the study conducted by Rensberg, Armacost and Bennett (1999) and Bernatovicz (1997). These authors pointed out that not only supervisor support; co-worker support also played an important role for reducing turnover intention among employees.

Supervisor & Co-worker Support

Vincent Rousseau and Caroline Aubé (2010) had conducted a study indicated the role of supervisory support, co-worker support, ambient conditions and job resource adequacy influencing the affective commitment of employees in organizations. Other studies have indicated positive relationships in between Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Social Support in organizations (Hutchison, 1977a, 1997b; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Malatesta, 1995; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Yoon, Han, & Seo, 1996; Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000). Lobburi. P. (2012) in a recent paper had pointed out that social support worked two ways, one in terms of workplace social support (i.e. in the form of supervisors & co-workers) and the other non-workplace social support (i.e. family & friends) (Brough & Frame 2004, Park, Wilson, and Lee, 2004). However this study was limited to organizations having collectivistic culture. The findings of the study indicated that perceived social support from supervisors, co-workers, and family and friends, and perceived organizational support had positive association with employee job satisfaction.

Social Networks

Holton, Mitchell, Lee, and Eberly, (2008) were of the opinion that social networks had impacts on employee embedding similar to what was proposed by Lewin's force field theory. They further indicated social networks as clusters of linked employees within organizations. Rollag, Parise, & Cross, (2005) raised the issues of interpersonal, relational, social networks, and team dynamics for influencing employee turnover. The research conducted by Uchino (2004) emphasized the importance of social networks and job embeddedness on voluntary employee turnover. Castilla (2005) conducted a study on the role of social networks in employee performance in call centres. The findings of this study had shown that post-hire organizational social processes played an important role for retaining socially connected employees. The role of social networks in enhancing employee performance had been widely investigated by authors like Mehra and Brass (2001), Cross and Cummings (2004), and Podolny and Baron (1997). Studies conducted by Infante, Anderson, Martin, Herington and Kin (1993), Infante, Gorden (1991), Vischer (2007), McPherson, Popielarz, Drobnic (1992), Barry M, (1998) indicated that significantly perceived social support led to employee job satisfaction in organizations. Social networks in organizations contributed to provide instrumental and emotional support to the employees. Further evidence could be drawn from studies conducted by House, (1981); Karasek & Theorall, (1990); Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, (2001); Um & Harison, (1998) where it was found that perceived workplace social support was considered to be an important working condition leading to the improvement of job satisfaction and organizational commitment behaviour which in turn reduced employee turnover intention.

Acculturation and Integration

In recent times the concept of *acculturation and adaptation* of employees has acclaimed importance in behavioral science, cross-cultural psychology (Vasquez, 1984) and management studies literature. Acculturation has been described to be associated with cultural changes resulting from group interactions and adaptation within an organizational set up. Acculturation is found when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both the groups (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits 1936). *Acculturation and adaptation* (Padilla and Perez, 2003) had also been referred to the psychological changes and outcomes in the behavioral patterns of employees in organization. Acculturation and adaptation tends to induce more change in one of the groups than in the other (Berry, 1990a, 1990b). Berry (1992) had come up with the acculturation framework depicting the acculturation process from the group level, societal and organizational leading to employee adaptation in organizations. Berry's model (Berry 2011) of acculturation may be used in the present research in order to identify whether acculturation leads to better socialization and thereby employee retention.

Individualistic/Collectivist Culture

Lobburi, P., (2012) in a recent research made an attempt to study the impact of workplace and non-workplace social support on turnover intention of employees in a collectivistic organizational culture. The study pointed out that societies in which people had strong social bonds with family and friends, as in collectivist culture, non-workplace related factors (e.g., family and friends, kinship responsibilities, etc.) may also influence job satisfaction and work related outcomes of employees (e.g., organizational commitment and turnover intention) (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; Steers & Mowday, 1981). This perspective has been supported by the research conducted by Eisenberg (1999), who pointed out that the success of tomorrow's industries would be dependent on the ability of the management of organizations to effectively employ the talents in a culturally diverse work force. The importance of individualism/collectivist cultures has been extensively researched in the corporate sector in order to measure employee performance and motivation (Eisenburg, 1999). The understanding of collectivism and individualism in the Indian context has evolved in a different perspective. A number of research evidence collected from studies conducted by Bhawuk (2004), House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta(2004), Sinha (1985), Sinha & Verma (1987, 1994), Triandis (1995), Triandis & Bhawuk (1997), Verma (1999), Verma & Traindis (1998) depicted that Indians are by large collectivists in nature. Recent studies however claim that Indians are both collectivists and individualists and this depends on the situation (contextual) they are in (Mishra 1994, Sinha & Tripathi 1994, Tripathi 1988). Subsequent studies (Sinha, Sinha, Verma, J., & Sinha, 2001, Sinha, Vohra, Singhal, Sinha, & Ushashree, 2002) revealed that individualism and collectivism constitute the interchanging "means & goal" relationships each influencing the other. Such propositions regarding the co-existence of the opposites were previously established by the studies conducted by Sinha & Verma (1987, 1994).

Now the question arises how does individualism or collectivism affects employee, performance and social behavior. Cho and Yoon, (2009) in their paper studied the moderating effect of individualism-collectivism on the relationship between organizational HR practices and individual employee performance. In another study Hatrup, K., (2010), Hatrup, K. & Luu, L., (2010) examined how national

differences in uncertainty avoidance (UA) and individualism/collectivism (I/C) moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Other studies by Brough & Frame 2004; Shimazu, Shimazu, & Odahara, 2004 indicate that in a collectivist cultural context, not only does workplace social support (supervisor and co-worker support) influence job satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intention of workers but also influence their non-workplace social support (family and friends support). Coleman, (1988), indicated that that growing individualism led to the destruction of social capital. Triandis (1995) pointed out that in collectivist approaches people gave priorities to the goals of the group over one's individual goals.

Trust and Control Mutuality

In a study conducted by Tser-Yieth Chen D et al (2012) transformational leadership, trust had been discussed as important antecedents of the employee voluntary performance. Similar findings have been supported by the study conducted by Men, L.R., (2015). The present study would also consider the role of trust as an important social antecedent.

Men, L.R., (2015) in a recent study had indicated the role of trust and control mutuality as relationship sub variables influencing employee engagement. Previously Grunig and Huang (2000) found that the quality of organization–public relationships is indicated by public trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction.

Team Cohesiveness

Xiao-Ping Chen, Simon, Naumann and Schaubroeck (2005) in their paper had discussed a model depicting the role of Group Leadership Support, Procedural Justice Climate, Group Cohesiveness, Goal Congruence, Group Homogeneity and Group affective tone as social antecedents of group citizenship behavior which influences group performance and employee turnover intention. In the present study the variable Group Cohesiveness is proposed as another important social antecedent influencing employee retention.

Social Recognition

The need for employee influence, autonomy, and empowerment for successful service delivery has been frequently emphasized (Stewart, 1997; Appelbaum and Honeggar 1999; Grönroos, 2000). The study conducted by Bjarnason, T., (2009) discussed the importance of social recognition in terms of approval, skill utilization and influence as an important social antecedent influencing employee organizational commitment and intention to stay.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- To study the role of social factors influencing employee intention to stay in selected IT organizations in and around the NCR of Delhi
- To study whether individualistic or collectivistic approaches in IT organizations had any influence on the social factors and thereby employee intention to stay.

- To identify among the various social variables like supervisory relations, co-worker relations, social support, social network, acculturation& adaptation, trust and control mutuality, social recognition and team cohesiveness had any role in employee intention to stay in these IT organizations

HYPOTHESIS

Based on the above objectives, the following hypothesis were established, namely:

- $H1_0$: Social factors (supervisory relations, co-worker relations, social support, social network, acculturation, trust and control mutuality, social recognition and team cohesiveness) did not contribute to employee intention to stay.
- $H2_0$: Individualistic and Collectivist approaches used in IT organizations in and around the NCR of Delhi had no influence on the social variables as well as employee intention to stay.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study used descriptive research design. Data was collected from 300 employees representing operational positions in various Information Technology (IT) organizations in and around the NCR of Delhi. The respondents were contacted by the use of personal networks. The samples were randomly picked from a list of probable respondents. Primary data were collected by using the social variable-employee intention to stay questionnaire. Data collected from the study were analyzed by using SPSS.

The Research Instrument

The instrument used was aimed to identify respondent opinion on their intention to stay consisting of 5 question elements and 50 other questions (5 questions for each variable) pertaining to 10 variables namely, collectivist approach, individualistic approach, supervisory relations, co-worker relations, social support, social network, acculturation& integration, trust and control mutuality, social recognition and team cohesiveness. A five point Likert scale was used in the instrument for collecting respondent opinion.

DATA ANALYSIS

Respondent Profile

The respondents consisted of a mix of male and female employees. 78 % males were single whereas 22% males were married. Regarding the females, 43% of them were single and 57% of the females were married. Out of the male respondents, 69% belonged to the age group of 21-25 years, followed by 31% belonging to the age group of 26-30 years. Regarding the females, 42% belonged to the age group of 21-25 years whereas 58% belonged to the age group of 26-30 years.

Responses on the 50 question items were summarized under the heads namely, collectivist approach, individualistic approach, supervisory relations, co-worker relations, social support, social network, acculturation& integration, trust and control mutuality, social recognition and team cohesiveness. In similar way the remaining 5 question items were summarized under the variable “intention to stay”.

Data Validation & Descriptive Statistics

In order to assess whether the various items of the instrument used in the study were statistically relevant and formed a reliable scale, Cronbach's alpha score was computed for each was computed. Data analysis reveals that Cronbach's Alpha score of .751 for 55 items of questions used in the survey had fairly high score establishing the reliability of the instrument used.

Table 1
Reliability Statistics

<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
.751	55

Table 2 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the respondent opinion on the 11 items studied in the instrument. Based on the mean scores and the standard deviation computed for the eight social factors and those regarding Individualistic and Collectivist approaches used in the studied organizations, it can be identified that; Acculturation & Adaptation had the highest mean score (4.67), followed by Team Cohesiveness & Social Network (each having mean score of 4.66). Social Support had a mean score of 4.65 followed by trust and control mutuality with a mean score of 4.62. Intention to stay had the highest mean score of 4.70.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Collectivist Approach	300	4.41	.406
Individualistic Approach	300	4.43	.438
Supervisory Relations	300	4.58	.276
Co-worker Relations	300	4.59	.278
Social Support	300	4.65	.257
Social Network	300	4.66	.245
Acculturation&Integration	300	4.67	.236
Trust & Control Mutuality	300	4.62	.245
Social Recognition	300	4.59	.263
Team Cohesiveness	300	4.66	.253
Intention to Stay	300	4.70	.242
Valid N (listwise)	300		

Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to have an in-depth understanding of the contribution of the variables on employee intention to stay, exploratory factor analysis was done. Table 3 illustrates the KMO and Barlett's Test results of sampling adequacy. The KMO score of .756 indicates that enough items are predicted by each factor.

Table 3
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.756
	Approx. Chi-Square	480.113
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	55
	Sig.	.000

Barlett test was also found to be significant depicting that the variables are correlated highly enough to go for factor analysis. The total variances were computed using principal axis factoring as the extraction procedure (Table 4).

Table 4
Total Variance Explained

Com- ponent	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.910	26.457	26.457	2.910	26.457	26.457	1.990	18.094	18.094
2	1.342	12.204	38.661	1.342	12.204	38.661	1.612	14.653	32.748
3	1.114	10.125	48.785	1.114	10.125	48.785	1.421	12.919	45.666
4	1.055	9.589	58.374	1.055	9.589	58.374	1.398	12.708	58.374
5	.866	7.874	66.248						
6	.834	7.579	73.827						
7	.716	6.508	80.335						
8	.640	5.822	86.157						
9	.557	5.066	91.223						
10	.524	4.761	95.984						
11	.442	4.016	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Extraction used through principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was used in order to understand the underlying orientation of the 11 items used in the instrument. Four factors were requested based on the assumption that the items were designed to index the constructs namely, Intention to stay, Collectivist approach, Individualistic Approach and Social Support. After rotation, the first factor contributed to 18% of the variance, followed by the second factor accounting to 14.6%, third factor 12.9% and the fourth factor 12.7% variances. Table 5 displays the items and factor loadings for rotated factors with loadings less than 0.5 not considered for clarity of the interpretation.

It is clear from Table 5 that the first factor indexing Intention to stay loads most strongly on the five items of the first column namely social support (.575), social network (.752), co-worker relations (.645), acculturation & integration (.513), and trust and control mutuality (.775). The second factor, indexing Collectivist approach was contributed by three factors in the second column namely, Intention to stay

Table 5
Items and factor loadings for the rotated factors

Item	Factor Loading				Communality
	1	2	3	4	
Intention to Stay		.759			.598
Collectivist Approach				.815	.676
Individualistic Approach					.760
Social Support	.575				.515
Supervisory Relations			.655		.699
Co-worker Relations	.645			.606	.627
Social Network	.752	.755			.588
Acculturation & Integration	.513				.351
Trust & Control Mutuality	.775	.517			.403
Social Recognition					.604
Team Cohesiveness					.600
Eigen Values	1.990	1.612	1.421	1.398	
% of variance	18.094	14.653	12.919	12.708	

Note. Loadings <.50 are omitted. Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

(.759) Social Network (.755) and Trust & Control Mutuality (.517). The third factor indexing Individualistic approach was contributed by supervisory relations (.655). The fourth factor indexing social support was contributed by collectivist approach (.815) and co-worker relations (.606).

The exploratory factor analysis thereby brings a very inconclusive picture regarding the influence of collectivist and individualistic approaches on the intention to stay although the influence of some of the social factors like Social support, co-worker relations, social network, acculturation & integration and Trust & control mutuality can be established. The analysis highlights that social recognition and team cohesiveness hardly have any impacts on employee intention to stay. This had made the present investigation have a look at the regression estimates considering social support, social network, co-worker relations, acculturation & integration, and trust and control mutuality as independent variables and intention to stay as dependent variable.

Regression Estimates

The Model Summary (Table 6 a) shows that the multiple correlation coefficient (R), using all the predictors simultaneously, is .389 ($R^2 = .15$) and the adjusted R^2 is .137, meaning that 13% of the variance in *employee intention to stay* can be predicted from all the independent variables like *social support, social network, co-worker relations, acculturation & integration, and trust and control mutuality* combined together.

Table 6b shows that $F = 10.513$ and is significant. This indicates that the combination of the predictors significantly predict employee intention to stay.

Table 6 a
Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.389 ^a	.152	.137	.225

a. Predictors: (Constant), Trust & Control Mutuality, Acculturation & Integration, Social Network, Social Support, Co-worker Relations

b. Dependent Variable: Intention to Stay

Table 6 b
ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.651	5	.530	10.513	.000 ^b
	Residual	14.829	294	.050		
	Total	17.480	299			

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to Stay

b. Predictors: (Constant), Trust & Control Mutuality, Acculturation & Integration, Social Network, Social Support, Co-worker Relations

Table 6c indicates the standardized beta coefficients, which are interpreted similarly to correlation coefficients or factor weights. The t value and the Significance level of each independent variable indicates whether that variable is significantly contributing to the equation for predicting employee intention to stay from the whole set of predictors.

Table 6 c
Regression Coefficients^a

Model	B	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.120	.394		5.383	.000	1.345 2.896
	Co-worker Relations	.130	.058	.149	2.257	.025	.017 .243
	Social Support	.028	.060	.030	.468	.640	-.090 .146
	Social Network	.197	.056	.199	3.534	.000	.087 .307
	Acculturation & Integration	.044	.058	.043	.758	.449	-.070 .158
	Trust & Control Mutuality	.157	.057	.159	2.773	.006	.046 .269

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to Stay

It is evident that, Co-worker Relations, Social Network and Trust & Control Mutuality are the three variables which are having significance ($P < 0.05$) considering the prediction where the other contributing variables are considered together. It can be further interpreted that as $R^2 = .15$ and $1 - R^2 = .85$, tolerances are low for social support, Acculturation & Integration.

DISCUSSIONS

Based on the above findings, several issues pertaining to employee retention can be identified. The first conclusion that could be drawn regarding the present study is that the causal social factors behind employee intention to stay in the investigated IT organizations are diverse and complex in nature. As revealed in the present study although the impact of social factors on employee intention to stay in IT organizations are clearly seen as indicated by the statistical data ($H1_0$ is rejected), however the role of collectivist and individualistic approaches followed in these organizations on employee intention to stay as well as those on the social factors remained inconclusive and unclear. As the present study had failed to come up with any statistical evidence regarding the probable role of both individualistic as well as collectivist approaches it is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding their role in employee retention showing that the second Null Hypothesis ($H2_0$) assumed during the beginning of the study stood accepted.

The role of social factors in employee intention to stay has been clearly established in the present study. Exploratory factor analysis had indicated that social factors such as social support, social network, co-worker relations, acculturation & integration and trust & control mutuality had important roles to play for employee intention to stay in their organizations. Regression analysis based on assuming intention to stay as dependent variable and social support, social network, co-worker relations, acculturation & integration and trust & control mutuality as independent variables had revealed that among these five independent variables, Co-worker Relations, Social Network and Trust & Control Mutuality had bigger role to play regarding employee intention to stay. Surprisingly social support and acculturation & integration had no significant association with intention to stay.

Role of Social Network

The present study had revealed the interrelationship of employee intention to stay and social network. Hurlbert (1991) indicated that social networks played an important role in job satisfaction by serving as a social resource by providing social support to people. Manev and Stevenson (2001) had indicated that social network ties are linked to employee organization citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Similar justifications were presented previously by Argyle (1991). Other studies such as those of Van der Vegt, Emans and Van de Vliert (1999) and Gersick, (1989) indicated that employees are motivated by their self-interest to order to facilitate the work of others causing better social network ties. Hsieh-Hua Yang, Yi-Horng Lai, Wan-Ching Chao, Shu-Fen Chen, Mei-Hua Wang (2009) had discussed that social networks influence job satisfaction by extending supportiveness. In a recent study Akhter, Siddiqui and Masum (2011) had shown that social network, job satisfaction, and employee productivity and commitment had positive interrelationships in between them. In another paper Rosalie G.B.M. van Stormbroek-Burgers, Lidewey E.C. van der Sluis and Kees van Montfort (2011) had pointed out that social networks positively influenced employee identification in organizations. The importance of social networks in job satisfaction had also been discussed in the paper authored by Thammakoranonta, Jarusamanya, and Chayawan (2014).

Role of Co-worker Relations

The findings of the present study have indicated that Co-worker Relations had contributed to employee intention to stay, which is further justified by the findings of other researchers. Herman (1999) had identified unsatisfactory relationships with co-workers as one of the factors influencing employees leaving

organizations. A very recent study conducted by María Vera, Martínez, Lorente and Chambel. (2016) had established the role of co-worker support and supervisor relationship influencing work engagement. Lee and Ok (2011) in their paper had discussed the implications of workplace friendship for employee job-related outcomes in the hospitality industry. Karatepe (2011) argued that co-worker support along with organizational support played an important factor in terms of influencing employee outcomes and job embeddedness in an organization. Similarly She-Cheng Lin and Jennifer Shu-Jen Lin (2011) in their study had found that job satisfaction acted an intermediate variable in between the interrelationship of co-worker relationship at the workplace and organizational commitment of employees.

Role of Trust & Control Mutuality

Previous research findings as that of Hon and Grunig's (1999), Agarwal (2013) had indicated that trust plays an important role in identification in organizations.

Heather K. Spence Laschinger, Joan Finegan, Judith Shamian (2002) had argued that employees experiencing greater organizational trust, improved their job satisfaction and job-related work attitudes. Callaway (2006) had indicated that lack of trust and disconnection among employees and supervisors led to job dissatisfaction and resulted in difficulty for attracting and retaining talents in organizations. Further Vineburg (2010) had suggested that workplace trust facilitated higher levels of employee performance and organizational competitiveness. Parastoo Gashtasebi Fard & Fariba Karimi (2015) in a recent study showed that organizational trust had significant interrelationship with employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In another study on teachers Olamiposi Usikalu, Adedeji J. Ogunleye and James Effiong (2015) pointed out that organizational trust significantly influenced job performance. In the present study trust and control mutuality has been found to be one among the causal factors influencing employee intention to stay which is justified by the arguments placed by previous researchers.

LIMITATIONS

One of the limitations of the study is that respondents were contacted informally. Secondly in order to understand the relationship between the social variables and employee opinion regarding their intention to stay only the opinion of some employees working in selected IT organizations were considered instead of having a cross section of respondents and even those representing the top management of the organizations to which they were belonging.

SCOPE OF FURTHER RESEARCH & PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

In spite of the aforesaid limitations the present study had opened the scope of emphasizing spotlight on social variables as an important causal factor influencing employee retention studies. Previous studies had mostly emphasized on psychological and organizational issues predominantly and turning the spotlight on social factors would enable HR professionals and industry captains emphasize more attention on the individual and social needs of the employees which had been predominantly ignored by prior researchers. This would eventually open up new avenues of HR policies that would be more employee engaging in the long run having far reaching outcomes in terms of facilitating employee job satisfaction and retention.

CONCLUSION

The study had revealed that employee intention to stay in Information Technology (IT) organizations in and around the National Capital Region (NCR) of Delhi is influenced by social factors. However individualistic and collectivistic approaches apparently had no influences on social factors and employee intention to stay in these organizations. Among the social factors social network, co-worker relations and trust & control mutuality had important roles to play for employee intention to stay in their organizations. Although the results of the study are encouraging the findings can be considered to be inconclusive considering the probable intervention of other social as well as cultural issues which may bring in ample scope of extension of the research in other cities across the country involving respondents from different Information Technology (IT) organizations.

REFERENCES

- Abbasi, S., & Hollman, K. (2000). Turnover: The Real Bottom-line. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(3), 333-342.
- Abelson, M.A. (1993). Turnover cultures. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 11, 339-376.
- Agarwal, V (2013). "Investigating the convergent validity of organizational trust", *Journal of Communication Management*, Vol. 17 Iss 1 pp. 24 – 39
- Agrela, R., Carr, R., Veyra, V., Dunn, C., Ellis, D., Gandolfi, A., Gresham, B., King, L., Sims, A., & Troutman, I. (2008). Retention issues and solutions: tools to ensure University of California becomes an employer of choice. <http://www.ucop.edu/cucsaldocuments>
- Akhter, M.M., Siddiqui, Md. and Masum, A.A., (2011). Analysis of Social Network and its Effect on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance, *ASA University Review*, 5(1), January-June, 2011, 195-207.
- Allen, D. G., & Griffeth, R. W. (2001). Test of a mediated performance-turnover relationship highlighting the moderating roles of visibility and reward contingency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1014-1021
- Allen D.G. (2006). Do Organizational Socialization Tactics Influence Newcomer Embeddedness and Turnover? *Journal of Management*, Vol. 32 No. 2, April 2006 237-256
- Appelbaum, Steven H. and Honegger, Karen (1998). "Empowerment: a contrasting overview of organizations in general and nursing in particular - an examination of organizational factors, managerial behaviors, job design and structural power." *Empowerment in Organizations*, Vol. 6(2): 29-50
- Argyle, M.: 1991, *Cooperation* (Routledge, London, UK).
- Baron, J. N., Hannan, M. T. & Burton, M. D. (2001). Labor pains: Change in organizational models and employee turnover in young, high-tech firms, *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(4), 960-1012. <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1253&context=articles>
- Barry, M., (1998). "Social Network Conceptions of Solidarity." Pp. 343-72 in *The Problem of Solidarity: Theories and Models*, Edited by P. Doreian and T. Fararo. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Gordon and Breach.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995), The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation, *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529
- Bernotavicz, F. (1997). Retention of child welfare caseworkers: A report. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine: Institute for Public Sector Innovation, Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service.
- Berry J.W. (1990a). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-cultural perspectives: Nebraska Synposiirn on Morivarion* (pp. 201-234). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Berry J.W. (1990b). The role of psychology in ethnic studies. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. 22. 8-21.
- Berry, J.W. (1992). Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. *International Migration*.

- Berry, J. W. (2011). Integration and Multiculturalism: Ways towards Social Solidarity, *Papers on Social Representations*, Vol. 20: 2.1-2.21
- Bhawuk, D. P. S. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. In *Encyclopedia of Leadership* (Vol. 2, pp. 706–710). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bjarnason, T., (2009), Social recognition and employees' organizational support – The Impact of Social Recognition on Organizational Commitment, Intent to Stay, Service Effort, and Service Improvements in an Icelandic Service Setting, *Department of Sociology, Goteborg University, Goteborg Studies In Sociology* (Vol 37).
- Bloom, M., and Michel, J.G., (2002), The Relationships among Organizational Context, Pay Dispersion, and Managerial Turnover, *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 45 (1):33-42
- Bluedorn, A. 1982. The theories of turnover: Causes, effects, and meaning. *Res. Sociol. Organ.* 1 75–128.
- Boomer Authority. (2009). *Competitive Strategies for a World Class Workforce*. Retrieved from <http://boomerauthority.ning.com>
- Broman, C.L. (1993), Social relationships and health-related behaviour, *Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 1993 Aug;16(4):335-50.
- Bridges, William. (1991), *Managing transitions — Making the most of change*, Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Brough P., & Frame R., (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The role of Social Support and Police Organizational Variables, *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 8-16
- Butler, J.C., Doherty, M.S., Potter, R.M. (2007), Social antecedents and consequences of interpersonal rejection sensitivity, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Volume 43, Issue 6, October 2007, Pages 1376–1385
- Buunk, B. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1993). Burnout: Perspective from social comparison theory. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds.), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Callaway, P.L., (2006). The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Job Satisfaction: An Analysis in the U.S. Federal Work Force, PhD Dissertation Report, <http://www.bookpump.com/dps/pdf-b/1123523b.pdf>
- Caplan, Gayle and Teese, Mary. (1997), *Survivors—How to keep your best people on board after downsizing*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.
- Castilla, E.J., (2005). Social Networks and Employee Performance in a Call Center, *AJS Volume 110 Number 5* (March 2005): 1243–83, [http://web.mit.edu/ecastill/www/publications/Castilla\(AJSMarch202005\).pdf](http://web.mit.edu/ecastill/www/publications/Castilla(AJSMarch202005).pdf)
- Cho, T., Yoon, S., (2009). Human Resource Management, Individualism-Collectivism, and Individual Performance among Public Employees: A Test of the Main and Moderating Effects, *The Korean Journal of Policy Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 57-78.
- Cross, R., and Cummings, J., (2004), “Tie and Network Correlates of Individual Performance in Knowledge-Intensive Work,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 47/6 (December 2004): 928- 937.
- Coleman, (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, Supplement: Organizations and Institutions: Sociological and Economic Approaches to the Analysis of Social Structure (1988), pp. S95-S120.
- Eisenberg Jacob, (1999). How Individualism – Collectivism Moderates the Effects of Rewards on Creativity and Innovation: A Comparative Review of Practices in Japan and the US, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 8 (4), pp.251 – 261
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500– 507.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565-573.

- Farmer, S., Aguinis, H., (1999), Antecedents and outcomes of subordinate perceptions of power in supervisor-subordinate relationships: an integrated model, *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 08/1999; 1999(1):E1-E6
- Fitz-enz, J. (1997), It's costly to lose good employees, *Workforce*, 50, 50.
- Gersick, C. J. G: 1989, 'Marketing Time: Predictable Transitions in Task Groups', *Academy of Management Journal* 32(2), 274-309.
- Griffeth, R.W., & Hom, P.W. (1995), The employee turnover process, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 13, 245-293.
- Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., & 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.
- Griffeth, R.W., & Hom, P.W. (2001). *Retaining valued employees*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Grönroos, Christian (2000). *Service Management and Marketing. A Customer Relationship Management Approach*. Second edition. Chichester: John Wiley & sons Ltd.
- Grunig, J. E., & Huang, Y. H. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of Relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 23–54).
- Harter, J.K. Schmidt, F.L. & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-Unit-Level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 268 –279
- Hatrup, K. (2010). An Investigation of Country Differences in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions, *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 2010, Vol. 12, (1): 17-39.
- Hatrup, K. & Luu, L., (2010). An Investigation of Country Differences in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions, *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 2010, Volume 12, Number 1, pages 17-39
- Heather K. Spence Laschinger, Joan Finegan, Judith Shamian (2002). The impact of workplace empowerment, organizational trust on staff nurses' work satisfaction and organizational commitment, in (ed.) *Advances in Health Care Management (Advances in Health Care Management, Volume 3)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.59 – 85
- Holton, B.C., Mitchell, T.R., Lee, T.W., Eberly, M.B., (2008). Turnover and Retention Research: *A Glance at the Past, a Closer Review of the Present, and a Venture into the Future*, *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2008, 231–274
- Herman, R.E. (1999), "Hold on to the people you need", *HR Focus Special Report on Recruitment and Retention*, June, Supplement 11.
- Hon, L.C. and Grunig, J.E. (1999), *Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations*, Institute for Public Relations, Gainesville, FL.
- House, J.S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M. J., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE, study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Hsieh-Hua Yang, Yi-Horng Lai, Wan-Ching Chao, Shu-Fen Chen, Mei-Hua Wang (2009). Social Networks and Job Satisfaction of Nurses, *WSEAS Transactions on Communications*, 7(8), 698-707.
- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1332–1356
- Hurlbert Jeanne S.(1991), Social Networks, Social Circles, and Job Satisfaction, *Work and Occupations*, 18(4), 415-430

- Hutchison, S. (1997a). A path model of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 159–174.
- Hutchison, S. (1997b). Perceived organizational support: Further evidence of construct validity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 1025–1034.
- Infante, D.A., Anderson, C.M., Martin, M.M., Harrington, A.D., & Kim, J.K. (1993). Supervisors' compliance-gaining tactics, argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, and style. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6, 307-326.
- Infante, D.A., & Gorden, W.I. (1991). How employees see the boss: Test of an argumentative and affirming model of supervisors' communicative behavior. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 55, 294-304
- John W. Fox, (1992), The Structure, Stability, and Social Antecedents of Reported Paranormal Experiences, *Sociological Analysis*, Vol. 53, No. 4, The Unique and the Shared in Religion and Society (Winter, 1992), pp. 417-431
- Karasek, R. & Theorell, T. (1990) *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karatepe, O. M. (2011). The effects of coworker and perceived organizational support on hotel employee outcomes: The moderating role of job embeddedness. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(4), 495e516.
- Young, K., (1930). The Social Antecedents of Human Behavior. Chapter 1 in *Social Psychology: An Analysis of Social Behavior*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf (1930): 3-14. Accessed from https://brocku.ca/MeadProject/Young/1930/1930_01.html.
- Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 1075–1079.
- Koys, D.J. (2001), The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol: 54(1): 101-114.
- Lee, J. J., & Ok, C. (2011). Effects of workplace friendship on employee job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, turnover intention, absenteeism, and task performance, http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1053&context=gradconf_hospitality
- Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9, 370–390.
- Loburi, P. (2012). The Influence of Organizational and Social Support on Turnover Intention in Collectivist Contexts, *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 28(1), 93-104.
- Logan, J. K. (2000). Retention tangibles and intangibles: More meaning in work is essential, but good chair massages won't hurt. *Training & Development*, 54 (4), 48-50.
- Maertz, C.P., & Campion, M.A. (1998). 25 years of voluntary turnover research: A review and critique. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 13, 49–81.
- Maertz, C.P., Stevens, M.J., & Campion, M.A. (2003). A turnover model for the Mexican maquiladoras. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 111–135.
- Maertz, C.P., & Campion, M.A. (2004). Profiles in quitting: Integrating process and content turnover theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 566–582.
- Maertz, C.P., & Griffeth, R.W. (2004). Eight motivational forces and voluntary turnover: A theoretical synthesis with implications for research. *Journal of Management*, 30, 667–683.
- Maertz, C.P., Griffeth, R.W., Campbell, N., & Allen, D.G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 1059–1075.
- Malatesta, R. M. (1995). Understanding the dynamics of organizational and supervisory commitment using a social exchange framework. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Manev, I. M. and W. B. Stevenson: 2001, 'Nationality, Cultural Distance, and Expatriate Status: Effects on the Managerial Network in a Multinational Enterprise', *Journal of International Business Studies* 32(2), 285-303.

- March, J.G., Simon, H.A., (1958), *Organizations*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc, pp 262.
- María Vera, Isabel M. Martínez, Laura Lorente, M José Chambel (2016). The Role of Co-worker and Supervisor Support in the Relationship Between Job Autonomy and Work Engagement Among Portuguese Nurses: A Multilevel Study. *Social Indicators Research* 126:3, 1143-1156
- McElroy, J.C. Morrow, P.C. and Rude, S.N. (2001), Turnover and Organizational Performance: A Comparative Analysis of the effects of voluntary, involuntary and reduction-in-force Turnover, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol: 86 (6): 1294-1299.
- McPherson, JM, PA Popielarz, S Drobnic (1992), Social networks and organizational dynamics, *American sociological review*, 1992, Vol: 57: 153-170
- Men, L.R., (2015), Employee Engagement in Relation to Employee–Organization Relationships and Internal Reputation: Effects of Leadership Communication, *Public Relations Journal*, 9 (2), 2015, <http://www.prsa.org/Intelligence/PRJournal/Vol9/No2/>
- Mehra, M. Kilduff, and D. Brass (2001), “The Social Networks of High and Low Self-Monitors: Implications for Workplace Performance,” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46/1 (March 2001): 121-146;
- Milkovich, G. T., and J. W. Boudreau (1997). *Human resource management*, 8th ed. Chicago: Irwin/McGraw Hill.
- Mishra, R. C. (1994). Individualist and collectivist orientations across generations. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application* (pp. 225–238). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Mitchell, Lawrence E. (2002), *Corporate irresponsibility—America’s newest export*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, W., Hand, H., & Meglino, B. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493-522.
- Mor Barak, M.; Nissly, J.; & Levin, A (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and metanalysis. *The Social Service Review*, 75(4), 625-661.
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Murrow, P. (1980). A multidisciplinary model of voluntary employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 17, 263-290.
- O’Reilly, C. A. & Chatman, J. A. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 71, 492-499.
- Olamiposi Usikalu, Adedeji J. Ogunleye and James Effiong (2015). Organizational Trust, Job Satisfaction and Job Performance Among Teachers in Ekiti State, Nigeria, *British Open Journal of Psychology* 1(1), March 2015, pp. 1- 10. http://borpub.com/British%20Open%20Journal%20of%20Psychology/BORJ_Vol.%201,%20No.%201,%20March%202015/Organizational%20Trust.pdf
- Parastoo Gashtasebi Fard & Fariba Karimi (2015). The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Silence with Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of the Employees of University, *International Education Studies*; 8(11), 219-227.
- Pine, B.J., Gilmore, J. H., (1998). Welcome to the Experience Economy, *Harvard Business Review*, <https://hbr.org/1998/07/welcome-to-the-experience-economy>
- Pichler S., Varma A., Budhwar P., (2012), Antecedents and consequences of the social categorization of expatriates in India, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23, No. 5, March 2012, 915–927
- Price J.L., Mueller C.W. (1981). A Causal Model of Turnover for Nurses, *Academy of Management Journal*, September 1, 1981 vol. 24 no. 3 543-565
- Podolny, J., and Baron, J., (1997), Resources and Relationships: Social Networks and Mobility in the Workplace, *American Sociological Review*, 62/5 (October 1997): 673-693

- Rappaport, A., Bancroft, E., & Okum, L. (2003), The aging workforce raises new employee management issues for employers, *Journal of Organizational Excellence*, 23, 55-66.
- Ramlall, S., (2003), Managing Employee Retention as a Strategy for Increasing Organizational Competitiveness, *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 2003, 8 (2), 63-72
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*. 38. 149-152.
- Remsburg, R. E., Armacost, K. A., & Bennett, R. G. (1999). *Improving nursing assistant turnover and stability rates in a long-term care facility*. *Geriatric Nursing*, 20(4), 203-208. DOI: 10.1053/gn.1999.v20.101102001
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 825–836.
- Rollag, K., Parise, S., & Cross, R., (2005), Getting New Hires Up to Speed Quickly, *MIT Sloan Management Review* 46(2).
- Rosalie G.B.M. van Stormbroek-Burgers, Lidewey E.C. van der Sluis and Kees van Montfort (2011). Social Networks: effects on identification, performance and satisfaction, *Nyenrode Research Paper Series*, 11(6), 1-30. <http://www.nyenrode.tv/FacultyResearch/research/Documents/Research%20Paper%20Series/2011/nrp1106.pdf?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1>
- Schooler, C (1972), Social Antecedents of Adult Psychological Functioning, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Sep., 1972), pp. 299-322
- She-Cheng Lin 1 and Jennifer Shu-Jen Lin (2011). Impacts of coworkers' relationships on organizational commitment and intervening effects of job satisfaction, *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5(8), pp. 3396-3409.
- Shimazu, A., Shimazu, M., & Odahara, T. (2004). Job control and social support as coping resources in job satisfaction. *Psychological Reports*, 94(2), 449–456.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1985). Collectivism, social energy, and development. In I. R. Langunes & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), *From a different perspective of behaviours across cultures* (pp. 109–119). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.
- Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application* (pp. 123–136). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Sinha, J. B. P., Sinha, T. N., Verma, J., & Sinha, R. B. N. (2001). Collectivism coexisting with individualism: An Indian scenario. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 133–145.
- Sinha, J. B. P., & Verma, J. (1987). Structure of collectivism. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 123–129). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.
- Sinha, J. B. P., & Verma, J. (1994). Collectivism and socio-economic and psychological wellbeing. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 267–275). Thousand Oakes/London/ New Delhi: Sage.
- Sinha, J. B. P., Vohra, N., Singhal, S., Sinha, R. B. N., & Ushashree, S. (2002). Normative predictions of collectivist-individualist intentions and behaviour of Indians. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, 309–319.
- Sinha, C., Sinha, R., (2012), Factors Affecting Employee Retention: A Comparative Analysis of two Organizations from Heavy Engineering Industry, *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol 4, No.3, 2012, 145-162.
- Stauss, B., Chojnacki, K., Decker, A., Hoffman, F. (2001). "Retention effects of a customer club", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 12 No.1, pp.7-19
- Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and the post decision accommodation process. In B. M. Shaw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organization Behavior: Vol. 3* (pp. 235-281).
- Stewart, Thomas (1997). *Intellectual Capital. The New Wealth of Organizations*. New York: Doubleday / Currency
- Thammakoranonta, N., Jarusamanya, N., and Chayawan, C., (2014). Using Social Network to Increase Job Satisfaction in Thailand, *International Journal of Computer Theory and Engineering*, 6(6), December 2014,451-454.

- Trevor, C., (2001). Worker Performance and Voluntary Turnover in Worker Cooperatives, Discussion paper, Retrieved from: <http://reic.uwcc.wisc.edu/discussion/papers/trevor.pdf>
- Triandis, H.C., (1995). Individualism and Collectivism, Boulder, Co: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., & Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1997). Culture theory and the meaning of relatedness. In P. Christopher Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/ organizational psychology* (pp. 13–52). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Tripathi, R. C. (1988). Aligning development to values in India. In D. Sinha & H. S. R. Kao (Eds.), *Social values and development: Asian perspective*. New Delhi: Sage
- Tser-Yieth Chen, D, Shih-Nan Hwang, and York Liu, (2012), Antecedents of the Voluntary Performance of Employees: Clarifying the Roles of Employee Satisfaction and Trust, *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 41, No. 3, Fall 2012, 407-420.
- Thoits, P. A. (1995), Stress, coping, and social support processes: Where are we? What next? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 35, 53–79.
- Uchino, B. N. (2004). *Social support and physical health: Understanding the health consequences of relationships*. Yale University Press.
- Um, M.Y. & Harrison, D.F. (1998). Role stressors, burnout, mediators and job satisfaction: A stress strain – outcome model and an empirical test. *Social Work Research*, 22, 100–115.
- Van der Vegt, G., B. Emans and E. Van de Vliert (1999), Effects of Inter dependencies in Project Teams, *Journal of Social Psychology* 139(2), 202-214.
- Vasquez, A. (1984). Les implications ideologiques du concept d'acculturation. *Cahiers de Sociologie Economique et Culturelle*, I. 83-121.
- Verma, J. (1999). Collectivism in the cultural perspective: The Indian scene. In J. C. Lasry, J. Adair, & K. Dion (Eds.), *Latest contributions to cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 228–241). Lisse: Swets & Zetlinger.
- Verma, J., & Triandis, H. C. (1998, August). The measurement of collectivism in India. Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Association of Cross Cultural Psychology, Bellingham, WA.
- Vincent Rousseau, Caroline Aubé (2010), Social Support at Work and Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Moderating Effect of Job Resource Adequacy and Ambient Conditions, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 2010, 150(4), 321–340
- Vineburg, J.H., (2010). A study of organizational trust and related variables among faculty members at HBCUs, Doctoral Thesis, <http://ir.uiowa.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1799&context=etd>
- Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical environment on job performance: Towards a theoretical model of workplace stress. *Stress and Health*, 23, 175-184.
- Xiao-Ping Chen, Simon S. K. Lam, Stefanie E. Naumann and John Schaubroeck (2005), Group Citizenship Behaviour: Conceptualization and Preliminary Tests of its Antecedents and Consequences, *Management and Organization Review* 1:2 273–300.
- Yoon, J., Han, N-C., & Seo, Y-J. (1996). Sense of control among hospital employees: An assessment of choice process, empowerment, and buffering hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 686–716.
- Yoon, J., & Lim, J. C. (1999). Organizational support in the workplace: The case of Korean hospital employees. *Human Relations*, 52, 923–945.
- Yoon, J., & Thye, S. (2000). Supervisor support in the work place: Legitimacy and positive affectivity. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 295–316.
- Zineldin, M. (2000). TRM Total Relationship Management, Student litterateur, Lund.