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ABSTRACT

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND EMPLOYEE TURNOVER: A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF COLLECTIVE TURNOVER

Jinuk Oh
University of Guelph, 2020

Advisor: Dr. Nita Chhinzer

This study addresses four ongoing theoretical and empirical research questions related to employee turnover: 1) Does transformational leadership have a direct effect on employee turnover at both the individual and business-unit level? 2) Does collective turnover influence organizational performance? 3) Can turnover intention predict turnover behaviour? and 4) How does collective turnover contribute to individual turnover decisions? To achieve this, I collected longitudinal and multi-source data from car dealerships of a Korean car brand in South Korea. The research participants were 201 salespeople working at 93 dealerships. The findings of this research have important implications for turnover research. Transformational leadership appears to influence employee turnover intentions, which supports the idea that transformational leadership is an important pull-to-stay factor. Collective turnover appears to influence organizational performance as well as employee turnover decisions, empirically confirming contagious influence.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Employee turnover broadly refers to the end of an individual’s employment with an organization (Mobley, 1982), and it is often classified into involuntary and voluntary turnover. Involuntary turnover reflects an employer’s decision to terminate the employment relationship, usually in the form of a dismissal or layoff, whereas voluntary turnover reflects an employee’s decision to leave an organization, usually through the employee quitting (McElroy, Morrow, & Rude, 2001; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998). Voluntary turnover is often dysfunctional for the employer, given that employees who are more skilled or better performers are more likely to leave the organization, as they are believed to have more external job opportunities than average or poor performers (McElroy et al., 2001). Thus, high rates of voluntary turnover are often perceived as one of the greatest threats to organizational effectiveness (Allen & Griffeth, 2001; Wynen, Van Dooren, Mattijs, & Deschamps, 2019). In contrast, involuntary turnover is often viewed as functional, given that dismissal, termination, and layoff decisions are largely associated with the severance of employment of subpar performers (Mobley, 1982). In addition, given that involuntary turnover is within the control of organizational leaders, it is not considered as uncontrollable and unpredictable as voluntary turnover (Holtom & Burch, 2016). Accordingly, organizational leaders strive to minimize voluntary turnover to enhance organizational effectiveness, and therefore, the focus of this research is on voluntary turnover.

The question of why employees leave their organizations voluntarily has been an area of interest to researchers for the past century (Hom, Lee, Shaw, & Hausknecht, 2017; Lee, Hom, Eberly, Li, & Mitchell, 2017). Traditionally, research on voluntary turnover has primarily addressed individual employees’ psychological motives for leaving an organization. However,
even though poor leadership is one of the prime reasons for employees’ departure (Bhattacharya, 2008; Kim, 2015; Reina, Rogers, Peterson, Byron, & Hom, 2018), leadership as a pull-to-stay factor has attracted less attention than other determining factors (i.e., job dissatisfaction and job alternatives), as evidenced by a few published studies in the literature (Rubenstein, Eberly, Lee, & Mitchell, 2018).

Moreover, despite the individual-level studies’ explanations of how and why employees quit, existing research has yet to address the broader consequences of turnover for teams, business units, or entire organizations (Hausknecht, 2017; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). The individual-level perspective cannot explain the departure of cohorts of employees who leave at or around the same time due to shared social processes (Bartunek, Huang, & Walsh, 2008) or turnover contagion (Felps et al., 2009). Thus, contemporary researchers now advance exploration of “collective turnover,” exploring turnover at the meso and macro levels, based on human capital resources perspectives (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). A human capital resource is an intangible and internal resource that is created from the emergence of individuals’ knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics, such as social relationships (Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011). Importantly, it is deemed to be a valuable, rare, non-substitutable, and inimitable asset; as such, a source of sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). To put it another way, when employees leave their organizations, organizations lose not only workers but also tactical intellectual capital.

In order to distinguish collective turnover from individual turnover, researchers have commonly defined collective turnover as “the aggregate levels of employee departures that occur
within groups, work units, or organizations” (Hausknecht, 2017, p. 528), which assumes some level of interdependence within a unit, group, and organization (Morgeson & Hofmann, 1999). Thus, the potential consequences of collective turnover can be more severe than individual turnover, given that collective turnover not only depletes the human capital resources of a unit, group, and organization, but also generates detrimental effects for the remaining unit members as well as for the entire organization over time (Hausknecht, 2017; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). However, as the concept of collective turnover is relatively new and underexamined in the literature, the vast majority of research has primarily conceptualized and measured the leadership influences on employee turnover and organizational outcomes at the individual level (Hausknecht, 2017; Hom, Allen, & Griffeth, 2020).

Accordingly, this study aims to make two timely and novel contributions to the emergent topic of collective turnover. First, it establishes the relationship between transformational leadership and collective turnover based on the premise of the job embeddedness model (Mitchell et al., 2001), as well as the relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance from the perspective of turnover contagion and human capital resources (Felps et al., 2009; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). In other words, collective turnover is considered an important mediator that elicits indirect effects of transformational leadership on organizational performance. Thus, this study merges two separate research streams (i.e., the leadership–turnover link and the turnover–organizational effectiveness link), responding to the recent call for a greater focus on the effectiveness of transformational leadership at the business unit level (Dinh et al., 2014; Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011), and indicating why minimizing collective turnover is essential to human capital levels needed to maximize organizational performance.
Second, this research explores effects of collective turnover on individual decisions to leave an organization. Although a body of turnover research has treated employee turnover intention as the best predictor of actual turnover behaviour (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012), the impact of collective turnover on this relationship remains unknown. Instead, existing literature uniformly focuses on turnover as a dependent variable. Accordingly, we know very little about how turnover affects subsequent turnover in organizational settings. As an attitudinal construct, turnover intention is a process-based variable that is sensitive to ever-fluctuating influences (Cohen, Blake, & Goodman, 2016). According to turnover contagion models, employees are influenced by the departure of others in the organization (Bartunek et al., 2008; Felps et al., 2009; Naidoo, 2016). In this regard, I consider collective turnover as a moderator in the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover behaviours that may increase individual decisions to leave an organization. In addressing effects of collective turnover, this study is the first to examine turnover contagion as a mechanism for translating turnover intentions into turnover behaviours in the workplace.

The research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. Does transformational leadership have a direct effect on employee turnover at both the individual and business-unit level?
2. Does collective turnover influence organizational performance?
3. Can turnover intention predict turnover behaviour?
4. How does collective turnover contribute to individual turnover decisions?
This study is organized in four sections. The first section reviews theoretical and empirical studies on human capital resource, employee turnover, and transformational leadership. The next section presents a conceptual research model. The penultimate section presents an empirical test of hypotheses using data collected from car dealerships in South Korea. The final section discusses the interpretation of the main results, the theoretical and practical implications of the findings, and future research directions stemming from this study.
This chapter aims to review relevant theoretical frameworks and empirical studies on human capital resource, employee turnover, and transformational leadership, to make claims concerning the study’s main purposes. Specifically, this chapter includes four main sections. The first section is a review of the literature on human capital resource. Human capital resource will be defined, and its implications will be discussed. In the second section, I will review the theoretical framework of employee turnover at the individual level. The third section will focus on the recent advancement of collective turnover. Specifically, based on a review of the recent theoretical development of collective turnover, its definition from the perspective of human capital resource and a current research gap will be discussed. Lastly, the fourth section will focus on transformational leadership as an important antecedent of employee turnover at both the individual and business-unit levels.

2.1 Human Capital and Human Capital Resource

The resource-based theory (RBT) has been widely used as the theoretical grounding of most research on human resource management (HRM) (e.g., Jeong & Choi, 2016; Fabi, Lacoursiere, & Raymond, 2015). RBT emphasizes the strategic relevance of knowledge-based competencies for achieving and sustaining a competitive advantage. It is advised that these core competencies be developed internal to an organization so that they are not transferable to competitors. Thus, among other variables that are relevant to success, human capital is becoming more significant. Human capital includes valuable, rare, non-substitutable, and—most importantly—inimitable knowledge and skills, or sources of sustainable competitive advantage in today’s knowledge-based economy (Barney, 1991; Barney, Ketchen, & Wright, 2011).
Researchers consistently define human resources as employees and human capital as their knowledge and skills (e.g., Hatch & Dyer, 2004). Human capital has been recognized as a primary factor that accounts for differences in productivity and performance among employees (Becker, 1993). Since an individual acquires knowledge and skills through education and training, it is clear that education and training enhance an individual’s knowledge, skills, and abilities. This leads to a higher productivity rate, which results in a higher wage (Tan, 2014; Wright, McMahan, & McWilliams, 1994). Accordingly, human capital is usually defined at the individual level and is used as a general term for “the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the creation of personal, social, and economic well-being” (OECD, 2007, p. 29). Definitions of human capital in the HRM literature appear similar to the OECD’s conceptualization. For example, Barney and Wright (1998) defined human capital as “such things as the skills, judgment, and intelligence of the firm’s employees” (p. 32), and Skaggs and Youndt (2004) defined it as “the skills, knowledge, and expertise of employees” (p. 86). Although researchers identified different factors in defining human capital, human capital clearly refers an individual’s knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs).

While traditional human capital theory focused on the productivity of each individual employee, a new perspective extended it to the contributions of human capital to organizational effectiveness. In this new perspective, the unit of analysis shifted from individuals to business units. Consequently, human capital can be defined slightly differently at the business unit level. Researchers have introduced the term “human capital resource” to differentiate it from human capital at the individual level. A human capital resource is an intangible and internal resource
that is created from the emergence of individuals’ knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics, such as social relationships (Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011). Unlike human capital, which has its origins in the full range of individual level KSAOs, a human capital resource is constructed and perceived via the repeated aggregation of human capital in a unit. Moreover, as human capital resources are based on the aggregation of individual KSAOs, they are changeable and malleable (Hatch & Dyer, 2004; Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011). Thus, a human capital resource is a multi-level emergent phenomenon at a level of a group, business unit, or organization for analysis purposes, with relevant aggregation of individual KSAOs (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013; Ployhart & Moliterno, 2011).

Given that organizations cannot “own” human capital as with other assets (e.g., finances) and human resources can move between firms, organizations must be careful not to lose too much human capital (Gardner, Wright, & Moynihan, 2011; Hitt & Ireland, 2002). When employees leave their organization voluntarily, organizations lose not only workers, but also a large amount of valuable, competitively relevant tacit knowledge that was used by these workers to make decisions in the organization (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). Thus, high rates of voluntary turnover are the greatest threat to organizational effectiveness; accordingly, researchers have attempted to answer the question “why do employees leave their organizations voluntarily” for the past century (Hom et al., 2017).

2.2 Employee Turnover at the Individual Level

The majority of turnover studies at the individual level have been based on the assumption that dissatisfied employees simply leave their organizations, whereas satisfied
employees stay (Li, Lee, Mitchell, Hom, & Griffeth, 2016). Based on this assumption, several theoretical frameworks of employee turnover have been proposed. According to Allen, Hancock, Vardaman, and McKee (2013), 14 turnover theories have been employed as primary theoretical foundations in 447 published articles in 11 influential journals in the field of management (e.g., *The Academy of Management Journal*, *Human Resource Management*, *The Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and *The Journal of Applied Psychology*). Among the 14 turnover theories, three are the most frequently used as foundational theories: organizational equilibrium theory (frequency: 78; March & Simon, 1958), the intermediate linkages model (frequency: 70; Mobley, 1977), and the expanded process model (frequency: 94; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979).

In 1958, the publication of *Organizations* (March & Simon, 1958) changed the world of turnover research, as those involved in the project inaugurated the first formal turnover theory, proposing the fundamental constructs underlying employee decisions to participate in organizations (Lee et al., 2017). March and Simon (1958) proposed the theory of organizational equilibrium. According to this theory, employees compare their contributions to the organization with inducements they should receive from that organization and that these comparisons are critical in developing turnover intention. This inducement-contribution balance is broadly influenced by two factors: (1) the individual’s desire to move (or the perceived desirability), which is generally a function of his or her work-environment satisfaction, and (2) the individual’s employability, which is influenced by macro- and micro- level factors that determine his or her positions in the labor market (e.g., perceived or actual job alternatives). In
short, they suggested that employees who are satisfied with their jobs (i.e., achieved inducement-contribution balance) and who do not have alternative job options are more likely to stay.

Building on the work of March and Simon (1958), Mobley (1977) introduced an “intermediate linkages model” that proposes a series of mediating links between job dissatisfaction and turnover. More specifically, the model describes employee turnover as a process. First, when individuals are not satisfied with their existing job, job dissatisfaction triggers thoughts of quitting. From this point, individuals start to evaluate the expected utility of costs and benefits of seeking alternative jobs. Then, they engaged in a search for alternative jobs and compare job offers with the present job. Through this process, turnover intention is established, which drives actual turnover behaviours. For example, when an alternative job option is found and evaluated as more attractive than the current one, an employee develops an intention to depart and, consequently, leaves the organization. According to Hom et al. (2017), this model serves as the core foundation of modern turnover research, given its emphasis on how turnover unfolds over time through the emergence of several cognitive decisions made by employees linking job dissatisfaction to actual turnover.

Later, advancing prior literature, Mobley et al. (1979) proposed expended process model, depicting a wide-ranging set of individual demographic and personal variables (e.g., age and education), and external environmental factors (e.g., the labor market) that influence employees’ turnover intentions and behaviours through affecting the primary determinants of turnover (namely, job satisfaction, attraction expected from the utility of the present job, and attraction expected from the utility of alternative jobs). In addition, they identified potential moderators of
turnover decisions, such as non-work-related values, the need for immediate gratification, and impulsivity. Rooted in the expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), their expanded process model centered on how an employee’s turnover intention depends on those primary determinants of turnover, further clarifying why dissatisfied employees may not leave the organization; that is, they may have higher expected utility of the present job (e.g., expecting future promotions) or lower expected utility of the alternative jobs (e.g., lower pay rates from new job offers). Given that Mobley et al.’s model identifies both why and how employees engage in turnover, the model has received the most substantial empirical support in the literature (Allen et al., 2013).

Expanding on Mobley et al.’s frameworks, Steers and Mowday (1981) introduced organizational commitment as a mediator of the relationship between job expectations and values, and turnover intention while discussing alternative modes of accommodating to job dissatisfaction other than turnover (e.g., absences). Their proposed sequences are as follows: (1) job expectation evaluations influence an individual’s affective responses to a job (i.e., organizational commitment); (2) affective responses influence the intention to stay or leave, with the decision depending on various non-work issues (e.g., family influences); and (3) turnover intention leads to actual turnover. They also suggest that this process may vary across individuals. For example, for some, turnover intention directly triggers actual turnover behaviour, whereas for others, turnover intention may lead to a search for more attractive job alternatives. Such individuals may leave an organization only after finding preferable alternatives.
In line with Steers and Mowday’s (1981) conceptual model, the three-component model of organizational commitment (TCM) (Allen & Meyer, 1990, 1996) is another model that emphasizes organizational commitment for predicting turnover (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008). The TCM treats organizational commitment as an important factor in minimizing the likelihood of turnover based on the idea that organizational commitment comes in three distinct forms: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. First, affective commitment refers to an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, characterized by enjoyment within the organization and a desire to stay. Second, continuance commitment refers to organizational involvement that reflects a logical and rational evaluation of an individual’s circumstances, opportunities, and the perceived costs associated with discontinuing employment with the organization. Third, normative commitment refers to the employee’s sense of obligation, duty, and the fulfillment of expectations to the organization and the belief that staying with it is the right thing to do. In short, “employees with strong affective commitment remain because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 3). Since its conceptualization, the TCM has received the most sustained theoretical and empirical focus in attempting to understand psychological states that link an individual to an organization (i.e., reducing turnover) (Allen, 2016).

In sum, the central claim of classic turnover theories can be summarized as being comprised of distal determinants on the left, intermediate attitudinal causes in the middle (which are then followed by turnover intentions), and a criterion space on the right. For example, job
satisfaction positively influences employees’ job attitudes, which in turn reduce their turnover intention (Hom et al., 2012). The focus on job dissatisfaction and job alternatives as key predictors of voluntary turnover is valid, however classic models have had modest success in predicting voluntary turnover, with their variables seldom explaining more than 10 percent of variance (Lee, Mitchell, Sablynski, Burton, & Holtom, 2004).

A noteworthy observation is that empirical evidence demonstrates that many people who leave (1) are relatively satisfied with their jobs and (2) do not search for other job opportunities before leaving because individuals are under unique circumstance when they leave organizations (Mitchell et al., 2001; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999). Moreover, since most of the emphasis is on job satisfaction, the classic models have either neglected or underestimated some important motivations for quitting, such as relationships with the leaders within the original organization (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Waldman, Carter, & Hom, 2015). Collectively, these limitations lead researchers to develop new ways to think about turnover.

In a review of the literature on turnover and work attitudes, Maertz and colleagues (Maertz & Campion, 2004; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) claim that no overarching framework exists to help researchers understand the diverse motivations behind turnover decision processes. To organize the variations in turnover models and multiple constructs involved, Maertz and colleagues identified eight motivational forces that lead to turnover intentions and actual turnover. The forces most relevant to the current study are constituent forces, which concern the employee’s attachment to people or groups within the organization. In terms of constituent forces, employees build relationships with managers, coworkers, union representatives, and
others within the organization. Thus, employees may maintain these relationships by staying within the organization, or, conversely, they may end these relationships by quitting. Maertz and colleagues (Maertz & Campion, 2004; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004) also identified other factors that influence the decision to quit, such as job performance and alternative job opportunities, which have been identified in previous theoretical models.

Redirecting the conceptual lens from why employees leave to why they stay, Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski, and Erez (2001) focus on the reasons employees stay with an organization while proposing a job embeddedness construct. Reflecting as “a net or a web in which an individual can become stuck” (Mitchell et al., 2001, p. 1104), job embeddedness has three sets of factors that entice employees to stay: fit, links, and sacrifice. First, fit refers to the formal and informal bonds employees forge with coworkers, supervisors, and organizations in general. Second, links refer to “an employee’s perceived compatibility or comfort with an organization and with his/her environment” (p. 1104). Third, sacrifice refers to the perceived cost of material or psychological benefits that may be forfeited when leaving an organization. In short, employees are embedded when they have strong links with people, fit well with their jobs and communities, and would need to make greater sacrifices if they leave their organizations (Mitchell et al., 2001; Felps et al., 2009; Tse, Huang, & Lam, 2013). As conceptualized, job embeddedness is a retention construct that reflects employees’ decisions to participate broadly and directly, and it moves scholarly attention beyond classic turnover models that emphasize dissatisfaction-induced leaving (Lee et al., 2004).
Table 1 summarizes the theoretical frameworks of voluntary turnover discussed in this section in terms of key components and main ideas. Based on the terse review of the available frameworks, this study cannot rest on a primary theoretical foundation to link leadership and turnover at the individual level. Instead, I adopt various aspects of classic theoretical turnover models (March & Simon, 1958; Mobley, 1977), the motivational forces (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004), and other existing theories, such as the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Thus, this study focuses on treating transformational leadership as a distal determinant that affects employees’ affective response to the organization (i.e., turnover intentions), which in turn affects employees’ decisions to leave the organization, while controlling for other conventional distal determinants (e.g., job satisfaction and perceived employability).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical frameworks</th>
<th>Key components</th>
<th>Main ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational equilibrium theory (March &amp; Simon, 1958)</td>
<td>• The employee’s desire to move&lt;br&gt;• The employee’s employability (or individual’s ease of movement)</td>
<td>• The turnover triggers when employees perceive that their contributions to an organization exceed the inducements they should receive from the organization. &lt;br&gt;• The inducement-contribution balance is influenced by two key components: the individual’s desire to move and the individual’s ease of movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intermediate linkages model (Mobley, 1977)</td>
<td>• Job dissatisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Alternative job opportunities</td>
<td>• When employees are not satisfied with their job and then a more attractive job alternative is found, an employee develops an intention to leave and in turn, leaves the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded process model (Mobley et al., 1979)</td>
<td>• Job dissatisfaction&lt;br&gt;• Alternative job opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Demographic and personal variables&lt;br&gt;• External environmental factors</td>
<td>• Employee values, job perceptions, and labor market perceptions are combined to influence withdrawal intentions. &lt;br&gt;• Potential moderators of turnover decisions, such as non-work values, the need for immediate gratification, and impulsivity are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steers and Mowday’s turnover model (Steers &amp; Mowday, 1981)</td>
<td>• Organizational commitment</td>
<td>• Organizational commitment is a mediator in the relationship between job expectations and values and intention to leave. &lt;br&gt;• There are alternative modes to accommodating to dissatisfying jobs other than turnover (e.g., absences).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-component model of organizational commitment (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1990)</td>
<td>• Affective commitment&lt;br&gt;• Continuance commitment&lt;br&gt;• Normative commitment</td>
<td>• The major difference between the three components concerns the nature of the mindset associated with each component. &lt;br&gt;• The individual’s emotional ties to the organization minimize the likelihood of turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Motivational Forces</td>
<td>Behavioral Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight motivational forces</td>
<td>Eight psychological forces that motive turnover behaviour (e.g., constituent forces)</td>
<td>No overarching framework can be used to understand the diverse motivations behind turnover decision processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framework (Maertz &amp; Griffeth, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job embeddedness model</td>
<td>Job embeddedness</td>
<td>Employees are embedded when they have strong links with people, fit well with their jobs and communities, and would need to make greater sacrifices if they leave their organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mitchell et al., 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Collective Turnover

Thus far, I have been discussing individual-level turnover theories. Individual-level turnover helps explain how and why employees quit. However, this approach does not address the broader consequences of turnover for teams, business units, or entire organizations. For example, the individual-level approach cannot explain the departures of cohorts of individuals who leave at or around the same time due to shared social processes (Bartunek et al., 2008) or emotional contagion (Felps et al., 2009). In addition, turnover can have very different meanings and consequences, depending on human resources and their KSAOs (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). Thus, advancement to collective turnover have intensified, including theoretical contribution (Bartunek et al., 2008; Felps et al., 2009; Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Naidoo, 2016; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

As Table 2 shows, researchers have defined collective turnover in slightly different ways but one essential element among the various definitions is multiple employees leaving the organization during a certain period. In terms of quantity of leavers, collective turnover represents the aggregate employee departures that occur within groups, business units, or organizations (Hausknecht, 2017). Commonly collective turnover is operationalized as a “turnover rate” where the numerator represents all voluntary turnover during a certain time span (e.g., monthly, quarterly, yearly) divided by a denominator representing the total number of employees within a collective (Husknecht, 2017). Using this definition and measure, previous research identifies antecedents, correlates, and consequences of collective turnover (e.g., Hancock, Allen, & Soelberg, 2017; Heavey, Holwerda, & Hausknecht, 2013).
Hausknecht and Holwerda (2013) and Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) criticize prevailing
definition and measure of collective turnover because they focus only on quantity, not the
qualities of departures. Collective turnover can have different meanings depending on human
resources and their KSAOs. Thus, they propose a definition which accounts for the depletion of
employees’ human capital because collective turnover compels us to pay attention not only to the
quantity but also the quality of turnover at the collective level, such as the number of employees
who left and information about leavers’ KSAOs (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg &
Ployhart, 2013). Although the way of employing KSAO levels of leavers is still unclear
(Hausknecht, 2017), a few studies were able to consider the leavers quality by acquiring
subjective assessments from informants (Shaw, Dineen, Fang, & Vellella, 2009) or by utilizing
objective measures of job performance (Call, Nyberg, Ployhart, & Weekley, 2015). In this study,
I have adopted the definition proposed by Hausknecht and Holwerda (2013) and Nyberg and
Ployhart (2013), which fully accounts for the depletion of leavers’ human capital, because this
definition implies that leavers are not of equal value. In addition, collective turnover will be
operationalized in terms of aggregated KSAO depletion, which is in line with the conceptual
definition.
Table 2. Definitions of Collective Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartunek et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Collective turnover</td>
<td>“The turnover of two or more organizational members in close temporal proximity based on shared social processes and decisions to leave an organization” (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausknecht et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Unit-level voluntary turnover rates</td>
<td>“The proportion of unit employees that quit” (p. 1068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock et al. (2013) Hausknecht (2017) Hausknecht &amp; Trevor (2011)</td>
<td>Collective turnover</td>
<td>Aggregate employee departures that occur within entities such as groups, work units, or organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naidoo (2016)</td>
<td>Change-induced collective turnover</td>
<td>“The turnover of multiple employees, during the same period they collectively experience a major organizational change, in which the decision to leave the organization is based on shared communicative and negotiation processes” (p. 278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hausknecht &amp; Holwerda (2013)</td>
<td>Capacity-based turnover</td>
<td>The depletion of the proportion of human and social capital utilization achieved by a given collective in a given period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyberg &amp; Ployhart (2013)</td>
<td>Collective turnover</td>
<td>“The aggregate quantity and quality of employee knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) depleted from the unit” (p. 109).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.1 Turnover contagion perspective

Turnover contagion perspective emphasizes the likelihood of turnover contagion. Turnover research at the individual level has explicitly or implicitly posited that employees independently decide to leave their organizations, regardless of whether antecedents to their decisions are individual or organizational (Bartunek et al., 2008). Turnover contagion models contradict this assumption, in that employees are influenced by the departures of others in the organization. Specifically, when an employee leaves an organization, it may cause remaining employees to think more deeply about their employment situations and to contemplate a change in employment for themselves. In turn, the work climate of the organization changes as a result of collective turnover (Bartunek et al., 2008; Felps, et al., 2009; Gardner et al., 2011). I discuss four theoretical models that either directly or indirectly imply turnover contagion.

2.3.1.1 Process model of collective turnover

Bartunek et al. (2008) proposed an escalating interaction process model illustrating that collective norms can develop and that they may affect employees’ turnover attitudes and behaviours. Their process model shows how shared sense-making and emotional contagion culminate into negative group experiences. An initial sense of dissatisfaction in multiple members of an organization that is not ameliorated, despite complaints to supervisors, instigates an interaction process that produces increasingly negative shared perceptions and feelings about organizational life. As complaints go unaddressed, employees collectively realize that they will only be resolved by leaving the organization.
2.3.1.2 Turnover contagion model

Felps et al. (2009) made the central theoretical claim that observing withdrawal behaviours of coworkers is a key determinant of an individual’s likelihood of engaging in those behaviours. More precisely, a coworker’s actual turnover behaviour can influence others’ turnover behaviours, due to people’s pervasive tendency to compare themselves to others. Felps et al. (2009) termed this process of transmitting the tendency to leave a job from one individual to another as “turnover contagion.” In addition, coworkers’ job search efforts act as a critical mechanism in the turnover contagion process. When an employee sees or hears about coworkers looking for other jobs, through internet job searches or email correspondence about other positions, for example, his/her turnover intention grows because the employee may readily infer negative aspects in the organization and interpret it as a negative cue for staying. Thus, like an infectious disease, turnover becomes contagious over time.

2.3.1.3 Collective affective commitment model

Researchers have offered descriptions of the relationships among HR practices, organizational commitment, and voluntary turnover, demonstrating that HR practices boost employees’ level of affective commitment, thereby reduce their intention to quit (see Fabi et al., 2015; Kehoe & Wright, 2013). The key assumption of this research stream is that firms use HR practices to gain a comparative advantage through a reduction in voluntary turnover of valuable human capital. Reconciling with this research stream, Gardner et al. (2011) treat turnover as a collective, rather than individual, phenomenon and forge the connection between HR practices, collective affective commitment, and collective turnover behaviour.
Collective affective commitment is “a shared mindset and a shared psychological state among a delimited collective of individuals regarding their employer typified by feelings of loyalty and a desire to invest mental and physical energy in helping the organization achieve its goals” (Gardner et al., 2011, p. 318). Theoretical assumptions about the process through which HR practices lead to collective affective commitment are grounded in theories of group emotional contagion, like in Burtunek et al. (2008) and Felps et al. (2009). Collective affective commitment emerges from consistent interactions and shared feelings among members of a group. Employees working as part of a shared organizational structure, such as in work units, are exposed to the same stimuli and HR practices. The use of motivation, empowerment, and skill-enhancing HR practices impacts the level of individual commitment in the job group. Then, repeated interactions among group members homogenize and stabilize the level of collective affective commitment, creating a group norm of committed behaviour and retention. In short, a convergence of commitment levels among the group members can be a mediator of HR practices and collective turnover.

2.3.1.4 Communicative-tension model of change-induced collective turnover

Recently, Naidoo (2016) proposed the communicative-tension model of change-induced collective voluntary turnover in the context of Information Technology. This model reveals how seemingly irresolvable communicative tensions at broader relational levels provide a generative mechanism that gives employees the meaning that induces their turnover decisions during organizational change. Based on relational dialectics theory (Baxter and Braithwaite, 2009), organizational change can be conceptualized as “a series of interrelated discursive struggles or communicative tensions where internal tensions occur between people in dyads and external
tensions occur when members of the dyad interact within larger social units” (Naidoo, 2016, p. 281). Communicative tensions play an important role in social interaction, as they are the interplay between two emotional forces: centripetal forces that create unity and centrifugal forces that create division. These oppositional emotions evolve dynamically in changing relational contexts because employees tune into the emotional experiences of peers to whom they are socially attached and co-create shared emotional and behavioural patterns. While Bartunek et al. (2008) clarified that a lack of supervisory support in resolving complaints is important in informing multiple employees’ turnover decisions, Naidoo views their concept of supervisor-against-employees as that of discourse-against-discourse, which suggests that competing discourses result in shared dissatisfaction and motivates collective turnover decisions.

2.3.2 Human resource capital perspective

Researchers have explored the depletion of human capital resources when employees leave the working unit. For example, Hausknecht, Trevor, and Howard (2009) said that “turnover initiates disruption by depleting firm-specific knowledge and experience from the unit, as leavers are replaced with individuals who lack the knowledge of work process” (p. 1068). Extending this logic, Hausknecht and Holwerda (2013) and Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) theorize dynamic relationships between turnover and human capital resources and their impacts on organizational performance. These two theoretical models make it clear that impact of turnover at the individual level is not parallel with impact at the unit level.
2.3.2.1 Turnover capacity theory

Hausknecht and Holwerda (2013) began their theoretical argument by defining capacity. Capacity represents “the proportion of human and social capital utilization achieved by a given collective in a given period” (p. 217). Conversely, turnover depletes the maximum potential of collective capacity, and thus, the quality of employees can be addressed. Hausknecht and Holwerda argued that although how rising turnover rates affect performance can be explained by quantity-focused arguments that focus on the number of members who leave during the study, all leavers are not of equal value because of five turnover properties: (1) leaver proficiencies (i.e., to what extent the unit is losing novice workers versus experienced workers), (2) time dispersion (i.e., to what extent the departures are spaced over time), (3) positional distribution (i.e., to what extent the departures are spread across positions), (4) the proficiencies of the remaining member (i.e., to what extent the remaining members are proficient), and (5) newcomer proficiencies (i.e., to what extent the newcomers are filling recently vacated positions proficient). According to this logic, for instance, departures by those who possess firm-specific knowledge and experience (i.e., high human capital) are costlier than departures initiated by relative novices (i.e., low human capital) because novices may make relatively fewer contributions to group functions over time.

2.3.2.2 Context-emergent turnover (CET) theory

Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) develop the CET theory to explain the nature of collective turnover and its consequences. In line with the turnover capacity theory (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013), they argue that “collective turnover involves aggregated individual turnover decisions and may result in less or more detrimental consequences than simple replacement.
costs. These losses will depend on employees’ KSAOs, context, social relationships, and employee roles in the unit” (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013, p. 111). Thus, the potential consequences of collective turnover at the unit level could be different from those at the individual level.

Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) challenge the distinction between voluntary and involuntary turnover at the individual level (see also McElroy et al., 2001). A long-standing individual turnover perspective holds that voluntary turnover is more important than involuntary turnover because firing poor performers and replacing them with high performers or even average performers improves organizational performance (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). However, within the CET theory, Nyberg and Ployhart also suggested that involuntary turnover may be negatively associated with unit-level performance because, even if the organization eliminates poor performers, it is likely to contribute to coordination disruptions and a climate of turnover that affects those who remain.

Time is central to the CET theory. A temporal dynamic of the flow of human capital resources is not observable at the individual level. Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) argued that the quantity and quality of human capital resources can fluctuate over time, and absolute turnover rates do not have identical meaning. Holtom and Burch (2016) provided a simple scenario for when absolute levels of turnover rates have different meanings, depending on the timing of turnover:

Assume that a unit has 24 employees and an annual turnover rate of 50%. The effect of losing one employee per month for a year may have a very different impact on the unit
than losing twelve employees in one month—especially if that month falls during a peak performance period (e.g., holiday season at a retailer). (p. 33)

Another example of why the timing of collective turnover is likely to be more impactful than absolute turnover rate was provided by Call et al. (2015):

Consider two retail stores with 12% turnover rates. Traditional turnover rate studies would predict that the turnover rate effect on unit performance would be the same for both units (all else equal). However, if one unit was experiencing a 10-percentage point increase in turnover rates (i.e., from 2% to 12%) and the other was experiencing a 10 percentage point decrease in turnover rates (i.e., from 22% to 12%), the expected unit performance impact should be different between the two units. The unit with an increasing turnover rate should see a decrease in its ability to deliver quality service compared to the unit with decreasing turnover. This service deterioration leads to growing customer frustration corresponding with lowered desire to be in the store, lower spending, and increased negative word of mouth (p. 1211).

Thus, the timing of change is important to consider, and understanding the consequences of its impacts requires a longitudinal perspective.

Moreover, the CET theory emphasizes the role of context. It conceptualizes context in two arenas: climate and environmental complexity. First, Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) posit that climate moderates the relationship between collective turnover and unit performance by offsetting or exacerbating the effects of collective turnover. For example, losing high-quality
employees may lead to the turnover contagion effect (Felps et al., 2009). Second, they postulate that environmental complexity also moderates the direct effect of collective turnover on unit performance. For example, collective turnover has more detrimental effects on an intensive workflow structure in which members are dependent on each other (e.g., a surgery team or a team-based manufacturing organization) than in a pooled workflow structure, in which coordination is not needed and human capital resources are simply the sum of individual contributions (e.g., cashiers at a store or drivers in a trucking company).

In sum, the CET theory advances the understanding of collective turnover by (1) defining collective turnover in terms of KSAOs, (2) challenging a long-lasting perspective on voluntary vs. involuntary turnover, (3) outlining human capital resources flow over time, and (4) describing the moderating roles of climate and environmental complexity.

Table 3 summarizes the theoretical frameworks discussed so far in terms of theoretical lenses, definitions of collective turnover, key components, and main ideas. As both the turnover capacity theory and the CET theory are recent theoretical advancements, researchers have ample opportunities to test and refine collective turnover measures (Hausknecht, 2017; Trevor & Piyanontalee, 2020). Based on these theories, researchers have pursued alternative measures (e.g., Call et al., 2015), but the key challenge is to identify ways to operationalize the qualities of departures. Accordingly, “the door is open for validation and extension of alternative metrics that move beyond simple rates” (Hausknecht, 2017, p. 542). In addition, in terms of the practical feasibility of data collection, measuring collective turnover requires a suitable sample containing longitudinal data on both the quantity and quality of turnover rates and replacement, but finding
such data is another obstacle for empirical advancements (Call et al., 2015). Given this, it is not always practical to measure both quantity and quality in a single study. Therefore, Nyberg and Ployhart (2013) recommend that when such rich data collection is not possible, measuring a single component of collective turnover (e.g., leaver proficiency) is still valuable.
Table 3. Summary of Theoretical Frameworks of Collective Turnover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical frameworks</th>
<th>Definition of collective turnover</th>
<th>Key antecedents of collective turnover</th>
<th>Main ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contagion perspective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process model of collective turnover</td>
<td>“The turnover of two or more organizational members in close temporal proximity based on shared social processes and decisions to leave an organization” (p. 6)</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction and complaints, group processes, relational context, exit behaviours</td>
<td>Employees with negative experiences choose to leave their organizations in close temporal proximity, if the concerns they have voiced go unaddressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bartunek et al., 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This model is based on shared social processes through group sense-making and emotional contagion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover contagion model</td>
<td>The aggregate employee departures that occur within an organization</td>
<td>Coworkers’ turnover behaviours and job search behaviours</td>
<td>This model examines the extent to which coworkers’ job search behaviours explains why people leave their jobs, while controlling for individual job embeddedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Felps et al., 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective affective commitment model</td>
<td>The aggregate voluntary turnover</td>
<td>Collective affective commitment, HR practices</td>
<td>This model focuses on collective affective commitment as a mediator of the relationship between HR practices and collective turnover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gardner et al., 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative-tension model of change</td>
<td>“The turnover of multiple employees, during the same period they collectively experience a major organizational change, in which the</td>
<td>Communicative tensions, communicative practices, organizational changes</td>
<td>Multiple employees who are dissatisfied with negative communicative practices employed by their managers in the midst of communicative tensions leave the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>induced voluntary turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decision to leave the organization is based on shared communicative and negotiation processes” (p. 278)

**Human capital resource perspective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover capacity theory (Hausknecht &amp; Holwerda, 2013)</th>
<th>The depletion of the proportion of human and social capital utilization achieved by a given collective in a given period</th>
<th>Multiple turnover properties in a temporal context</th>
<th>Turnover consequences can be determined by joint functions of leavers, newcomers, and remaining members’ proficiencies over time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context-emergent turnover (CET) theory (Nyberg &amp; Ployhart, 2013)</td>
<td>“The aggregate quantity and quality of employee knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) depleted from the unit” (p. 109).</td>
<td>Time, climate, environmental complexity, KSAOs</td>
<td>This model views collective turnover as the quantity and quality of depletion of KSAOs from an organizational unit. No distinction is made between voluntary and involuntary turnover because what matters most in understanding the effects of collective turnover is the quantity and quality of human capital resource depletion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3 Recent empirical contributions to collective turnover

Along with theoretical advancement, the interest in collective turnover has increased, resulting in some empirical studies (Brymer & Sirmon, 2018; Call et al., 2015; Kuypers, Guenter, van Emmerik, 2018; Reilly et al., 2014) and meta-analytic studies (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel, & Pierce, 2013; Hancock et al., 2017; Heavey, Holwerda, & Hausknecht, 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013). Empirical studies support theoretical arguments regarding collective turnover by examining contextual moderators, addressing novel occupations or industries, and explicitly addressing the role of time, while meta-analytic studies provide quantitative summaries and identify the moderators of the antecedent-turnover and turnover-performance relationships (Hausknecht, 2017). These studies are summarized in this section.

Although all four meta-analytic studies summarized contribute to our overarching understanding of the role of collective turnover, each study adopts a unique approach to examining the role of collective turnover (e.g., different types of sampling). Two of the four studies focus exclusively on the turnover-performance relationship (Hancock et al., 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013), and the other two address both the antecedents and consequences of collective turnover (Hancock et al., 2017; Heavey et al., 2013).

Hancock et al. (2013) analyze studies at the unit and organizational levels (excluding group-level studies) and locate 157 effect size estimates in 48 independent studies. They categorize organizational performance measures into four types: productivity (e.g., sales/output), financial performance (e.g., shareholder return), customer outcomes (e.g., customer satisfaction), and safety and quality outcomes (e.g., accident rates). Of these, the effects of safety and quality outcomes were strongest (average $r = -.12$), followed by customer service ($r = -.10$),
productivity \( (r = -0.04) \), and financial performance \( (r = 0.00) \) (Hancock et al., 2013, p. 585). When all performance types are collapsed, the overall relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance is negative \( (r = -0.03) \).

Like Hancock et al. (2013), Park and Shaw (2013) focus on estimating the overall turnover-performance relationships, identifying 300 effect size estimates in 110 independent studies. Park and Shaw (2013) find that the higher the turnover rate, the lower the organizational performance (\( \rho = -0.15 \)), and they segment organizational performance by dimension (i.e., workforce productivity, financial performance, customer satisfaction, work attitudes, and quality). Also, like Hancock et al. (2013), their results show the strongest negative effects for the dimensions of customer satisfaction (\( \rho = -0.28 \)) and quality (\( \rho = -0.26 \)), followed by work attitudes (\( \rho = -0.19 \)), productivity (\( \rho = -0.13 \)), and financial performance (\( \rho = -0.11 \)).

The meta-analytic study conducted by Heavey et al. (2013) complements those of Hancock et al. (2013) and Park and Shaw (2013) by focusing on the antecedents and consequences of collective turnover. Heavey et al. (2013) organize the many antecedents of collective turnover into six categories: HRM inducements and investments, HRM expectation-enhancing practices, shared attitudes toward the job and organization, quality of the work group and supervisory relations, job alternative signals, and job embeddedness signals. The authors reason that HRM inducements and investments (e.g., pay and benefits) would be negatively related to collective turnover, while HRM expectation-enhancing practices (e.g., employee monitoring and routinization) would be positively related to collective turnover. To test their hypotheses, they identify 694 effect sizes estimates from 82 independent studies. The results
show that lower turnover rates were associated with greater investments in high-commitment HR systems \((r = -0.23)\), higher relative pay \((r = -0.13)\), and more opportunities for internal mobility \((r = -0.25)\). However, higher turnover rates were associated with routinization practices \((r = 0.36)\) and electronic monitoring of employees \((r = 0.18)\). The identified relationships between collective turnover and consequences are similar to those reported by Hancock et al. (2013) and Park and Shaw (2013): Collective turnover has strong relationships with counterproductivity \((r = 0.27)\), customer satisfaction \((r = -0.22)\), and production efficiency \((r = -0.22)\), but no significant relationship with financial performance metrics, such as return on equity, operating profit, and sales growth.

Most recently, Hancock et al. (2017) update the meta-analytic findings related to collective turnover by expanding and building upon the three aforementioned meta-analytic studies. They include all published studies identified in the three meta-analytic studies (Hancock et al., 2013; Heavey et al., 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013) as well as newer studies, yielding 2,149 effect sizes estimates from 159 independent studies. This newest study comprehensively analyzes the antecedents and consequences of collective turnover, bringing together the findings of the three meta-analytic studies published in 2013. The results generally confirm previous conclusions; for example, collective turnover has negative relationships with overall organizational performance \((r = -0.04)\), productivity \((r = -0.03)\), and customer outcomes \((r = -0.14)\). Additionally, as in the three studies, customer outcomes exhibited the strongest relationship with collective turnover.
Although these meta-analytic studies provide many insights into collective turnover, most previous studies examine static turnover rates, treat each employee’s departure identically, and ignore the dynamic nature of collective turnover, including recovery and replacement (Call et al., 2015). However, recent theoretical advancements have led researchers to begin to consider collective turnover within broader systems (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). CET theory and turnover capacity theory propose more nuanced calculations of collective turnover that incorporate quality as well as quantity; account for coordination and efficiency losses beyond individual turnover events; and highlight the need to consider the quality of leavers, context, and time (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). Recently, there have been a few original contributions to collective turnover research that directly address the effects of collective turnover on organizational performance based on these theories (Brymer & Sirmon, 2018; Call et al., 2015; Kuypers et al., 2018; Reilly et al., 2014).

Consistent with CET theory, Reilly et al. (2014) focus on how human capital flows (i.e., turnover, hiring, and transfers) affect patient satisfaction within a sample of nursing units in a large hospital. They argue that the consequences of collective turnover could be offset by attempts at hiring (or transferring in) qualified replacements over time. A unique addition of this study is a method for tracking transfers (i.e., employees who join the unit from another part of the organization) and hiring rates. Based on the theoretical argument that transfers have greater firm-specific knowledge than outside replacements, the authors hypothesized that transfers into the unit would have a more immediate effect on patient satisfaction compared to external hires. Their model is unique in that it considers both human capital outflows (voluntary turnover) and inflows (hiring and transfers) over time to understand the offsetting effects on unit performance.
The results of this study clearly reveal that “managers react to turnover rates in a variety of ways, including reducing workflows, transferring replacement employees from other parts of the organization, and increasing hiring rates” (Reilly et al., 2014, p. 782). In the study’s setting, hospital administrators used transfers “to smooth workflow and offset the less controllable effects of voluntary turnover” (Reilly et al., 2014, p. 784). Thus, this study adds to our understanding of how human capital inflows buffer the usual negative impacts of collective turnover.

Similar to Reilly et al. (2014), Call et al. (2015) focus on turnover–performance relationships over time, although their study was conducted in the context of a major US retail chain. Their investigation is grounded in CET theory, as the model includes both the quantity and quality of turnover and replacement. The authors also draw upon turnover capacity theory to examine replacement quality and the time dispersion of turnover events. A notable aspect of this study is that the authors distinguish between turnover rate (i.e., static turnover rates), turnover rate change (i.e., within-unit change over time), and the quality of turnover (i.e., the unit capacity that is lost). They found that (1) turnover rate change was negatively associated with unit performance (i.e., adjusted profits) after controlling for the turnover rate, (2) the negative effects of turnover rate change on unit performance were stronger when turnover quality was high, and (3) the time dispersion of turnover events is important because performance losses were smaller when turnover events were scattered over time. In short, the authors demonstrate how and when turnover rate change is more likely to harm unit performance over time, and how these negative effects can be accentuated or attenuated, implying that collective turnover in the real world is dependent upon context and time, aligning with the predictions of CET theory.
Two other recent studies examine collective turnover relationships for occupational groups, such as lawyers (Brymer & Sirmon, 2018), and/or test the contextual factors that may buffer the effects of collective turnover (Brymer & Sirmon, 2018; Kuypers et al., 2018). Working within the context of the largest US-based law firms, Brymer and Sirmon (2018) ask how specific firms can weather the detrimental effects of losing professional employees more effectively than other firms. The authors provide some support for the previously identified negative effect of the quantity of collective turnover on firm performance (i.e., revenue per lawyer). In addition, they find that the various dimensions of professional human capital bundling (i.e., geography, goods/services offered, seasoned newcomers, and managerial concentration) are important contextual factors because human capital bundling ensures that the professionals who remain post-exit retain both the capacity to meet job demands and tacit knowledge of organizational routines, which is critical for maintaining effectiveness. Based on this logic, the authors show that human resource bundling moderates the negative relationship between collective turnover and firm performance. When firms bundle their human capital to support fewer types of services, the effects of professional loss are mitigated. However, interestingly, managerial concentration (i.e., focusing partners’ managerial responsibility on fewer subordinates) exacerbates the effect of professional loss.

Kuypers et al. (2018) examine whether a team’s collective experience (i.e., team organizational tenure) attenuates the association between team turnover and task conflict changes. They investigate turnover and task conflict over time within a sample of 74 work units in a Dutch healthcare organization. The results show that team turnover was especially problematic when team-level organizational tenure was low because organizational tenure
represents an important human capital resource. According to human capital resources theory, longer-tenured employees perform better because they have accumulated more firm-specific and job-related knowledge (Becker, 1993). Kuypers et al. (2018)’s finding provides empirical support for CET theory. Additionally, the authors find an interactive effect between human capital resources (e.g., team organizational tenure) and collective turnover (i.e., team turnover) and show how human capital and collective turnover jointly play out over time.

Like the aforementioned empirical contributions, the current study is grounded in CET and turnover capacity theory. I focus on transformational leadership as an antecedent of collective turnover and how collective turnover influences subsequent turnover over time in the context of car sales.

2.4 Transformational Leadership as an Antecedent of Employee Turnover

Transformational leaders engage and motivate their followers to exceed expectations and transcend their own interests for the sake of the organization (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership is generally comprised of five dimensions: attributed idealized influence (attributed charisma), idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized considerations (Walumbwa & Wernsing, 2012; Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). The first dimension, attributed idealized influence, refers to a follower’s attributions to the leader as a result of how they perceive the leader’s power, confidence, and transcendent ideals. This is an emotional component of leadership which theoretically shifts follower self-interest toward the interest of the greater good. The second dimension is idealized influence or behavioural charisma, which refers to specific leadership behaviours that reflect a leader’s
values, beliefs, sense of mission and purpose, and moral standards. The third dimension is *inspirational motivation*, which refers to a leader’s enthusiasm and optimism in creating a compelling vision meant to inspire followers. The fourth dimension is *intellectual stimulation*, or how a leader questions the status quo, values the intellectual ability of his or her followers, and encourages them to take risks, such as questioning existing assumptions or ideas and then inviting innovative and creative solutions to problems. *Individualized consideration* is the fifth dimension, epitomized by a leader who pays attention to the individual needs of followers and coach them to self-actualization by serving as a mentor, listening to their concerns, and empowering them. These five related and substantive characteristics are all regarded as necessary for a leader to be considered as transformational (Walumbwa & Wernsing, 2012; Wang et al., 2011) and thus, transformational leadership can be defined as “the style of leadership that heightens consciousness of collective interest among the organization’s members and helps them to achieve their collective goals” (García-Morales, Jiménez-Barrionuevo, & Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez, 2012, p. 1040).

Recent studies have suggested that transformational leadership has an important influence on turnover dynamics (Caillier, 2018; Tse et al., 2013; Sun & Wang, 2017; Waldman et al., 2015). There are two particularly noteworthy studies on the effect of transformational leadership on the withdrawal process at the individual level. In the first, Tse et al. (2013) investigate the underlying mechanisms through which transformational leadership influences employee turnover. They found that the negative relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover intention was mediated by affective commitment and leader-member exchange (LMX). Also, they found that turnover intention mediates the relationship between
affective commitment and turnover behaviours. By examining this dual-mediation process, Tse et al. (2013) address the role of transformational leadership in the actual turnover process.

In the second noteworthy study, Waldman et al. (2015) find that transformational leadership predicts turnover behaviour based on the intention to quit. A unique aspect of this study is that the authors consider group-level transformational leadership using 375 Chinese employees from 96 work groups in a large hospitality organization. In addition, they consider the moderating role of transformational leadership in the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover behaviours. The results reveal that employees are less likely to act on turnover intentions when they perceive transformational leadership.

At the organizational level, Caillier (2018) and Sun and Wang (2017) examine the relationship between transformational leadership and the quantitative dimension of collective turnover (i.e., turnover rates). Caillier (2018) uses the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey and FedScope data, which were collected by US federal agencies, in order to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and voluntary turnover (i.e., the aggregate of quits and transfers). Transformational leadership was found to negatively impact voluntary turnover in public sector organizations. This finding is similar to that of Waldman et al. (2015), who also find a negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover at the individual level. Sun and Wang (2017) also contribute to organization-level analysis of the relationship between transformational leadership and voluntary turnover in public organizations. Using a large sample of public-school data, their research provides empirical evidence
suggesting that principals’ transformational leadership directly prevents teachers from forming turnover intention while indirectly reducing actual turnover rates.

Although these four studies treat transformational leadership as a critical antecedent of employee turnover that deters employees from forming turnover intentions and acting on those intentions, in general, the turnover literature pay little attention to how such leadership can be an antecedent to turnover (Hom et al., 2020; Rubenstein et al., 2018). Moreover, there are two prevalent limitations in the literature. First, with a few exceptions (e.g., Caillier, 2018; Sun & Wang, 2017), most studies conceptualize and measure the influences of leadership on employee turnover at the individual level. However, in practice, efforts to curtail its damaging effects are developed at the organizational level (Caillier, 2018). Thus, recent research has begun focusing on collective turnover. Applying the concept of collective turnover, researchers suggest that modeling leadership and employee turnover at the business unit level is more consistent with the human resource management practices employed by human resource personnel and unit leaders (Caillier, 2017; Hausknecht & Trevor, 2011).

Second, in terms of examining individual turnover, more rigorous research is also needed because most studies on leadership and employee turnover at the individual level treat employees’ turnover intentions as a proxy for actual turnover (e.g., Azanza, Moriano, Molero, & Lévy Mangin, 2015; Gatling, Kang, & Kim, 2016; Mathieu, Fabi, Lacoursière, & Raymond, 2016; Mittal, 2016; Oh & Oh, 2017; Park & Pierce, 2020). Theoretically, an employee’s turnover intention can be the culmination of the withdrawal process and, thus, can predict actual turnover (Ajzen, 1991; Mobley, 1977; Price, 2001). However, the empirical evidence demonstrates that
there is a discrepancy between turnover intention and actual behaviour. For example, Jung (2010) finds that employees who report their intention to leave may not actually do so. In this case, “translating turnover intentions into turnover behaviour is more complex than previously thought” (Vardaman, Taylor, Allen, Gondo, & Amis, 2015, p. 1188). Therefore, instead of using turnover intentions as a simple proxy for turnover behaviour, turnover intentions should be reclassified as a predictor of turnover behaviour (Hom et al., 2012; Rubenstein et al., 2018).

Third, previous studies call for further investigation into the generalizability of the impact of leadership on employee turnover, particularly due to the fact that research contexts have been limited to a call center in China (Tse et al., 2013), a hospitality organization in China (Waldman et al., 2015), public schools in the United States (Sun & Wang, 2017), and US federal agencies (Caillier, 2018). Similarly, a recent meta-analytic study demonstrates that only a handful of leadership-turnover link studies are from outside the United States, and thus, it is difficult to determine the generalizability of the previous results (Rubenstein et al., 2018). Accordingly, further studies should focus on other working groups (e.g., salespeople), different organizational settings (e.g., car dealerships), and a representative collectivist country (e.g., South Korea) to corroborate and expand upon the results of previous studies.
CHAPTER 3 HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

I adopt aspects from different collective turnover theories (Felts et al., 2009; Hauskencht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013), classic turnover models (Mitchell et al., 2011; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979), and other management theories, such as the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), to model how transformational leadership enhances organizational effectiveness by preventing employee turnover and how employees are influenced by coworkers when they make a turnover decision. As illustrated in Figure 1, Hypothesis 1 posits a negative effect of unit-level transformational leadership on collective turnover. Next, Hypothesis 2 posits a negative relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance. Hypothesis 3 and 4 collectively elucidate how unit-level transformational leadership influences the process by which individual turnover decisions are made. Hypothesis 5 suggests a moderating effect of collective turnover on employee turnover decisions. Justifications for each of the relationships are explained in the next sessions.

Figure 1. A Conceptual Model of the Hypotheses
3.1 Transformational Leadership and Collective Turnover

Poor leadership is one of the major antecedents of collective turnover (Hausknecht & Trevor, 2011; Hom et al., 2020). Given the daily interactions between leaders and employees, leaders represent a vital mechanism that can potentially deter employees from forming turnover intentions or from acting on those intentions (Mitchell et al., 2011; Reina et al., 2018). Indeed, “employees leave leaders, not companies” has become a popular adage (Plano, 2016). However, the transformational leadership’s capacity to reduce turnover has long been overlooked (Hom et al., 2020; Rubenstein et al., 2018; Waldman et al., 2015), and the nature of the relationship between transformational leadership and collective turnover requires both theoretical development and empirical examination.

The rationale to link transformational leadership with collective turnover is rooted in the job embeddedness model (Felps et al., 2009; Mitchell et al., 2001). Although Mitchell et al. (2011) did not make theoretical claims regarding leadership’s influence on collective turnover, subsequent studies have argued that transformational leadership fits within the job embeddedness model, as it is related to both fit (i.e., an employee’s perceived comfort level with the organization) and links (i.e., the number of formal and informal connections that an employee forges with the organization) (Caillier, 2018; Waldman et al., 2015). Transformational leadership posits that employees identify with leaders’ values and goals, which clarifies the expected or supported behaviours, as well as the relative priorities within each work unit. Greater value congruency between leaders and employees promotes greater person-organizational fit in terms of goals and values, thus reinforcing an employee’s willingness to stay (Waldman et al., 2015).
Furthermore, transformational leaders help employees forge stronger links to the organization and foster closer relationships between unit members by building mutual trust and openness through enhancing two-way interpersonal communication (House & Shamir, 1993; Klauss & Bass, 1982). Through building dense communication networks among group members, transformational leaders are likely to positively affect the organizational climate, thus strengthening group cohesion and establishing unit-wide norms regarding contextual interpretation, behaviours, and initiatives (Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005). In these circumstances, employees perceive themselves to have greater responsibility for group and organizational decisions and, consequently, create unit-wide norms for lower turnover rates (Kerr & Slocum, 1987; Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005). To avoid being identified as having high levels of turnover intentions, employees may mirror the level of turnover intentions generally exhibited by coworkers; thus, collective turnover of the work unit decreases (Felps et al., 2009; Richardson & Vandenberg, 2005).

Given that transformational leaders may induce their collectives of followers to have strong personal fit and links, transformational leadership is expected to be an important driver for decreasing collective turnover. Thus, I propose the following:

*Hypothesis 1. Transformational leadership negatively affects collective turnover.*

### 3.2 Collective Turnover and Organizational Performance

A growing body of literature has advanced the knowledge of collective turnover and its effect on organizational productivity (Hancock et al., 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013). However, most studies have looked at the quantity of collective turnover (i.e., turnover rates) rather than its
quality. Although quantity-focused studies explain why increasing absolute turnover rates affects organizational productivity, defined as the ratio of company goods and services to inputs (Price, 1989), these studies imply that leavers are of equal value. In fact, only a handful of recent studies differentiate leavers’ value (Call et al., 2015; Kuypers et al., 2018). Departures by members who possess firm-specific proficiencies and who make sustained contributions to organizational productivity should be more costly and detrimental than departures initiated by relatively poor performers (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013). Thus, the detrimental effects of collective turnover on organizational performance should be explained from the perspective of human capital resources (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013) as well as a traditional cost approach (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010).

The first way to understand the relationship between collective turnover and organizational productivity is the cost approach. According to Allen et al. (2010), when employees leave an organization, there are both tangible and intangible costs associated with their departure. Tangible costs include the time taken by HR staff and managers to conduct exit interviews, accrued benefits to be paid out, and overtime work to minimize work disruptions. Intangible costs include loss of customers or clients and disruptions to teamwork. Previous studies demonstrate that collective turnover contributes to operational disruption, which may involve shifting resources and experienced workers away from daily work to train and socialize newcomers (Staw, 1980) and undermining the workplace rules that form the basis of organizational control (Price, 1977; Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005).
Also, regardless of whether the employee who quits is high- or poor-performing, high costs are incurred by the recruitment, training, and socialization of new employees; it is estimated that the cost of recruiting and training replacements due to collective turnover can range from 90–200% of employees’ annual salary (Allen et al., 2010; Boushey & Glynn, 2012; Cascio, 2006). Thus, the conceptual link to productivity in the cost approach is straightforward: higher collective turnover increases costs monotonically, and thereby lowering organizational productivity (Dess & Shaw, 2001).

Another way to examine the consequences of collective turnover is the human capital resources approach, which suggests that organizational productivity is determined by the accumulation of firm-specific and valuable human capital resources (Strober, 1990). Human capital resources are seen as the primary determinant of productivity given that human capital resource accumulation results in a high level of in-role performance. Conversely, collective turnover creates aggregate in-role performance deficits for a firm, because collective turnover involves the depletion of human capital, thus, productivity is weakened as collective turnover increases (Batt, 2002; Batt & Colvin, 2011; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

Performance differences between leavers can influence whether or not collective turnover generates productivity losses for organizations. Departures by those who possess firm-specific knowledge and experience (i.e., high human capital) are more costly than departures initiated by relative novices (i.e., low human capital) because novices may make relatively fewer contributions to group functions over time (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013). According to Call et al. (2015), collective turnover has only recently begun to address the relative quality of leavers.
In their sample of retail chain units, they found that units in which higher-quality employees were leaving suffered significantly larger performance losses. Thus, based on the aforementioned theoretical reasoning and recent empirical support, I expect that high-performing collective turnover tends to be detrimental to organizational productivity because it increases not only costs related to collective turnover but also leads to loss of human capital resources. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis:

\textit{Hypothesis 2}. Collective turnover negatively affects organizational productivity.

### 3.3 Transformational Leadership and Voluntary Turnover Intentions

Turnover intention is defined as an individual’s motivation to leave an organization (Mobley et al., 1979). More specifically, Vandenberg and Nelson (1999) defined it as the “individuals’ own estimated probability (subjective) that they are permanently leaving the organization at some point in the near future” (p. 1315). It has been regarded as the best predictor of the actual turnover behaviour (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). Researchers in both management and psychology have paid significant attention to the importance of employee turnover intentions, highlighting the adverse consequences of losing valuable employees for organizations (Hancock et al., 2013; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008).

The current conceptual model proposes that a transformational leader has the ability to decrease employees’ levels of turnover intentions by building high-quality relationships based on positive social exchanges. The rationale behind this relationship is rooted in social exchange theory, which emphasizes the norm of reciprocity between employer and employees (Blau, 1964). When employees receive advantageous treatment from an organization, they develop a
greater attachment to the organization as a means of responding in kind and remunerating the organization (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Transformational leaders can be viewed as embodying the organization’s intentions, and followers therefore may perceive their leaders as their exchange target and reciprocate their good behaviours by returning favors to the organization. In other words, since transformational leaders take care of their followers by providing them with the support they need, they are in a better position to strengthen the bonds between them and their subordinates, which, in turn, reduces their intentions to leave their organizations (Caillier, 2018; Tse et al., 2013).

By building strong bonds with their leader, employees develop a strong sense of belonging within organization because he or she enjoys being a member of the work community by identifying with its organizational goals and values (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Thus, those who possess high levels of affective commitment exhibit higher levels of job satisfaction and better performance, in addition to lower rates of absenteeism and reported turnover intentions (Fischer & Mansell, 2009; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). In this sense, the negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention has been supported by previous studies (e.g., Waldman et al., 2015). Thus, I propose the following:

*Hypothesis 3.* Transformational leadership negatively affects employees’ turnover intention.
3.4 Voluntary Turnover Intentions and Actual Turnover Behaviour

Conventionally, the turnover-intention-to-actual-turnover linkage has been a fixed assumption in most studies of voluntary turnover (e.g., Gatling et al., 2016; Oh & Oh, 2017). The rationale justifying turnover intention as a turnover proxy rests upon both theoretical and practical reasons. First, theoretically, an employee’s turnover intention can be the culmination of the withdrawal process and thus, can predict actual turnover (Ajzen, 1991; Mobley, 1977; Price, 2001). Several theoretical models of turnover proposed that employees go through a progression of withdrawal before they engage in actual turnover and thus, turnover intention is the last cognitive step before the actual turnover behaviour (Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Price, 2001; Rosse, 1988; Steers & Mowday, 1981). In other words, the immediate cognition preceding leaving (i.e., turnover intention) is a necessary antecedent of actual leaving (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012).

Moreover, the role of intentions in understanding behaviour has long played a part in explanations of turnover based on the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991; 2001). The main argument of TPB is that the best way to predict and explain a person’s behaviour is through their behavioural intentions. Ajzen (1991) states that “the stronger the intention to engage in a behaviour, the more likely should be its performance” (p. 181). TPB makes three assumptions: (1) people behave rationally and systematically make use of available information when deciding to act or not; (2) people’s actions are led by conscious motives and not by unconscious motives; and (3) people consider the implications of their actions before deciding to act or not. With these three assumptions, Ajzen argued that perceived behavioural control is another important variable to predict a behaviour. When a person intends to perform a behaviour,
they perceive themselves as having complete control over deciding to perform that behaviour or not. For example, a person may have a strong intention to perform a behaviour but may not have the necessary opportunities or resources (e.g., information, time, and money). Therefore, both behavioural intentions and perceived behavioural control influence the performance of a behaviour.

Second, in terms of practicality of research, the intention construct is more amenable to research than actual turnover. Although employee turnover is a discernable and objectively measurable phenomenon, researchers cannot help but use the intention construct as a surrogate because: (1) organizations often refuse to provide relevant data for individual employees, (2) assessing actual turnover variables requires a costly longitudinal design, and (3) turnover intention is relatively easy to measure directly and anonymously from employees and possesses more desirable statistical qualities than actual turnover (i.e., a dichotomous variable) (Cohen et al., 2016; Dalton, Johnson, & Daily, 1999). Therefore, due to both theoretical and practical justifications, the turnover-intention-to-actual-turnover linkage has been a fixed assumption in the area of employee turnover.

However, this fixed assumption now appears to be suspect because the empirical evidence showing a discrepancy between turnover intention and actual behaviour have been accumulating (Jung, 2010; Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). For example, Jung (2010) found that employees who report their intention to leave may not actually do so and claimed that “we cannot simply rely on the results of the existing empirical studies on turnover intention” (Jung, 2010, p. 311). Moreover, a recent meta-analytic study reveals that turnover intention and actual
turnover are not identical (Rubenstein et al., 2018). Therefore, instead of using turnover intentions as a simple proxy for turnover behaviour, turnover intentions should be reclassified as a predictor of turnover behaviour (Hom et al., 2012; Rubenstein et al., 2018).

This theoretical argument has been recently supported by longitudinal empirical investigations. Waldman et al. (2015) and Nelissen, Forrier, and Verbruggen (2017) demonstrate that turnover intention at Time 1 affects actual turnover at Time 2 (9 months after Time 1 in Waldman et al., 2015; 12 months after Time 1 in Nelissen et al., 2017). Similarly, another study conducted in public organizations also supported the assertion that employees’ intentions to leave can predict the actual turnover behaviour (Sun & Wang, 2017). Moreover, Tse et al. (2013) use three-wave longitudinal data to show that turnover intention at Time 1 positively influences turnover behaviour both at Time 2 (6 months after Time 1) and Time 3 (12 months after Time 1). Hence, the preceding discussion leads to the following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 4._ An employee’s turnover intention positively affects voluntary turnover behaviour.

### 3.5 Collective Turnover as a Moderator of the Turnover Intention-Behaviour Relationship

An aspect that has received little research attention is the individual-level consequences that may occur after collective turnover happens. Collective turnover research has not directly addressed this question because existing research on collective turnover continues to predominantly focus on collective turnover as a quantity measure (Hausknecht, 2017), evaluating
collective turnover as the aggregate of multiple employees leaving the organization during a specific time period.

Although the turnover intention-behaviour link is theoretically valid (Hom et al., 2012), turnover intentions typically account for only 14%–25% of the variance in actual turnover behaviour (Griffeth et al., 2000; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007), and a recent meta-analysis revealed that turnover intention and actual turnover are correlated but not multicollinear (Rubenstein et al., 2018). To explain such modest intention-behaviour congruence, a few studies have examined how unemployment (Hom, Caranikis-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992), personality traits (Allen, Weeks, & Moffitt, 2005), friendship (Vardaman et al., 2015), and pre-hire disposition (Barrick & Zimmerman, 2005) can encourage or dissuade prospective leavers from acting upon their turnover intentions. However, further investigation into the potential moderators is needed because they are centered on conditions beyond employers’ control (Waldman et al., 2015). To better understand the circumstances that are under the employers’ control and that either enhance or diminish the effect of turnover intention on turnover behaviour, the current study explores how collective turnover can moderate the turnover intention-behaviour relationship.

I propose that an organization’s collective turnover moderates the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover behaviour. Individuals within an organization with high collective turnover have experienced more coworkers who are high performers leaving the organization, and their remaining coworkers may therefore be more open to the possibility of leaving and seeking alternative employment due to negative group experiences. For the
individuals amid such a mass exodus, the resulting overwhelming social cues will increase both the legitimacy and viability of leaving (Felps et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2017). Thus, even if turnover intentions arise due to poor leadership, experiencing collective turnover may aggravate employees’ concerns and persuade them to perform their exit plans because employees may readily infer negative aspects in the organization and interpret it as a positive cue for leaving (Liu, Mitchell, Lee, Holtom, & Hinkin, 2012). On the contrary, individuals within an organization with low collective turnover may observe or converse with high performers who express favorable views about the organization or who participate in the organization. In this circumstance, even if an employee has strong turnover intention, positive cues from the social environment can promote organizational commitment or loyalty, which in turn may convince the employee to remain with the organization (Felps et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2012). Taken together, I propose the following:

*Hypothesis 5. Collective turnover moderates the relationship between voluntary turnover intention and actual turnover behaviour, such that the relationship will be stronger in an organization with high levels of collective turnover than with low levels of collective turnover.*
CHAPTER 4 METHOD

4.1 Data Sources

A suitable sample containing longitudinal data on both perceptual and behavioural variables was required to examine the hypotheses of this research. In other words, repeated measurements of the same individuals were necessary over a span long enough to encompass a detectable change in their status (i.e., six months) (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). However, obtaining such data is always challenging (Call et al., 2015).

To circumvent the obvious barriers to collecting data in the field, I arranged my data collection through a general manager of the Dealer Planning Team of a South Korean automotive company\(^1\) that has multiple dealerships in South Korea (hereafter Korea). The research participants were salespeople working at the company’s dealerships in Korea, selling cars directly to customers. I chose this research context because for two reasons. First, by using data from multiple dealerships of a single automotive company, I was able to hold constant both sales and HR policies. For example, these dealerships sell the same cars and follow the same HR policies designed by the Dealer Planning Team. Also, they face the same contextual characteristics, such as market conditions, competition, and customer demand that have been shown to influence collective turnover and organizational performance (Jeong & Choi, 2016;

\(^1\) There were 385 dealerships of the company and 3,774 salespeople in Korea in December 2016. The Dealer Planning Team manages these dealerships to maximize car sales by (1) offering an official training program for salespeople, (2) providing a specific guideline to run a dealership (i.e., operating time, human resource management practices, and incentives), (3) analyzing the entire market structure and then releasing the results to build a winning strategy with minimal investment, and (4) consulting with dealerships to provide specific analysis and viewpoints that help them improve sales, retain employees, and satisfy customers.
Shaw, 2011). In addition, while these dealerships have a contractual relationship with the Dealer Planning Team, each dealership is technically an independent organization led by a dealer principal, a job title that equates to the owners of dealerships or branch managers in the North American automotive industry. As dealerships are geographically dispersed and operate independently of one another, dealer principals take a leadership role in making a success of the business. Under a dealer principal’s leadership, all salespeople in a dealership have equal rights and responsibilities to achieve organizational goals (i.e., car sales) and are held accountable for them because their compensation is determined by a sales commission. Thus, in this study, dealer principals were considered to be the “leaders” to whom the dealerships’ salespeople report, which allowed me to test a multilevel statistical model.

Second, the sales sector is an environment with low task complexity and a high voluntary turnover rate. Car salespeople interact directly with customers and one another to fulfill sales and service needs. They meet customers, explain car models, deal with financial programs and car registration, and provide other needed services (e.g., installation of auto accessories). In addition, they are commission-based workers whose compensation is dependent solely on their individual sales performance. Due to this unique compensation policy, involuntary turnover is rare unless salespeople are committed to unethical sales practices (e.g., offering their sales commission as a cash incentive to customers). In terms of performance appraisal, dealerships use an objective performance measure (i.e., the number of cars sold) as an operational criterion (Cascio, 1998; Guion, 1998). Also, the sales sector has relatively high turnover rates that average over 20% (Jang, 2018). Collectively, these unique aspects of the research context allowed me to examine
the qualitative aspect of collective turnover as well as to test voluntary turnover behaviours during the study period.

The data collection was conducted with the assistance of the company’s Dealer Planning Team given, and this study was approved by both the Dealer Planning Team (Appendix A & B) and the Research Ethics Board (REB#: 18-11-006; see Appendix D). At Time 1, the team’s the general manager helped distribute the paper questionnaire at an official training program for salespeople. The participants responded to a series of questions designed to assess the study variables (i.e., transformational leadership, turnover intention, job satisfaction, and perceived employability). They received a consent cover letter explaining the study and describing their right to voluntarily participate or not (see Appendix C) and were informed that there were no right or wrong answers. Instead, they were asked to provide sincere responses to the questions. To minimize the risk of social desirability bias and because the authorities in these organizations assisted with the data collection, the consent form clearly indicated that no responses or personal information would ever be shared with any person or organization, a common research consideration in studies of this nature (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). In addition, because the survey included sensitive questions about the respondents’ perceptions of their dealership principal’s leadership and the respondents’ degree of turnover intention, and respondents were also required to provide an identifier that was used to link the survey but did not identify any sensitive information about the respondents, which was approved by the Research Ethics Board. The confidentiality of the respondents’ rating was firmly guaranteed.
The survey questionnaires were distributed to salespeople on the first day of a two-day training program. Two weeks before the training program, participation invitation letters had been sent to the salespeople through the company’s intranet. At the training program, the salespeople were informed of the purpose of the study, and they had two full days to review the consent cover letter and complete the survey at their convenience. Moreover, on the second day, the manager of the Dealer Planning Team kindly reminded them of the voluntary participation in the survey. When the salespeople had completed the survey, they could put it in a drop box at the end of the training program. The questionnaires were collected from the drop box by the manager and were delivered to me using Korea Post’s Express Mail Service.

A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to salespeople working in 98 dealerships, and at least one salesperson from each dealership participated in the survey. The average number of respondents per dealership was 2.26 (range: 1–6). Of the questionnaires, 219 were returned, a response rate of 43.8%. After excluding 18 that did not provide an identifier, the final sample comprised 201 respondents working in 93 dealerships. Of them, 86.6% were men; the mean age was 39.35 (range: 20–62; SD = 9.6) and the mean job tenure was 6.36 years (range: 1–31; SD = 7.73). More than half of them (61.7%) were married, and most had a high school diploma or university degree (37.8% and 36.3%, respectively). With regard to work-related characteristics, on average they worked for 54 hours per week (9 hours per day) and sold 4.18 cars per month (range: 0–26).

With regard to dealership-related characteristics, all the dealerships were located in the Seoul Capital Area, the biggest metropolitan area in Korea, which was home to half the Korean
population of 50.62 million in 2015 (Statistics Korea, 2017). The dealerships were geographically restricted to ensure that similar market conditions applied to every dealership and that they were in the same league to achieve their organizational goal. On average, the organizational size was 10.48 staff members (range: 2–22) and the organizational age was about 21 years (range: 2–28). The dealerships on average sold about 70 cars per month (range: 12–136). None of dealership principals resigned during the study period, and no unusual participant or dealership that needed to be removed from the data set was identified.

At Time 2 (i.e., six months after the survey), the Dealer Planning Team provided an extensive archival database containing information about employment and performance metrics for the dealerships in the study period as well as two years prior to Time 1. The database contained information about individual and organizational performance, such as yearly car sales, changes in the number of salespeople, and the names of salespeople at each dealership. Using the identifiers, I matched the participants’ responses at Time 1 to the objective data at Time 2. For example, I compared the list of salespeople at Time 1 to the list of salespeople at Time 2 to determine which participants had left the dealership during the study period. Also, the relevant performance metrics of each participant in the database were linked to their survey responses and the collective turnover and organizational productivity of the dealerships were calculated using information from the database. Thus, the study data set includes two distinct levels of data: (1) the salespeople’s perceptions of the study variables and their sales performance and voluntary turnover information at the individual level and (2) the dealerships’ organizational performance and collective turnover information at the business unit level.
4.2 Measures

Given that the research context was Korean businesses, it was important to pay attention to the unique characteristics of Korean respondents in terms of linguistic differences and response biases. With regard to the survey questionnaire, we used previously validated Korean versions of measures that have appeared in peer-reviewed articles (as is explained in each upcoming variable description). Unless otherwise indicated, the respondents provided their levels of agreement with each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree) to avoid the risk of central tendency bias. Korean respondents tend to avoid extremes and prefer responding around the middle points on scales (e.g., 3 on a 5-point Likert scale) rather than expressing how they may truly feel or what they actually perceive (e.g., Lee & Green, 1991). In fact, this central tendency bias in response sets may distort the potential to make reliable causal inferences of hypothesized relationships (Kim, 2013). In addition to using the 6-point Likert scale, I explicitly stated that the respondents should provide honest and accurate responses to the questions. Table 4 summarizes measurements in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Perceptual / Objective</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
<td>20 items (Avolio &amp; Bass, 2004)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Dealership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective turnover</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>The amount of KSAOs lost, as determined by</td>
<td>T1–T2*</td>
<td>Dealership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of cars sold by leavers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of cars sold in the dealership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational performance</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Productivity, as determined by</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Dealership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of cars sold in a dealership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of salespeople in the dealership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary turnover intentions</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
<td>3 items (Oh &amp; Oh, 2017)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual turnover behaviours</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>A binary variable (stay &amp; exit)</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
<td>6 items (Kim et al., 2011)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External employability</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
<td>4 items (Moon, 2017; Seo et al., 2009)</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual job performance</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>The number of car sales by individuals</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * T1–T2 means that data was collected from Time 1 to Time 2.
4.2.1 Transformational leadership

Transformational leadership is operationalized as aggregate salespeople’s perceptions of the extent to which their leader exhibits transformational leadership behaviours. Salespeople are the ones who directly and consistently witness their dealer principals’ leadership behaviours (Day, 2012). Salespeople of the same dealership have similar perceptions of these behaviours. Granted, it is possible that each member perceives their leaders’ leadership behaviours differently, but, theoretically, leaders direct many of their transformational leadership behaviours to the entire group rather than to each individual, such as communicating a vision to the group and motivating the group toward a common direction. Accordingly, salespeople in a dealership may perceive leadership similarly, and these perceptions may differ from the perceptions of salespeople in different dealerships (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003; Kim & Kim, 2015; Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009; Waldman et al., 2015). That is, transformational leadership can be a unit-level variable affecting all members of a leader’s unit. Regarding the research context, each dealership is assigned a single transformational leadership value on the basis of the average ratings within the dealership.

Salespeople rated their dealership principal’s transformational leadership using the subscale of the Korean-translated Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The license to reproduce the MLQ was purchased from Mind Garden, Inc., and the permission statement is included in Appendix E. Twenty items of the MLQ were used to measure five subscales of transformational leadership (i.e., idealized attributes, idealized behaviour, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation). Since the MLQ is copyrighted, it is forbidden to include all the items in the measures section or an appendix. Thus, a sample of five items is presented here including “Dealership principal helps
me to develop my strengths,” “Dealership principal talks optimistically about the future,”
“Dealership principal talks about his or her most important values and beliefs,” “Dealership
principal seeks differing perspectives when solving problems” and “Dealership principal instills
pride in me for being associated with him or her.” Transformational leadership was measured at
Time 1.

4.2.2 Voluntary turnover intention

Aligned with existing research, voluntary turnover intention is operationalized as the
extent to which the current employees are thinking of or consider leaving the organization.
Salespeople were asked to respond to the three items from Korea-based studies with slight
modifications (Kim, 2014; Oh & Oh, 2017), which were developed on the basis of the measures
of Michaels and Spector (1982). Sample items include the following: “I have thought about
leaving the organization” and “I am actually planning to quit.” Voluntary turnover intentions
were measured at Time 1.

4.2.3 Actual turnover behaviour

Actual turnover behaviour means an actual act of leaving an organization during the
study period. Six months after the completion of the first survey (Time 2), turnover information
from the Dealer Planning Team about whether any employees had resigned from the dealership
during those six months were obtained. Following previous studies (Tse et al., 2013; Waldman et
al., 2015), a dummy variable was created that was based on whether an employee had resigned
from the dealership during that six-month period to indicate actual turnover behaviour (0 = stay
and 1 = turnover).
4.2.4 Collective turnover

According to Hausknecht (2017), examining the separation rate is the most prevalent approach to measuring collective turnover. The separation rate, or in other terms, the turnover rate is usually calculated as the number of employees who left during the study period divided by the average number of employees during the study period. This measure implies that leavers are of equal value (Call et al., 2015). However, collective turnover can have different meanings depending on human resources and their KSAOs (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

Collective turnover relates to varying levels of proficiency loss associated with those who leave. Proficiency losses can come in the form of human capital losses. From the human capital perspective, employees add value to an organization because they possess unique KSAOs that support organizational functions and productivity. Collective turnover can be problematic because it depletes this collective level knowledge, expertise, and experience. For example, departures by salespeople who possess firm-specific proficiencies, build close relationships with customers, and make significant contributions to organizational function (i.e., sales) should be more costly than departures initiated by relative novices (Hausknecht, 2017; Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013). Thus, collective turnover was operationalized in terms of aggregated KSAO depletion from a dealership in this study.

I measured a qualitative aspect of collective turnover, aligned with research indicating that collective turnover is a construct that “takes on meaning beyond the simple aggregation of individual departures” (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013, p. 210). I calculated the leaver proficiency to
account for the extent to which the dealership was losing novice or experienced salespeople (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013). A qualitative measure of collective turnover was constructed using the data provided by the Dealer Planning Team. The team collects information on how many cars each salesperson has sold each year as well as how many cars a dealership has sold each year. This information was used to calculate collective turnover by dividing the number of cars sold by leavers by the number of cars sold in the dealership for a year prior to Time 1, thus representing the amount of KSAOs lost. For example, if two salespeople who left during the study period had sold 300 cars while the number of cars sold in the entire dealership was 1000 cars, the collective turnover was 30%.

4.2.5 Organizational performance

Organizational performance is based on dealership-level sales. Aligned with how organizational performance has been measured in existing literature (e.g., Hale, Ployhart, & Shepherd, 2016; Jeong & Choi, 2016; Xenikou & Simosi, 2006) and how the Dealer Planning Team actually compares performance of different dealerships, I assessed each dealership’s objective performance using dealership productivity from Time 1 to Time 2. Specifically, the total number of cars sold in a dealership was divided by the average number of salespeople in the dealership during the study period. Then, the dealership productivity was divided by six months to calculate a monthly average productivity measure. This information was provided by the Dealer Planning Team at Time 2.
4.2.6 Control variables

To account for the possibility of alternative explanations for individual turnover behaviours and organizational performance, I included several control variables at both the individual and business-unit levels.

At the individual level, job satisfaction, perceived external employability, and individual job performance were included. Classic turnover models have emphasized the important role of job satisfaction and external employability (e.g., Mobley et al., 1979). Job satisfaction is an important factor that affects employees’ desire to withdraw, and external employability is an important factor that shapes employees’ turnover cognition (March & Simon, 1958). In line with theoretical foundations, meta-analytic estimates of bivariate predictor-turnover relationships demonstrate that employees are most likely to quit because of: (1) turnover intentions, (2) job dissatisfaction and (3) awareness of job openings elsewhere (Griffeth et al., 2000). To isolate for effects of job satisfaction and perceptions of external employment opportunities, I measured these factors at Time 1. Thus, I measured job satisfaction by using the six items from Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986), which have been translated into and validated in Korean (Kim, Kim, Noe, Kim, & Yang, 2011). In addition, I measured perceived external employability by using the four items from Korea-based studies (Moon, 2017; Seo, Cho, & Cho, 2009).

Individual job performance is an important driver of employees’ turnover behaviours. Strong performance affects turnover behaviours because of increases in the perceived ease of movement (Allen & Griffeth, 2001). Accordingly, measures of job performance were included to
control for impact of high performance. Job performance was measured by the monthly average number of car sales over a year prior to Time 1.

At the business unit level, I included two control variables commonly considered to affect an organization’s performance. First, I controlled for the possible effect of organization age using the number of operational years (i.e., 2019 – The year of establishment) to control for any effects related to the length of business operation (Huselid, 1995). Second, organizational size was included to control for any advantages related to economy of scale (Datta, Guthrie, & Wright, 2005). Organizational size was measured as the number of employees in each dealership at Time 1.
CHAPTER 5 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1 Modification of Transformational Leadership as an Individual-Level Variable

Prior to discussing the model fit and details of the results, the responses collected from individual salespeople were aggregated at the dealership level to represent shared perceptions of the transformational leadership of the dealer principal. First, following LeBreton and Senter (2008), I calculated an \( r_{wg} \) value to assess interrater agreement, obtaining a median \( r_{wg} \) value of 0.99 for transformational leadership, which is above the cut-off value of 0.70 (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). This result implies that salespeople’s scores on transformational leadership could be aggregated within each leadership. Second, to assess the interrater reliability, I ran a one-way ANOVA. The results indicated that the between-groups variance for transformational leadership was not significant (\( p = .081 \)), which indicates that there is no significant difference in mean transformational leadership between dealerships. Next, I conducted an intra-class correlations (ICC) (1) and ICC (2) to appraise the level of observed variance of single score and average score that is affected by clustering (Shieh, 2016). The ICC (1) informed me whether the salespeople’s responses were affected by group membership while the ICC (2) informed me how reliably the mean response distinguished between the groups. I obtained an ICC (1) value of 0.130 and a reliability of group mean ICC (2) value of 0.244 for transformational leadership. According to Koo and Li (2016), these ICC results are not acceptable given that values of less than 0.5 indicate poor reliability, values between 0.5 and 0.75 indicate moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.9 indicate good reliability, and values greater than 0.9 indicate excellent reliability. Collectively, these results suggest that there is an insufficient level of agreement to aggregate individual responses to represent collective transformational leadership.
within the dealership. These results indicate that, although salespeople of the same dealership can theoretically have similar perceptions of the transformational leadership of their dealership principal, each salesperson perceives their dealership principal’s leadership behaviours differently. Thus, unfortunately, transformational leadership is treated as an individual-level variable. In the upcoming discussions, I opt to examine transformational leadership at the individual level to explore its impact on employee turnover decisions, which is directly aligned with existing research (e.g., Park & Pierce, 2020; Sahu, Pathardikar, & Kumar, 2018; Tse et al., 2013).

### 5.2 Measurement Model

To evaluate the fit of the measurement model, this study conducted a single confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), using Mplus 8.3, that included all measures (Muthén & Muthén, 2017). Initially, transformational leadership had a second-order factor structure with five first-order factors (i.e., idealized attributes, idealized behaviour, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration). Job satisfaction, perceived employability, and turnover intentions were specified as one-dimensional. This study used the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) and standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR) to evaluate a model for CFA because these fit indices are fairly robust across methods of estimation and violation of normality (Hu and Bentler, 1998). Values greater than 0.90 for CFI and TLI, RMSEA values of less than 0.08, and SRMR values of less than 0.08 are recommended as evidence of acceptable model fits, respectively (Schumacker and Lomax, 2016). The results of the measurement model indicate that the model does not fit the data well ($\chi^2(528) = 8063.927, p = .00; \text{CFI} = .877; \text{TLI} = .866$;
RMSEA = .098; SRMR = .056). In addition, not all factor loadings were larger than 0.7 (Hair et al., 2017). Thus, based on an assessment of the psychometric properties and scale parsimony, nine items were dropped, leaving 24 items. Specifically, five items concerning transformational leadership were dropped (one item per sub-dimension). Three items related to job satisfaction were dropped, and one item on perceived employability was dropped. The results of the modified measurement model indicate that the model fits the data well ($\chi^2(241) = 535.597, p = .00; \text{CFI} = .949; \text{TLI} = .941; \text{RMSEA} = .078; \text{SRMR} = .038$). In addition, the difference between the models was significant (chi-square difference = 7528.33, $df = 287, p = .00$), indicating that the modified model was a better fit to the data. Therefore, I adopted the modified measurement model.

The convergent and discriminant validity of the measures were assessed by computing the composite reliability (CR) and the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014; McNeish, 2018). The literature indicate that convergent validity is established if the CR of each construct exceeds 0.6 and the AVE of each construct is greater than 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014). As shown in Table 5, the CRs of the four latent variables ranged from 0.850 to 0.995, while the AVE for these constructs ranged from 0.653 to 0.977. In addition, all items loaded significantly ($p < .001$) onto their respective constructs (Hair et al., 2014). This evidence indicates that the measurement model possessed adequate convergent validity. Discriminant validity is achieved if the square root of the AVE from the construct is greater than the correlation shared between the construct and other constructs in the model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). As the square root of the AVE per construct was greater than the off-diagonal correlations in Table 6, these results confirmed discriminant validity. Collectively, these results confirmed that the study’s measurements were valid.
Table 5. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variables</th>
<th>Dimension / Item</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Idealized attributes</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized behaviours</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual consideration</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my job.</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considering my duties, I am paid adequately.</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am better treated than other workers who do the same job.</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Employability</td>
<td>Many employers want to hire me.</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am optimistic that I will get a good offer in another organization.</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would easily find another job whenever I want.</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>I have thought about leaving the organization.</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would be willing to explore opportunities to work for another organization.</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am actually planning to quit.</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = 201. Factor loadings are standardized. AVE = Average variance extracted; CR = Composite reliability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived Employability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover intention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover behaviour</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Individual performance</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.16†</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collective turnover</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 201$. SD = Standard deviation; Diagonal elements in parentheses are the square root of the AVE.

†$p < 0.1$; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$
5.3 Testing Hypotheses at the Business-Unit Level

I was not able to test the relationship between transformational leadership and collective turnover (Hypothesis 1) since the aggregation of transformational leadership at the dealership level was not justified. However, the relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention was evaluated in Hypothesis 3 as will be discussed.

Hypothesis 2 was tested the negative relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among the four variables at the business-unit level. On average, dealerships have run their businesses for about 21 years and have about 11 salespeople. There is a negative and moderately significant association between collective turnover and organizational performance ($r = -.124; p = .08$).

To test Hypothesis 2, I conducted a hierarchical multiple regression. With hierarchical multiple regression, the variables are entered into the regression equation in some order determined in advance. The order of entry of the independent variables in the regression model is crucial and should be determined by causal priority or by the need to remove confounding relationships (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Generally, potentially confounding variables that need to be controlled for are entered in the first step, and the variables of main interest are entered in the final step. Thus, following Cohen et al.’s instructions, organizational size and organizational age were entered in Model 1 as they were not of central interest to this study and were confounding variables that needed to be controlled for (Datta et al., 2005; Huselid, 1995). Collective turnover, which is the independent variable of Hypothesis 2, was entered in Model 2.
Table 8 shows the results of a hierarchial multiple regression analyses of collective turnover and organizational performance. Overall, the control variables (organizational age and size) and collective turnover, explained 14% of the variance in organizational performance. Although there was little change in $R^2$ ($\Delta R^2 = 0.02$), collective turnover turned out to be a significant predictor of organizational performance ($b = -0.143, p = 0.033$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was supported given that collective turnover had a negative and significant relationship with organizational performance after controlling for organizational size and age.
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients of Variables at the Business-unit Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organization age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational size</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective turnover</td>
<td>-.188**</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational performance</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.366**</td>
<td>-.124†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n = 93$. †$p < 0.1$; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$

Table 8. Summary of Regression Results for Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Organizational performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization age</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational size</td>
<td>-.366**</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.369**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.143*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td></td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td></td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>15.465**</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.615*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Table entries are standardized regression coefficients. $n = 93$. †$p < 0.1$; *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$
5.4 Testing Hypotheses at the Individual Level

To test hypotheses 3–5, which include relationships among transformational leadership, employee turnover decision, and collective turnover, the hypotheses were tested simultaneously by specifying a structural equation model (SEM) using Mplus 8.3 that included all latent and observed variables and all hypothesized paths. I conducted a SEM mainly because of a greater recognition of the validity and reliability of observed scores from measurement items (Hayes, Montoya, & Rockwood, 2017). Because the explanatory variables and control variables are latent variables that are measured by multiple items, SEM allows me to account for measurement errors more effectively (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016). However, it has been widely acknowledged that estimating interactions involving latent variables in survey data is difficult and complicated for researchers. There are at least two major reasons for this difficulty. The first reason suggests a measurement error of indicator variables. According to Moosbrugger, Schermelleh-Engel, and Klein (1997), the reliability of product variable $x_1 \times x_2$ depends both on the reliability of $x_1$ and $x_2$ and on the correlation between the two. They demonstrate that even with very high reliable measures of $x_1$ and $x_2$ (e.g., 0.9), the reliability of the product variable is less than 0.9.

A second reason involves the non-normality of variables. Moosbrugger et al. (1997) state that “even if all indicators of the latent exogenous variables and the latent variables themselves are normally distributed, the distribution of the product term is not normal” (p. 100). They illustrate that the distribution of the latent product term deviates from normality even if the variables follow a normal distribution. In this case, the endogenous variable cannot be also
normally distributed because of the non-normality of the product term in the structural equation (Moosbrugger et al., 1997).

Given that I hypothesize a latent interaction between a latent variable (i.e., turnover intention) and an observed variable (i.e., collective turnover), I used the latent moderated structural equations approach (LMS) (Klein & Moosbrugger, 2000), because this procedure has significantly more power than do other latent moderation approaches, such as the two-stage least-squared approach (Bollen & Paxton, 1998), to detect latent moderation and takes into account the non-normality of the interaction terms (Colwell & Joshi, 2013; Klein & Moosbrugger, 2000). Although model fit indices such as CFI, TLI, and RMSEA have not been developed for LMS, the latent moderation can be evaluated using the path coefficients and their significance test, as well as a model difference test using the likelihood ratio test statistic (i.e. comparing the model with and without the moderation) (Maslowsky, Jager, & Hemken, 2015).

Figure 2 provides an overview of the structural model results for Hypotheses 3–5. In this structural model, job satisfaction, perceived employability, and individual performance, which are confounding variables that need to be controlled for, were included. I included paths between these variables and turnover intention and turnover behaviour given that these variables are highly related with both turnover cognitions and turnover behaviour (Griffeth et al., 2000). None of three control variables were significant in affecting turnover behaviours. However, perceived employability had a positive and moderately significant relationship with turnover intentions ($\gamma = .155, p = .088$), which is in line with existing research (e.g., Baranchenko, Xie, Lin, Lau, & Ma, 2020; March & Simon, 1958).
As Figure 2 illustrates, support was found for three out of four hypotheses. First, Hypothesis 3 was about the negative relationship between transformational leadership and turnover intention. The results indicate that transformational leadership negatively affects turnover intentions ($\gamma = -0.435, p = .00$), which supports Hypothesis 3. Second, Hypothesis 4 implies the positive relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour. The results demonstrate that turnover intentions have a positive and moderately significant relationship with turnover behaviours ($\gamma = 0.156, p = .07$).

The moderation hypothesis (Hypothesis 5), which posited collective turnover as a moderator of the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviours, was tested using the significance test of the interaction and a model difference test using the likelihood ratio test statistic, as suggested by Maslowsky et al. (2015). First, Figure 2 shows that the moderating effect of collective turnover on the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviours was positive and significant ($\gamma = 0.361, p = .00$). Second, using a log-likelihood ratio test, the relative fit of Model 0 (a model that does not estimate the interaction effect) and Model 1 (a model that estimates the interaction effect) was compared to determine whether the more parsimonious Model 0 represents a significant loss in fit relative to the more complex Model 1. If Model 0 fits well and Model 0 represents a significant loss in fit relative to Model 1 based on the log-likelihood ratio test, I can conclude that Model 1 is also a well-fitted model.

The results of the measurement model indicate that Model 0 fits the data well ($\chi^2(305) = 607.815, p = .00; \text{CFI} = .948; \text{TLI} = .940; \text{RMSEA} = .070; \text{SRMR} = .041$). Thus, the test statistic
for a log-likelihood ratio test is calculated to assess whether the fit of Model 1 is better than that of Model 0 using the following equation:

\[ D = -2[(\text{log-likelihood for Model 0}) - (\text{log-likelihood for Model 1})] \] (Moslowsky et al., 2015, p. 89).

Thus, I obtained \( D = 38.314 \) (log-likelihood for Model 0 = -6725.096 and log-likelihood for Model 1 = -6705.939). The values of \( D \) are distributed as \( \chi^2 \), and the degrees of freedom (\( df \)) to determine the significance of \( D \) are calculated by subtracting the number of free parameters in Model 0 from the number of free parameters in Model 1. In the case of modeling one latent interaction, one additional parameter is estimated in Model 1 and, thus, the difference in free parameters = 1. Then, the \( D \) statistic was compared to an \( \chi^2 \) distribution using \( df = 1 \). This result showed that Model 1 fits significantly better than did Model 0 (\( \Delta \chi^2(1) = 38.314, p < .001 \)).

Collectively, there is enough evidence to support Hypothesis 6 since the moderating effect of collective turnover on the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour was positive and significant, and the model that included the moderation fit significantly better than did the model without the moderation.
Figure 2. SEM Results for Testing Hypotheses 3–5

†p < 0.1; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01;
Additionally, following conventional procedures (Dawson, 2014), I plotted simple slopes at one standard deviation above and below the mean of the collective turnover to examine the pattern of the interaction effect on actual turnover behaviour. As Figure 3 illustrates, at low levels of collective turnover, the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour was positive but nonsignificant (simple slope = .009, \( t = .006, p = .995 \)). At high levels of collective turnover, turnover intention had a stronger positive relationship with turnover behaviour, although this effect was also nonsignificant (simple slope = .160, \( t = .107, p = .915 \)). Overall, the significant interaction and model difference test suggest that turnover intentions have a different relationship with turnover behaviour depending on the level of collective turnover, and the magnitude of the increased turnover behaviour related to turnover intention appears to be fairly substantial.

Figure 3. The Moderating Effect of Collective Turnover on the Turnover Intention and Turnover Behaviour Relationship
CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes a discussion of the findings, implications for research and practice, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

This study is timely due to the increasing interest in collective turnover (Hausknecht, 2017; Trevor & Piyanontalee, 2020) and the underexplored research area of transformational leadership (Hom et al., 2020) as well as the growing body of literature that questions the fixed assumption in employee turnover studies (Rubenstein et al., 2018). While a number of models have been developed to predict employee turnover (e.g., Price, 2001), none have integrated transformational leadership and collective turnover as important factors that affect employees’ turnover decisions. In addition, the majority of previous studies have primarily conceptualized the influences of transformational leadership on employee turnover at the individual level. This study sought to fill these gaps by integrating previously independent studies on the effectiveness of transformational leadership and collective turnover theory. Specifically, this study examined three models: (1) a business-unit level model for establishing a sequence from transformational leadership to collective turnover to organizational productivity, which yields significant and practical insights; (2) an individual-level model to draw attention to transformational leadership as a critical determinant of employee turnover; and (3) a model of how collective turnover impacts turnover decisions.

6.1 Discussion of Findings

This section includes the discussion of the findings. It is organized according to hypotheses of this study.
One noteworthy discussion is that I was unable to test Hypothesis 1 because the unit-level transformational leadership was not statistically validated, despite a strong theoretical justification. Leadership can be defined as a mainly socio-perceptual phenomenon, which includes the process of being perceived by others as a leader (Day, 2012). Thus, following previous studies (e.g., Groves, 2020; Waldman et al., 2015), I expected that salespeople in a dealership perceive their dealer principal’s leadership share a common perception of their dealer principal’s leadership, but the data did not support this assumption.

There are many possible reasons for the insufficient statistical justification for the aggregation of transformational leadership. The first is the small sample and cluster sizes. For a multi-level analysis, a reasonable number of business units as well as clusters of an adequate size are needed to reliably estimate a business-unit level variable (Bliese, Halverson, & Schriesheim, 2002; Hui, Chiu, Yu, Cheng, & Tse, 2007). Although this study intended to include more than 50 dealerships with five or more employees who provided complete answers to the questionnaires, the size of the usable sample was 201 employees from 93 dealerships, yielding an average cluster size of 2.16. Of the 93 dealerships, only 45 had two more salespeople who completed the questionnaires, yielding an average cluster size of 3.4. This is insufficient according to Bliese et al. (2002), who recommend that the cluster size should be 10 in order to properly aggregate individual scores to a business-unit level variable. I tried my best to achieve this cluster size with the assistance of the Dealer Planning Team (e.g., sending invitation letters and reminders to respondents, explaining the purpose of study at the training program), but it was challenging to secure a reasonable sample and cluster size. This may hinder the possibility of data aggregation.
In addition, the potential for inconsistencies among the responses stems from the fact that leaders act with greater or lesser consistency in different conditions (Zohar & Tenne-Gazit, 2008). The more consistent a leader’s practices in different situations, the more they can reduce variation in group member perception (Ashforth, 1985). In the context of car sales, salespeople are largely independent workers who do not have regular interactions, coaching, or management from their dealership leaders. Also, their working hours vary. For example, some salespeople work from 8 am to 4 pm, while other salespeople work from 12 am to 8 pm. Thus, they have varying level of experience to their leaders. As long as they can perform well and achieve sales commission, they can work relatively autonomously.

This research context could be theoretically best explained by fragmented configuration of leader-member exchange (LMX) where a leader forms a unique LMX relationship with each member (Seo, Nahrgang, Carter, & Hom, 2018). Car dealerships in Korea are relatively small organizations where salespeople build a close relationship with the dealership owner. Some members perceive the quality of their relationship with the owner as more positive than others. These members might be more apt to rate their owner more highly (Moorman, 1991). Collectively, the data aggregation values reflect that in reality, certain organizations and organizational members do not always concur in their perceptions (Hui et al., 2007).

This study provides additional empirical evidence that can support the conventional view that collective turnover has a more dysfunctional effects on organizations when high performers quit than when low performers do. From the perspective of human capital, a negative relationship between collective turnover and organizational productivity is an implicit
assumption in the literature (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). However, existing studies have examined the relationship based on the aggregation of turnover quantity, which does not consider the measure of contribution of leavers to the organization (Call et al., 2015). A unique approach is that salespeople’s contribution to the business unit was defined based on an objective measure and this measure was used to longitudinally examine the relationship between qualitative aspect of collective turnover and organizational performance. In doing so, this study found support for the disruptive effects of collective turnover, given that the collective turnover measure represents collective turnover among high performers or those that have difficult-to-replace human capital (Hom et al., 2020).

This study sheds light on why and how exercising transformational leadership can help deter employees from forming turnover intentions, while controlling for the effects of conventional antecedents such as job satisfaction and perceived employability. Contemporary researchers have begun to focus on transformational leadership as a critical determinant of retaining valuable human resources for organizational effectiveness, due to its practices that strengthen the bond between leaders and employees, thereby enacting desirable behaviours and achieving organizational goals (Caillier, 2018; Tse et al., 2013; Waldman et al., 2015). The findings of this study supported this argument. Specifically, the SEM results show that the effect of transformational leadership on turnover intention is stronger than any other turnover antecedents (i.e., job satisfaction, perceived employability, and individual performance).

This study employed a longitudinal examination of the theoretical sequence of turnover intention-turnover behaviour. The typical turnover study relies on cross-sectional design (e.g.,
Oh & Oh, 2017), hindering researchers’ opportunities to identify temporal differentiations among individuals at two stages of the turnover process: planning turnover and executing turnover. While treating employee turnover intention as a proxy for actual turnover is theoretically sound, recent studies have offered mixed conclusions (e.g., an insignificant relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour: Jeong, 2010; a positive and significant relationship: Nelissen et al., 2017). By re-examining this well-established relationship, this study provides additional empirical evidence that can support the view that turnover intention can still be treated as a proxy for actual turnover behaviour.

This study empirically tested how collective turnover, as a qualitative measure, affects subsequent turnover in an organization. Turnover scholars have suggested that the influence of referent others’ departure from an organization encourages workers to examine their employment situations (Bartunek et al., 2008; Felps et al., 2009; Naidoo, 2016), thus perpetuating turnover in the organization. The results of this study demonstrated that collective turnover accentuated the strength of the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour. That is, the more often employees are exposed to a high level of collective turnover, the more likely they are to enact their exit strategies, which illustrates how turnover can be contagious in the workplace.

6.2 Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study have substantial implications for research. In this section, the implications are discussed focusing on the following three themes: (1) conceptualizing collective turnover as a qualitative measure, (2) integrating transformational leadership and collective
turnover theories to explain employee turnover, and (3) methodological rigor in the quantitative research and research context.

First, this study advances our understanding of the importance of collective turnover quality on organizational and individual outcomes (i.e., employee turnover decision). Existing studies conceptualized collective turnover as static turnover rates (i.e., aggregation of turnover quantity), which treat each employee departure identically. However, departures by members who possess firm-specific proficiencies and who make sustained contributions to organizational effectiveness should be more costly and detrimental than departures initiated by relatively poor performers (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013). Thus, recent theoretical frameworks reconceptualize the collective turnover to represent the depletion of human capital within a group, unit, or organization (Hausknecht & Holwerda, 2013; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

Unique to my approach of measuring the qualitative aspect of collective turnover, salespeople’s contribution to the dealership can be measured based on an objective performance measure, given that the operational criterion of salespeople’s performance is an objective output measure (i.e., the number of cars sold) (Cascio, 1998; Guion, 1998). Hence, I provide a qualitative way of measuring collective turnover that is consistent with both Nyberg and Ployhart (2013), who stated that collective turnover represents the depletion of human capital resources, and with Hausknecht and Holwerda (2013), who stated that collective turnover has varying meanings depending on the levels of firm-specific human capital associated with leavers. This approach is timely and valuable given that the prevailing measure of collective turnover has been criticized because it only focuses on quantity, not the quality of the departures (Hauskencht &
Moreover, the qualitative collective turnover measure has more practical value because it may more precisely diagnose the damage incurred by collective turnover for organizations and help explain the variability in the relationships between collective turnover and various organizational outcomes (Hausknecht, 2017; Trevor & Piyanontalee, 2020).

Furthermore, my approach begins to recognize the value of the quality of human capital lost as a critical factor in turnover contagion. Turnover contagion models emphasize that employees are influenced by the departure of others in the organization (Bartunek et al., 2008; Felps et al., 2009), which provides the basis for considering moderating effects of collective turnover on employee turnover decisions. Although turnover contagion is theoretically plausible, to the best of my knowledge, I am the first to demonstrate empirically that collective turnover moderates the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour. This is an important contribution because it demonstrates empirical support for using turnover contagion as a mechanism for translating turnover intentions into turnover behaviour in the workplace. In this study, salespeople were more prone to leaving their organization when they witnessed the departure of high performers, as measured by the quality aspect of collective turnover. Thus, these findings are making timely contributions to collective turnover theory because they not only illustrate the turnover contagion effect (Felps et al., 2009), but also introduce an evaluation of quality to collective measurement, responding to the need for measurement of qualitative aspects (Hausknecht, 2017).

Second, building upon the work of Felps et al. (2009) and Waldman et al. (2015), it integrates transformational leadership and collective turnover theories to expand the traditional
model of turnover. Leadership influence as an antecedent of employee turnover has been understudied in the turnover literature (Hom et al., 2020). This study hypothesized that transformational leadership reduces employee turnover after controlling for other turnover antecedents. Furthermore, the research model expands on the idea that when employees make a turnover decision, they are not only influenced by leaders (Waldman et al., 2015) but also the departure of other coworkers through emotional contagion (Felps et al., 2009). Theoretically, the empirical findings in this study support turnover contagion frameworks, aiding our understanding of how individuals in an organization develop turnover intention and how they subsequently act on their exit plans. The findings provide further evidence that the turnover process does not occur in a vacuum and is certainly not a decision that should be viewed as an isolated individual decision. Indeed, collective turnover in organizations can trigger subsequent turnover (Felps et al., 2009; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

Third, this study makes substantial contributions to the literature on employee turnover due to the rigorous research and unique research context. This study examines the turnover process over time, addressing the need for the use of multi-source data and longitudinal studies in the turnover literature. In terms of the practicality of research, researchers cannot help but use turnover intention as a proxy of turnover behaviour because organizations often refuse to provide relevant data about employee turnover, and assessing turnover behaviours requires a costly longitudinal design (Cohen et al., 2016). In this study, by obtaining HR metrics from the company, I was able to examine the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour and provide additional empirical evidence that moderately supports the view that turnover intention can still be treated as a proxy for actual turnover behaviour. However, it is still
not an identity and should not be treated as such ($\gamma = .156, p = .07$). This finding is in line with a recent meta-analytical study by Rubenstein et al. (2018), which also demonstrates that turnover intention and turnover behaviour are not identical ($\rho = 0.56$). Thus, I would caution researchers against simply treating turnover intention as a proxy for turnover behaviour and suggest that there is room for more research on why turnover intentions do not lead to turnover behaviour (e.g., Vardaman et al., 2015).

In terms of the research context, I examined the research model in the context of car salespeople and dealerships in Korea, which expands the generalizability of previous studies. Traditionally, studies on the relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance have viewed the issue from a North American perspective (e.g., individualistic cultures). Thus, these studies have called for further investigation to assess the generalizability of the results (Hancock et al., 2013). While the study participants were Koreans working in a collectivist society, and the nature of their task (i.e. selling cars) is different from those examined in previous studies (e.g., the implementation of legal provisions in Wynen et al., 2019), this study found support for the disruptive effect of collective turnover on organizational productivity, which corroborates the results of previous studies (Wynen & Kleizen, 2019; Wynen et al, 2019).

Similarly, this study corroborates and expands upon the results of previous studies on transformational leadership and employee turnover. Previous studies have called for further investigation into the generalizability of the impact of leadership on employee turnover, particularly because their research contexts have been limited to a call centre in China (Tse et al.,
2013), a hospitality organization in China (Waldman et al., 2015), public schools in the United States (Sun & Wang, 2017), and the U.S. federal agencies (Caillier, 2018). In addition, Rubenstein et al. (2018) claim that it is difficult to determine the generalizability of previous studies because the number of studies on leadership-turnover link from outside the United States was negligible. The results of this study were similar to those obtained in other organizational settings. This continued investigation has helped us to obtain a deeper understanding of the influential processes of transformational leadership and employee turnover in the workplace.

6.3 Practical Implications

This study has three practical implications for organizations. First, given the relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover, organizations must be aware of the effect of transformational leadership in minimizing employee turnover. Organizations should establish leadership development programs to cultivate transformational leadership behaviours among people in managerial positions (Kelloway, Barling, & Helleur, 2000). Once leadership programs are established, managers can focus their efforts on decreasing their subordinates’ turnover intentions, thereby facilitating a positive exchange relationship with their subordinates. In doing so, organizations can ensure the retention of valuable human resources.

The aforementioned suggestions would be particularly beneficial for businesses in Korea. Korean employees are more likely than are employees in other countries to build close relationships and have informal social ties with their leaders (Choi, Yoon, & Jeung, 2012). Conversely, Korean employees also tend to leave organizations because of their leaders. In fact, recent surveys have revealed that one of the top reasons for an employee deciding to leave his or
her job is the poor leadership of his or her immediate supervisor (Kim, 2015). In these circumstances, organizations should be willing to find ways to promote transformational leadership behaviours among all levels of management for effective employee retention. In terms of car sales business, car company should offer extensive leadership trainings on how to lead and how to develop close relationship with salespeople, and other retention management skills.

Second, the results of this study are practically meaningful because high-performer collective turnover significantly boost subsequent turnover rate. This suggests that organizations should minimize turnover contagion effects in the aftermath of the departure of multiple employees. Managers should identify key influential individuals (i.e., high performers) within the organization to decrease employee turnover intention and actual turnover. Managers should also provide employees with accurate and honest information about why their coworkers voluntarily left the organization, while also prohibiting gossiping about leavers, especially in organizations with a high turnover rate. Such open communication and prohibition may help to inhibit the spread of false information and to help in alleviating the remaining members’ insecurity, as well as likelihood of them tendering their resignation. Such changes may reduce subsequent turnover rates (Felps et al., 2009; Wolfe, 2004).

Third, collective turnover of high performers significantly reduces a firm’s productivity, suggesting that organizations must pay attention to this type of collective turnover in order to increase organizational performance. In particular, in the context of car sales, car dealerships seek high performers from other dealerships because such individuals could bring valuable human capital, such as interpersonal skills, persuasion and influencing skills, and a pool of
potential customers (Park, 2017). Thus, strategies for attracting and retaining high performers are important for dealerships, as these salespeople are the ones who build a positive brand image by directly interacting with customers (Kim, 2014). Otherwise, competing dealerships may attract high-performing salespeople, which could result in significant damage to organizational performance.
CHAPTER 7 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

First, although I used longitudinal and multi-source data, I measured transformational leadership and turnover intention at the same time, which hinders the possibility of making any definitive inferences about causality (Maxwell & Cole, 2007). However, my prediction was in line with the theoretical justification. Nevertheless, future research should consider time gaps that are more precise, wherein data is collected at three different time points, to provide greater insights into the causal relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover decisions. Along with the longitudinal research design, conducting interviews with leavers may be fruitful in future studies to verify how collective turnover affects their turnover decisions (King, 2004).

Second, attempting to test a relationship between transformational leadership and collective turnover at the business unit level is a straightforward endeavour. I used several statistics (e.g., r_wg, ANOVA, and ICCs) to determine the appropriateness of aggregation, mainly because these values are widely used in the literature and are comparable to those reported in previous studies that validated transformational leadership as a unit-level construct. For example, the interrater reliability coefficients for transformational leadership were 0.99 (Waldman et al., 2015) and 0.88 (Groves, 2020). The ICC (2) were 0.87 (Waldman et al., 2015) and 0.85 (Groves, 2020). However, although I used a validated measure (MLQ), in terms of ICC (2), I was not able to obtain statistical justification, possibly due to the small sample size, the small cluster size, and the unique working conditions of the research context. Thus, future studies need a more careful research design to measure transformational leadership. A feasible direction of interest would be
obtaining reported information from dealership principals on their transformational leadership and relating it to the levels of collective turnover.

Alternatively, a different perspective on transformational leadership as a unit-level construct could be taken. Although the ICC (2) value was 0.244, which is not acceptable, Liao and Chuang (2007) point out that aggregation can be reasonable if a unit-level construct is theoretically justified, if the values of $r_{wg}$ and ICC (1) are acceptable, and if between-groups variance is significant. Accordingly, it would be worthwhile to attempt to aggregate transformation leadership using dealerships that had more than two salespeople who participated in this study, given that the values of $r_{wg}$ and reasonable ICC (1) were acceptable.

Third, I could not consider other aspects of collective turnover, such as the quantity of collective turnover and the joint functions of leavers and remaining members, due to the practical feasibility of data collection. Regarding the quantity of collective turnover, I measured the turnover rate to examine the relationships with organizational performance and employee turnover decisions as part of the post-hoc analysis. The results demonstrated that the relationship between turnover rate and organizational performance is negative but not significant ($b = -.030$, $p = .675$). Additionally, the moderating effect of turnover rate on the relationship between turnover intention and turnover behaviour was not significant ($\gamma = .081, p = .374$). Thus, important roles of collective turnover were not statistically supported when the quantity aspect was considered.

In order to consider various aspects of collective turnover (e.g., the proficiencies of newcomers and remaining members), a suitable sample with longitudinal data on both the
quantity and quality of leavers, remaining organizational members, and replacements is required but such data are not accessible (Call et al., 2015). Researchers should go the extra mile to, at least, theorize about and conceptualize the latent nature of their collective turnover measures, asking, for example, “What types of KSAOs are likely captured in the turnover rate measure?” (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013, p. 127). Such studies are challenging but conceivable and valuable and hold substantial promise for understanding the characteristics of the collective turnover being studied.

Fourth, although my attempt to quantify the quality of collective turnover is valuable and meaningful for capturing the loss of KSAO competence in the context of car sales, more careful sampling strategies should be adopted in follow-up studies. In the current study, research participants who left their dealerships during the study period were included in the measure of collective turnover at the business unit level. This dependence in measures may cause the relatively high correlation between collective turnover and individual turnover ($r = .53$, $p < .01$). Therefore, researchers should be more conscious about measuring collective and individual turnover simultaneously to mitigate this potential issue. For example, if salespeople who fill out the survey were removed from the calculation of collective turnover per dealership, then the measures of individual and collective turnover per dealership would not have any reason for dependence apart from the turnover contagion. While it would be challenging to implement this sampling strategy, it would provide a more rigorous way to measure the quality aspects of collective turnover and examine the turnover contagion effect.
Fifth, this study only considered voluntary collective turnover, given that involuntary turnover and reduction in force are rare in the context of car sales because of 100% commission-based pay structure. For example, if salespeople are not making sales, they are actually not getting paid. Thus, dealerships have no occasion to terminate salespeople unless they are committed to unethical sales practices (e.g., offering sales commission as a cash incentive). This is the unique aspect of the research context in this study; however, collective turnover includes all types of turnover because the reason for the turnover is not as relevant in terms of how human capital influences organizational performance. In fact, what matters for collective turnover is both the quantity and quality of human capital depletion (Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013). There is a difference between voluntary turnover and involuntary turnover in terms of the qualitative components. For example, voluntary turnover is more likely to reflect high-quality KSAOs, while involuntary turnover is more likely to reflect low quality KSAOs. If this assumption is true, incorporating both voluntary and involuntary turnover allows us to capture a holistic view of human capital depletion in the organization and to predict how collective turnover damages organizational performance when the two types of turnover are similar or different (Hausknecht, 2017; Nyberg & Ployhart, 2013).

Sixth, with regard to the roles of collective turnover, generalizability may be hampered by the specific context of this study. Car dealerships are characteristically small, and sales businesses have turnover rates that are generally high (about 10% in this study). Moreover, sales jobs are relatively low-wage occupations, with pay being based on individual performance. While such characteristics allowed me to examine the role that collective turnover plays in relation to exit plans, the findings may not be found in different organizational contexts with
substantially lower turnover rates and highly skilled workers (Hausknecht, 2017). Thus, replicating this study in different organizational settings, such as in IT firms (Naidoo, 2016), to compare results would be a simple but meaningful direction for future studies.

Finally, although this study responded the call for more studies on turnover outside of the North American context (Hancock et al., 2013), this study does not specifically consider cultural values. In terms of leadership, employees in my data set may be more likely to build close relationships with their leaders than employees in Western countries (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009). In addition, in terms of collective turnover, the effect of collective turnover on organizational performance may be dependent on culture (individualistic vs. collectivistic) because individuals are expected to function in complementary ways within in the collectivist organization. Collectivist organizations can handle the disruption after collective turnover more effectively than individualistic organizations (Hancock et al., 2013; Hancock et al., 2017).

Accordingly, considering cultural dimensions in the relationship between transformational leadership and employee turnover decision and the relationship between collective turnover and organizational performance is another future direction. To do so, equating the collectivist culture of Korea directly with all Korean employment circumstances would be misleading because an individual and organization usually has cultural values that are not consistent with those of the national culture (Gelfand, Leslie, & Fehr, 2008). Moreover, although national culture is useful for the study of nations or societies, the reflection of culture at the individual and organizational level is more relevant in managerial situations (Patterson,
Cowley, & Prasongsukarn, 2006; Yoo, Donthu, & Lenartowicz, 2011). By capturing cultural dimensions at the individual and organizational levels, future studies can suggest the importance of cultural contexts in understanding both transformational leadership and collective turnover.
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSION

In summary, this dissertation addresses four major questions:

1) Does transformational leadership have a direct effect on employee turnover at both the individual and business-unit level?

2) Does collective turnover influence organizational productivity?

3) Can turnover intention predict turnover behaviour?

4) How does collective turnover contribute to individual turnover decisions?

The findings of this research have important implications for turnover research. Transformational leadership appears to influence employee turnover intentions, which supports the idea that transformational leadership is an important pull-to-stay factor. Collective turnover appears to influence organizational performance as well as employee turnover decisions, empirically confirming contagious influence.
REFERENCES


https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601111401017


https://doi.org/10.1080/09585199400000020


doi:10.1080/08961530.2011.578059

APPENDIX A CONTACT LETTER

February 2018

I am writing this letter to invite you to participate in my doctoral research study entitled “Transformational leadership and employee turnover: A longitudinal study on the effects of collective turnover” that is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Nita Chhinzer at the University of Guelph.

The purpose of this study is to examine the underlying mechanisms through which leadership induces the retention of employees. The study will provide a number of insights that should be important to the Dealer Planning Team at OOO. It will address important roles of leadership and will be focused around the following questions.

• What role do employees’ perceptions about their leader and organization play in terms of their decisions to leave organizations?
• How should owners of dealerships most effectively develop their own leadership attributes to build reciprocal relationships with their employees?
• How can owners of dealerships best manage their employees’ turnover intentions to organizations in order to facilitate satisfaction and performance?
• How can owners of dealerships best minimize turnover rate over time?

After reviewing the literature, I made hypotheses that are correlated to the above questions. To examine my hypotheses and draw practical implications from them, I am planning to conduct a survey study.

The survey has approximately 69 questions. It consists of eight parts, which explore employees’ perceptions of their dealer principals’ leadership, their level of commitment to the organization, their level of turnover intention, their cultural values, their relationship with the leader, and their feeling about job and job security. The survey data will be kept confidential. In addition, I will need to obtain data about whether a respondent leaves the organization during the study period. To do so, given the appropriate consent, administrative data can be linked to survey data about 6 months after collecting the second data in summer 2019.

In return for providing your participation in the study, if you want, I will provide you a specific and detailed feedback report of the results of my data collection from your company. In the report, I will answer the general questions above, but can also tailor the feedback to address any specific issues that are of interest to you. Except for the report for your organization, the survey results will be used only for academic research purposes.

Ideally, I need more than 500 participants (salespeople) from 50 different dealerships, and more than 5 participants per dealerships. However, the number can be adjusted depending on how many dealerships are willing to participate in the study.
I can provide more detail on the data collection requirements either through an in-person visit at your company or via video conference. I sincerely hope that you are interested in participating in this important research project. Please feel free to contact me by email (jinuk.oh@uoguelph.ca) or KakaoTalk with any questions. I look forward to working with you on this project.

Cordially yours,

Jinuk Oh
APPENDIX B LETTER FROM DEALER PLANNING TEAM

Dear Research Ethics Board Committee,

It is my understanding that Jinuk Oh will be conducting a research project entitled “Transformational leadership and employee turnover: A longitudinal study on the effects of collective turnover,” under the supervision of Dr. Nita Chhinzer. Jinuk has informed me of the design of the study, the targeted population, and the study’s potential contributions to both the academic and practical fields of human resource management.

I support this endeavor fully and will provide any assistance necessary for the successful implementation of the study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be reached at _______.

Sincerely,

General Manager

Dealer Planning Team, OOO Motors
Researcher’s Statement: This study is conducted by Mr. Jinuk Oh, a Ph.D. candidate in management in the College of Business and Economics at the University of Guelph, under the supervision of Dr. Nita Chhinzer.

You are invited to take part in this study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This form is designed to give you the information about the study so you can decide whether to be in the study or not. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please ask the researcher (Jinuk Oh) if there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called “informed consent.” A copy of this form will be given to you.

Purpose and procedures: This study attempts to examine roles of leadership in employee turnover. If you agree to take part in this survey, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire with 69 items. It will take about 10–15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Given the appropriate consent, 6 months after this survey, I will obtain information on whether you left the organization from the Dealer Planning Team.

Voluntariness: Your decision to be in this study is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not need to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

Confidentiality: The confidentiality of your responses will be firmly guaranteed under the STATISTICS ACT in Korea. STATISTICS ACT Article 33 (Protection of Secrets) explicitly states that (1) matters belonging to the confidential information of individuals, corporations, organizations, and so on that have become known in the course of collecting statistics shall be protected; and (2) data belonging to the confidential information of individuals, corporations, organizations, and so on that have been collected for the collection of statistics shall not be used for any purpose other than that of collecting statistics.

Thus, the researcher will never provide your responses or personal information to any external personnel or organizations, nor will the Dealer Planning Team have access to your responses.

Risks and Benefits: There are no foreseeable risks of harm in completing this survey. However, this survey includes sensitive questions about your managers’ leadership and your level of turnover intention. Moreover, in order to match your responses with administrative data from the Dealer Planning Team, an identifier (i.e., your name) is needed. Thus, there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed.

While responding to the survey, you may have concerns about whether your responses are monitored by authorities in your organization. Once again, your responses or personal
information will never be shared with any external personnel or organizations. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the sealing envelop in the returning box, you can directly mail it to Jinuk Oh, with no return address on the envelope at no cost. Also, if you have already completed and submitted the survey, and you change your mind about taking part, you can contact Jinuk Oh and ask to have your data removed.

The faculty advisor (Dr. Nita Chhinzer) and Jinuk Oh will be the only individuals who can access the information you provide. The information you provide will be kept by the researcher in a secure location to use in the analysis and reporting of the research results. To process data electronically, your information will be encrypted and stored on Jinuk’s personal computer, which is also encrypted with access keys and facial recognition system. In addition, please note that information will only be reported on in the aggregate.

You will not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study. However, you will have an opportunity to reflect on your perceptions of your leader and organization. In addition, your participation in this study will contribute to a body of knowledge about employee turnover. Consequently, your participation will help Human Resource Management (HRM) professionals develop an effective HRM strategy for employee retention in sales organizations.

**Right to Ask Questions:**
This research has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. Contact Jinuk Oh at jinuk.oh@uoguelph.ca, 010-XXXX-XXXX (Korean mobile), 1-519-XXX-XXXX (Canadian mobile), or KakaoTalk with questions, complaints, or concerns about the research. You can also call this number if you feel this study has harmed you.

**Agreement:**
Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consented to take part in the study. If you agree to participate in this study, please proceed to the survey on the next page. Your voluntary participation in this study would imply your informed consent to participate. Please tear off this page and keep it for your records or future reference.

I have read the above consent form and understood the nature of this study and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

Researcher: Jinuk Oh
Principal Investigator: Dr. Nita Chhinzer
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Certification of Ethical Acceptability of Research Involving Human Participants

APPROVAL PERIOD: December 13, 2018
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- Adhere to the protocol as last reviewed and approved by the REB.
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This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*
Authors: *Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*
Copyright: *1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass*

for his/her thesis research.

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

© 1995 Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass. All Rights Reserved. Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com
APPENDIX F SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH)

This questionnaire has 69 items. There are eight sections asking about (1) your dealer principal’s leadership, (2) your perception about finding a new job, (3) how you value organizational culture, (4) how you feel about your job, (5) your intention to quit, (6) your degree of satisfaction with respect to your job security, (7) your perception of job embeddedness, and (8) general demographic information (age, gender, etc.). It will take about 10–15 minutes to complete the survey.

This is a general survey asking for your sincere opinions whether you agree or disagree with the statements. Thus, there is no right or wrong answers. Please check the one response on each survey question that best reflects your perception.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Jinuk Oh.

| Email | jinuk.oh@uoguelph.ca | Phone | 010-xxxx-xxxx |

Section A. Leadership

Since the MLQ is copyrighted, it is forbidden to include all the items in an appendix.
Section B. External Employability

This section asks about your perception about how employable you are outside of this employer. Please provide your honest opinion about the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Many employers want to hire me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 I could get a good offer from another organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 I could easily find another job whenever I want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 No other employer has offered me a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C. Personal Cultural Values

This section asks about your values. Please provide your honest opinion about the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Group success is more important than individual success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how important each of the following is to you. There are no right or wrong answers – just give us your honest opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Extremely unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7 Careful management of money (thrift)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Going resolutely in spite of opposition (persistence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Personal steadiness and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Long-term planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Giving up today’s fun for success in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Working hard for success in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section D. Job Satisfaction

This section asks about how you feel about your job and different aspects of your job. Please provide your honest opinion whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 I find real enjoyment in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 I feel satisfied with my overall opportunities for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 I am satisfied with the dealership principal’s comments on my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 I like how the dealership principal runs the business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Considering my duties, I am paid adequately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 I am better treated than other workers who do the same job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section E. Turnover Intention

This section asks about your turnover intention. Please provide your honest opinion whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 I have thought about leaving the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 I would be willing to explore opportunities elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 I am actually planning to quit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section F. Job Security

This section asks about your degree of satisfaction with respect to your job security. Please provide your honest opinion whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1  I will be able to keep my present job as long as I want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2  My current organization will not cut back on the number of hours I work each week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3  If my current organization were facing economic problems, my job would be the first to go.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4  I am confident that I will be able to work for my organization as long as I wish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5  My job will be there as long as I want it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6  If my job were eliminated, I would be offered another job in my current organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7  Regardless of economic conditions, I will have a job at my current organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8  I am secure in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9  My current organization would transfer me to another job if I were laid off from my present job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10 My job is not a secure one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section G. Job Embeddedness

After considering both work-related (such as relationships, fit with job, benefits) and nonwork related factors (such as neighbors, hobbies, community perks), please rate your agreement with the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1 I feel attached to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 It would be difficult for me to leave this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 I’m too caught up in this organization to leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 I feel tied to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 I simply could not leave the organization that I work for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6 It would be easy for me to leave this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 I am tightly connected to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section H. Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions.

I1. What is your gender? Male [ ] Female [ ]

I2. What year were you born in? [ ]

I3. What is your marital status? Single [ ] Married [ ] Divorced [ ] Widowed [ ]

I4. How long have you been employed at the dealership? _________years or _________months

I5. How many hours per day do you USUALLY work at your job? _________hours

I6. What is the highest level of education completed?
   [ ] High school graduate [ ] Professional degree
   [ ] Bachelor’s degree [ ] Doctorate
   [ ] Master’s degree [ ] Other (please specify) ____________

I7. Provide your full name (Please note that researchers will never provide your personal information to any external personnel or organizations).

_____________________
안녕하세요. 저는 캐나다 웰프대학교에서 경영학 박사과정 4년차에 재학 중인 오진욱입니다. 본 연구는 저의 박사학위 연구이며, 지도 교수님인 Dr. Nita Chhinzer의 엄격한 지도 하에 수행되고 있습니다.

본 설문 조사는 대리점 대표의 리더십이 카마스터 분들의 다양한 심리 상태에 어떠한 영향을 미치는지를 연구하기 위해 작성되었습니다. 따라서 본 설문에 대해 설명을 드리고, 귀하의 참여를 부탁 드리고자 합니다.

이 설문지에는 총 8개의 섹션으로 구성되어 있으며, 설문의 응답은 약 10~15분이 소요될 것으로 예상됩니다. 만일 귀하가 연구 참여에 동의하신다면, 6개월 뒤에 귀하의 응용 상태(이직 여부)를 회사 내부 자료를 활용하여 파악 할 예정입니다. 따라서, 귀하께서 오늘 본 연구 참여에 동의하신다면, 설문지 응답과 6개월 후의 응용 상태에 대한 자료 수집에 대해 동의하는 것입니다.

귀하가 본 연구에 참여하지 않아도 그 어떠한 불이익은 없습니다. 또한 참여를 하셨더라도 언제라도 도 그만두실 수 있습니다. 만일 귀하가 연구 참여를 그만두고 싶으시다면 연구자에게 연락주시오. 귀하로부터 얻은 자료는 즉시 폐기될 것입니다. 귀하의 성의 있는 응답은 보다 나은 인사제도 수립을 위한 중요한 자료로 활용될 것입니다. 따라서 본 연구 참여를 간곡히 부탁드리겠습니다.

본 연구를 통해 수집된 정보는 오직 연구를 위한 통계 분석에만 사용될 예정이며, 통계법 제 33조(비밀의 보호)에 따라 조사 목적 이외에는 절대로 사용되지 않을 것이며, 그 어떠한 정보도 회사 측과 공유되지 않습니다. 또한 귀하의 응답 및 개인 정보들은 외부에 유출하지 않을 것을 약속드립니다.

본 설문지는 대리점 대표의 리더십과 본인의 고용에 대한 전반적인 인식과 같은 문항들이 포함되어 있습니다. 또한 대리점 지원팀에서 제공받은 자료와 취합하기 위해서 개인식별문항(성함)도 포함되어 있습니다. 앞서 설명 드린 것처럼, 본 설문의 응답과 개인적인 정보는 그 어떠한 개인, 조직, 회사에도 제공되지 않습니다. 오직 연구자와 연구자의 지도 교수만이 수집된 자료에 접근할 수 있으며, 수집된 자료는 연구자의 개인 컴퓨터에 암호화되어 저장됩니다. 암호화된 정보는 비밀번호와 지문인식 시스템을 통해 안전하게 보호됩니다. 향후에 본 연구에 대해 궁금한 것이 있으시면 연구자에게 언제든지 연락을 주셔도 좋습니다.

본 연구는 캐나다 연방정부의 연구 자금을 양격히 따랐으며, 웰프대학교 연구윤리위원회의 승인을 받았습니다. 따라서 언제라도 연구 참가자로서 귀하의 권리에 대한 질문이 있다면 웰프대학교 연구윤리위원회에 연락하실 수 있습니다 (re@uoguelph.ca). 또한, 본 연구에 대해 질문이 있으시면 언제든지 연구자에게 연락하십시오 (카카오톡 ID: imiyuk, oh@uoguelph.ca). 감사합니다.
연구 동의서

나는 본 연구의 설명문을 읽었고, 연구의 본질을 이해했으며, 연구에 참여하는 것에 대하여 자발적으로 동의합니다. 또한, 연구자가 회사 내부자료를 활용하여 나의 고용 상태에 대한 자료를 수집하는 것을 동의합니다.

본 연구에 참가를 동의하신다면 모든 질문에 빠짐없이 응해 주실 것을 정중히 부탁드립니다.
카마스터 설문

안녕하세요. 저는 캐나다 웰프대학교 경영학 박사과정에 재학 중인 오진욱입니다. 본 설문은 저의 박사학위 연구의 일환으로, 대리점 카마스터들의 심리적인 안정 및 역량 개발을 위해 나아가야 할 방향을 찾고자 하는 매우 중요한 설명입니다. 따라서 본 설문에 대해 간단히 설명드리고, 귀하의 적극적인 참여를 부탁드립니다.

이 설문조사는 총 8 개의 섹션으로 구성되어 있으며, 설문의 응답은 약 10 분이 소요될 것으로 예상됩니다. 본 설문을 통해 수집된 정보는 통계법 제 33 조 (비밀의 보호)에 따라 오직 학술연구를 위한 통계분석에만 사용될 예정이며, 그 어떤 정보도 외부에 유출하지 않을 것을 약속드립니다.

본 연구는 캐나다 연방정부의 인간대상 연구 지침을 엄격히 따랐으며, 웰프대학교 연구윤리위원회의 승인을 받았습니다(REB# 18-11-006). 따라서 본 연구에 대해 질문이 있으시면 언제든지 연구자에게 연락하십시오.

- 카카오톡:
- 메일: jinuk.oh@uoguelph.ca

[연구 동의서]

나는 본 연구의 설명문을 읽었고, 연구의 본질을 이해했으며, 연구에 참여하는 것에 대하여 자발적으로 동의합니다.

➢ 본 연구에 참가를 동의하신다면, 모든 질문에 빠짐없이 응해주실 것을 정중히 부탁드립니다.
A. 다음 질문들은 귀하의 대리점 대표의 리더십에 대한 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 읽고 리더로서 갖추어야 하는 바람직한 모습이 아닌, 귀하의 대리점 대표의 실제 모습과 가장 유사하다고 생각하는 항목에 ✔표를 해주시키 바랍니다.

Since the MLQ is copyrighted, it is forbidden to include all the items in an appendix.

B. 다음 질문들의 귀하의 고용가능성에 대한 질문들입니다. 각 문항들을 읽고 귀하가 바람직하다고 생각하는 것이 아닌, 현재 귀하의 안식과 가장 일치하는 항목에 ✔표를 해주시키 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나를 원하는 다른 회사들이 많다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 나는 다른 조직에 가셔도 좋은 대우를 받을 수 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 내가 원한다면 언제든지 다른 직장을 쉽게 구할 수 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나에게 일자리를 제의하는 곳이 없다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. 다음 질문들의 귀하의 개인적인 가치관에 대한 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 읽고 귀하가 바람직하다고 생각하는 곳이 아닌, 현재 귀하의 인식과 가장 일치하는 항목에 표를 해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 개인은 직장에서 집단을 위해 자신의 이익을 희생해야 한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 개인은 어떤 어려움이 있더라도 집단과 생각공감을 같이 해야 한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 집단의 이익이 개인의 이익보다 중요하다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 집단이 잘되는 것이 개인이 잘 되는 것보다 중요하다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 개인은 집단의 이익을 고려할 후에 개인의 목표를 추구해야 한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 개인의 목표가 집단보다라도 조직에 대한 충성심은 강조되어야 한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

다음의 각 항목은 귀하에게 얼마나 중요합니까?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 절약정신</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 인내심</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 변함없는 성실함</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 장기적인 계획</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 장래의 성공을 위해 오늘의 휘가로 포기하기</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 장래의 성공을 위해 열심히 일하기</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. 다음 질문들의 귀하의 전반적인 직무 만족도에 대한 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 읽고 귀하가 바람직하다고 생각하는 길이 아닌, 현재 귀하의 인식과 가장 일치하는 항목에 ✔표를 해주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나는 상사의 업무 추진 방식에 만족한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 나는 상사의 업무 수행과 관련된 조언에 대해 만족한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 나는 업무를 수행함에 있어 보람을 느낀다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나는 전반적인 승진 기회에 대해 만족한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 업무 성과를 고려할 때 나의 급여 수준은 적당하다고 생각한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 유사 업무를 수행하고 있는 사람들과 비교할 때, 나는 더 나은 대우를 받고 있는 편이라고 생각한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. 다음 질문들의 귀하의 이직 의도에 대한 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 읽고 귀하가 바람직하다고 생각하는 길이 아닌, 현재 귀하의 인식과 가장 일치하는 항목에 ✔표를 해주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나는 현 직장을 떠날 생각을 하고 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 나는 구직 활동에 나설 의사가 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 나는 실제로 이직을 준비 중이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. 다음 질문들은 귀하의 고용안정성에 대한 문항들입니다. 각 문항을 읽고 귀하가 바람직하다고 생각하는 곳이 아닌, 현재 귀하의 인식과 가장 일치하는 항목에 ✔ 표를 해주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나는 내가 다니고 싶은 만큼 현 직장의 오래 다닐 수 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 나의 현 직장은 나에게 퇴직 압력을 가하지 않을 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 회사의 사정이 안 좋아지면 내 자리는 위험해질 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나는 현 직장에서 내가 원하는 한 계속해서 근무할 수 있다고 확신한다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 내가 원하면 현 직장에서 계속 근무할 수 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 만약 내가 맡은 직무가 사라진다면 현 직장은 나에게 다른 직무를 제공할 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 회사의 경제 사정에 관계없이 나는 현 직장에서 계속 근무할 수 있을 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 현 직장에서 나의 고용은 보장되어 있다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 내가 만약 현 직무를 그만두어야한다면 나는 현 직장에서 다른 직무를 찾을 수 있을 것이다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 나의 고용은 보장되어 있지 않다.</td>
<td>①</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. 일과 관련된 요소(예: 직장 내 인간관계, 직무 적성, 보수 등)와 일과 관련되지 않은 요소(예: 개인의 취미)를 모두 고려한 후에, 아래의 문항에 대해 가장 일치하는 항목에 ✔ 표를 해주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 아니다</th>
<th>아니다</th>
<th>대체로 아니다</th>
<th>대체로 그렇다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 나는 현 직장에 예차이 있다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 지금의 조직을 떠나는 것은 힘들다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 나는 현 직장에 매우 불임해 있다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나는 현 직장에 유대감을 느낀다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 나는 일하고 있는 직장을 가볍게 떠날 수 없다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 현 직장을 떠나는 것은 쉬운 일이다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 나는 현 직장과 긴밀하게 연결되어 있다.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>②</td>
<td>③</td>
<td>④</td>
<td>⑤</td>
<td>⑥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. 귀하의 인적사항에 대한 간단한 질문드립니다. 각 질문은 통계적인 분석을 위해 사용되므로 한 문장도 빼짐없이 솔직하게 응답해주시기 바랍니다.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 성별</td>
<td>① 남 ( ) ② 여 ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 출생년도</td>
<td>( ) 년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 결혼관계</td>
<td>① 미혼 ( ) ② 기혼 ( ) ③ 기타 ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 입사년도</td>
<td>( ) 년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 일평균 근무시간 (외근, 야근 포함)</td>
<td>( ) 시간</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 학력</td>
<td>① 고졸 ( ) ② 전문대졸 ( ) ③ 대졸 ( ) ④ 대학원졸 ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 응답자 성함</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 본 연구자는 절대로 개인정보 및 응답 내용을 다른 사람 또는 조직과 공유하지 않을 것을 약속드립니다. 따라서 곧 응답해주시기를 부탁드립니다.
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