

ORGANISATIONAL PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEE TURNOVER

Lucie Linhartová

Abstract: *Employee turnover is considered as one of the persisting problems of human resource management. This paper explores perception of employee turnover and related issues by managers. The data for this study were collected by three successive surveys. Two of surveys were focused on employees and causes of their disaffection and turnover and following third research was focused on managers. The aim is to identify causes of employee turnover, compare the results of surveys focused on employees and managers and suggest intervention into parts which were identified as controversial. Data were tested by statistical tests and analyses. Results show low usage of information regarding employee turnover among Czech managers. Based on the outputs of analyses it is possible to conclude that turnover is not usually managed in referred organisations and effort to objectively solve negative employee turnover have minimum of referred managers. Intervention to the system of turnover management is suggested with greater emphasis of top management to existing practices, which are very often ignored by the line managers. The findings stimulate changes inside organisations to lower turnover, because even a minimum positive change of conditions bring greater effect than invested effort and costs.*

Keywords: *Turnover, Human Resources, Manager, Organisation, Fluctuation.*

JEL Classification: *J63.*

Introduction

There are several trends occurring within the employment scene that suggest companies need to pay better attention to turnover and retention issues. It is important to note that employee turnover significantly affects overall financial performance [4]. Lowering of negative employee turnover depends mainly on human resources in the specific organisation, on job relations, satisfaction and interest of management in the main reasons, why employees leave [5], [10], [16], [27]. Successful organisations accept responsibility for the atmosphere of the workplace [29]. It has been acknowledged that employees rarely leave their job position, when they feel confident and their needs and wishes are satisfied, even when a better job was offered in another organisation. Most of the staff prefers stability [8], [19], [20]. Factors which contribute to employee turnover have to be recognised and an organisation has to develop strategies to overcome them [4]. The reasons for employee turnover can be eliminated just by its detection.

1 Statement of a problem

Employee turnover can significantly affect the financial performance of an organisation [4]. A general approach to calculate employee turnover cost is to use 50%

to 200% of an employee's annual salary [8], [12], [19], [26], [27], [29]. Reducing employee turnover depends on the total work environment for employees [16]. The organisations that achieve the most dramatic reductions in turnover and maintain those lower levels are usually the ones where the top executive or owner makes it a priority [6]. Managers do not appear ready to change their traditional ideas in relation to disaffection or turnover of their subordinate staff [5], [19], [26]. The majority of managers indicate remuneration as the main reason of employee turnover (80% - 98% of managers). Employees indicate to the contrary. 80% to 90% of employees leave their job position for different reasons, other than remuneration [6], [7]; [8].

Employee retention is a challenge since millennial employees in particular, change jobs frequently [16]. Employees are missing future certainty [7], [19], [20], [25]. This leads to the first impulse to think about leaving a job position, to remove this dissonance. A missing strategy, lack of communication and information about company future growth, unforeseen effects predominating in the organisation, lack of quality, ethics, resources, promotion and development all have negative impacts on certainty [3], [17], [19], [20]. Employee-friendly organisations that value, empower, recognise, enable, provide feedback and fairly pay their employees will not have a recruiting or an employee turnover problem [16], because interpersonal relationships and a sense of belonging are two of the main human needs [10], [20], [21], [22], [23], [28]. The ability of an organisation to handle employees and managers equally and the possibility to have time for personal life (part-time employment etc.) fosters employee loyalty [5], [19]. Employees need is also to be recognised in their job positions. The role and position in an organisation also have significant impacts on the personal life of an employee [10], [20]. Inputs and impulses, from staff should be reviewed and implemented, if possible [10], [20]. On the other hand, meetings which are not related to specific objectives, issues, timing and persons are waste of time and leads to employee disaffection [3], [17], [19], [20]. Corporate culture constitutes a significant factor for employee satisfaction. The management style and organisation of workload influence the work life of the employee every day, and it is necessary to satisfy employee expectations [1], [7], [9]. Other than specific factors relating to employee disaffection are previous significant experiences of employee, ideas, way of perception and personality. Expectations of the job position are constantly reviewed and evaluated, and the employee decides whether it is according to his/her expectation or not, and to what extent [7], [10], [19], [20].

2 Methods

The aim of this article is to compare results of primary surveys focused on employee turnover by employees and managers to find differences in perception of human resource management practices. All outputs of surveys will be test by statistical tests and analyses. Firstly, reasons of employee turnover will be identified. Secondly, the article presents problematic areas within the organisational environment that trigger employee turnover. Using a sample of managers, the partial goal is to make proposals about how to eliminate unsuitable practices, which were found using the background information from surveys.

The data for the evaluation of reasons for employees' leaving of their jobs has been collected in quantitative surveys by means of questionnaire investigation. One additional research focus on managers took a part of the whole study to compare views of both parts of work process. Employees were surveyed to find hidden reasons to leave the organisation and organisations were surveyed to see, how they work with employee turnover and if they perceive it as a threat. Both questionnaires focused on employees were completed by 100 employees each (different respondents for the first and second questionnaire) who had already left their jobs. Questioned were also 34 managers, who directly manage at least one employee. The method used for the collection of data in the first survey was CAWI method (computer-assisted web interviewing) and the second, control questionnaire was based on the CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing). The selection of a representative sample of employee population across sectors was carried out by a random selection of telephone numbers, which incorporates the advantages of multilevel random selection [11]. The sample was selected solely for the purposes of the survey and included employees or managers in the age category from 20 to 55 who left their job in the course of the past twelve months. Following an introduction, respondents were included in the survey provided they had satisfied the predefined conditions. Their answers were categorised according to identification questions that formed the first part of the questionnaire. The measurement was based on closed questions with one or several possible answer(s) that had been selected based on the study of literature, documents and other related surveys carried out by the following authors: [7], [15], [24], [19]. In the second survey a semantic differential was applied that permitted the identification of nuances in respondents' attitudes through the questionnaire. Respondents' reactions to target statements and their attitudes to the given matter were restricted by offering a set of several statements [14]. The extremes of the seven-point scale represented bipolar concepts of the evaluation dimension. The third questioning focused on managers used the same topics as it was described for the first and second survey. Special attention is focus on use of information about employee turnover, knowledge of reasons, why employees leave and if organisation takes care about costing of employee turnover and wishes to keep trained employees. Questions were open and managers could speak about the theme. The respondents were found across sectors to create representative sample. The analysis was carried out using the Microsoft Excel 2007 and SPSS programmes. The conclusiveness of the outputs and relationships obtained were supported by the tools of descriptive statistics, the analysis of dispersion, parametric tests and correlation, regression and determination were used to review the outcomes.

Based on literature review determinants of reasons of employee turnover were deducted and main factors constructed. In two successive surveys 29 determinants¹⁷ were used to describe 7 main factors causing employee turnover. Those factors are remuneration, certainty, relationships, recognition, communication, culture and expectations. The factors were confirmed by the method of induction based on the results of the surveys. For reasons of provable clear understanding, the factors were structured as general, analogically to the survey carried out by [13], [18] [2]. The

¹⁷ Statements used by the respondents to characterize the main reasons to leave.

conclusiveness of the outcomes was supported by aggregation and was tested by correlation analysis at the significance level of 0.01; by adding individual tested items the superordinate item and the whole were supported¹⁸. The outcomes indicate a direct and strong dependence between employee dissatisfaction with the identified factors and the decision to leave their work position. The factors were therefore used for further analyses.

3 Problem solving

If personal reasons, such as moving, starting a family, illness, retirement or restarting studies are not taken into account, the causes of turnover can be summarized into the seven factors. Those are remuneration, future certainty, relationships, recognition, communication, organisational culture and expectations. Statistical analysis revealed adequate quality of correlation indicators for all factors, which were compiled by the induction method. Correlation analysis indicated that on a significance level of 0.01 there is a relationship between all elements of the construct.

Results of a survey focused on use of information, rate, time series, reasons and consequences of turnover in organisations are stated in Tab. 1. It is clear that reference sample of organisations do not work with leaving interviews and possibilities, which are hidden in the monitoring of employee turnover.

Tab. 1: Monitoring of turnover in organisations

Workflow	Yes (%)	No (%)
Use of leaving interview	45	55
Retention of results of leaving interviews	55	45
Leaving interview initiated by supervisor	68	32
Costing of employee turnover	65	35
Use of employee turnover rate	45	55
Use of time series of employee turnover	29	71
Individual evaluation of turnover rate for managers/departments	26	74
Comparison of managers/departments	10	90
Use of results and ups downs of employee turnover	26	74
Monitoring of costs and incomes per employee	45	55
Unexpected leaves of employees are common	45	55
Discussion upon comments of leaving employees	97	3
Effort to maintain trained employees	71	29
Average	48	52

Source of data: Author's survey

Organisations tested in a survey use leaving interviews in just 45% of all cases. That implies great reserves in retention management in organisations. Thus, other categories related to monitoring of employee turnover are dependent on using of leaving evaluation form. If an organisation does not work with leaving interviews, it is

¹⁸ Individual items of the construct sustaining final factors were tested separately and their reliability was added up in the whole.

rarely expected that it is deeply interested into retention management, because in such an organisation, the most important tool and information source is not being used for further analyses and results. Results of leaving interviews are saved in organisations in 55%, but their only saved, but nobody works with them and nobody uses its potential (use of leaving interviews and related information is 10% lower than saved ones). If organisations do not use leaving interviews, they lose not just money and time spent on the leaving interviews but also time and cost wasted on formal meeting of employee and supervisor which is meaningless and does not help to one or another. All persons related to this senseless just spent their time with no reason and organisation pay for this wasted time to all participants, which unnecessarily higher personal cost. Referred sample of managers mentioned that leaving interview is usually initiated by supervisor of leaving employee, because of prescription of internal organisation rules. Tab. 1 shows that leaving interview is commonly used in just 68% of monitored organisations, the rest of managers do not use leaving interview and employees leave without getting feedback to the organisation.

Costing of turnover is regarding to the answers of monitored managers used in 65% of organisations. This implies higher awareness of necessity to monitor turnover and its impact to an organisation, but still 35% of organisations do not care about turnover costs and do not have any overview about amount of loses which are caused by this phenomenon. The fact, that organisations rather use costing of turnover but do not pay attention to information from leaving interviews is bewildering. This phenomenon shows that supervisors only formally follow the rules of the organisation but they do not analyse the situation in order to eliminate negative practices and thus lower turnover and its costs. Turnover rate is being used in only 45% of referred managers. This value proof also fact, that 49% of managers does not have any idea about turnover rate in the organisation or department where they work.

Following four monitored items in Tab. 1 (Use of time series of employee turnover, Individual evaluation of turnover rate for managers/departments, Comparison of managers/departments and Use of results and ups downs of employee turnover) follow the overall ignorance of turnover rate in organisations and proof inadequate use of the potential which is hidden in the reports from leaving employees. Time series are used in less than one third of referred organisations. 71% of organisations do not have any overview about changes of turnover or if it for example reaches tolerable or long term maximum or it comes to a situation which need to be intervene. Individual evaluation of departments or managers is used only in 26% of cases, 74% of sample cannot tell, if there are for example only one or a few problematic managers, where intervention into a few persons behaviour could solve the entire situation without need to change of the whole corporate culture or to innovation of organisational processes. Organisations should focus on thorough recognition on real source of problems, because small local change is considerably less expensive than change of the whole or large part of an organisation. The suggestion supports also statement of managers, that individual evaluation of departments or managers are used only in 10% of cases and the vast majority of findings stay unused because result and turnovers claims only 26% of referred organisations. Managers only do their work and follow internal rules with no

insight or knowledge about why are they doing so and results are not used in three quarters of organisations.

Costs-benefit ratio per employee and his/her potential utility and value for organisation as amount of potential loss if organisation would lost that employee, is monitored in 45% of organisations. More than half of firms do not have any view about how and which employees are beneficial and productive to the organisation. Thus it can provoke lack of involvement in recognition if it is better for organisation to dismiss an employee as he/she is no longer beneficial to the organisation and can be easily replace by other more suitable employee if he/she shows an interest of leaving the company or try to convince him/her to stay. Monitoring of cost-benefit ratio is suggested to organisations not just because of turnover and retention decisions, but also to performance management. It is wondering that such useful tool is being used only in half of the organisations.

Managers know their subordinates and pay attention to them only in 50% of cases. 45% of referred managers confirmed, that their employees are leaving job positions suddenly with no warning. Low knowledge of subordinates or disregard to impulses from disaffected employees can be the reason. Contrary, almost all referred managers (97%) stated that they discuss comments with leaving employees. As it is possible to see in Tab. 1, those comments are most probably never used. It is only formal affair, which does not lead to desired change. Survey focused on employees proves such statement. 71% of employees stated that they discussed the real and truthful reasons to leave with their supervisor or other manager in organisation, but in reply there was nothing offered to them what would change the situation and make them stay (in 76%). Yet, it is counterproductive, because 54% of referred employees are open to change their mind during the period of decision of leaving if the inconvenient conditions were changed or eliminated.

Effort to maintain trained employees stated 71% of managers. Percentage is relatively high, but it can only be an attitude, because above mentioned analysis of current situation implies that managers does not know anything about their subordinates, does not monitor reasons of their disaffection and conflict situations, they do not care about their feelings, thus employees are leaving suddenly. On the other hand, employees in 71% of cases stated, that organisation did not try to avoid their leave. Thus it is possible to describe statement of managers that they try to maintain employees as overstated.

Links and deeper understanding of monitored facts which characterised use and work with turnover rate in referred organisations shows Tab. 2. The table shows correlation coefficients between selected statements (the statements are the same as in Tab. 1). Bold are highlighted straight dependencies of variables with the strength of dependence weak till moderate and the whole highlighted field indicates strong or very strong dependence (relation between variables).

Tab. 2: Correlation table of organisational work with employee turnover

	INTE	RESU	SUPE	CALC	RAT	TIM	INDI	COM	USER	COS	UNE	DISC	MAIN
INTER	1,000	0,563	0,072	-0,004	0,218	0,419	0,502	0,141	0,354	-0,433	0,218	0,166	0,152
RESUL	0,563	1,000	0,206	0,140	0,303	0,295	0,387	0,078	0,239	-0,218	0,303	0,201	0,134
SUPER	0,072	0,206	1,000	-0,223	-0,067	-0,167	-0,224	-0,241	-0,224	-0,067	-0,067	-0,126	0,015
CALC	-0,004	0,140	-0,223	1,000	0,402	0,326	0,283	0,243	0,437	-0,140	0,267	-0,135	-0,177
RATE	0,218	0,303	-0,067	0,402	1,000	0,705	0,650	0,361	0,650	-0,303	0,349	-0,201	-0,134
TIME	0,419	0,295	-0,167	0,326	0,705	1,000	0,760	0,512	0,760	-0,295	0,276	-0,285	0,253
INDIV	0,502	0,387	-0,224	0,283	0,650	0,760	1,000	0,555	0,663	-0,239	0,354	0,108	0,215
COMP	0,141	0,078	-0,241	0,243	0,361	0,512	0,555	1,000	0,555	-0,078	-0,078	0,060	0,209
USER	0,354	0,239	-0,224	0,437	0,650	0,760	0,663	0,555	1,000	-0,239	0,057	0,108	0,377
COST	-0,433	-0,218	-0,067	-0,140	-0,303	-0,295	-0,239	-0,078	-0,239	1,000	-0,172	0,166	0,009
UNEXP	0,218	0,303	-0,067	0,267	0,349	0,276	0,354	-0,078	0,057	-0,172	1,000	-0,201	-0,276
DISCU	0,166	0,201	-0,126	-0,135	-0,201	-0,285	0,108	0,060	0,108	0,166	-0,201	1,000	0,285
MAINT	0,152	0,134	0,015	-0,177	-0,134	0,253	0,215	0,209	0,377	0,009	-0,276	0,285	1,000

Source of data: Author's survey

3.1 Comparison of factors affecting staff turnover: view of employees and organisation

Clear comparison of perception of problematic factors related to employee turnover shows Tab. 3. Analysis was compiled by the rate of agreement or satisfaction with concrete attribute by managers (organisational representatives) and employees. Tab. 3 shows differences in use of practices by management and the situation perceived by employees. It is possible to summarize, that employees are very tolerant to organisational practices, although support by managers is significantly lower.

Tab. 3: Comparison of employees and managers

Factor	Practices	Agree/satisfaction(%)		d _i	Regression coefficient
		Managers	Employees		
Recognition	Talent promoting	57	64	7	1,25537
	Independent work of experts	42	46	4	
Communication	Directive	36	53	17	
	Discussion	64	60	4	
Culture	Autocratic	8	19	11	
	Democratic/team	87	71	16	
Remuneration	Salary	23	42	19	
	Benefits	18	44	26	
Future certainty	Stimulation by future certainty	18	61	43	
	Development	45	46	1	
Relationships	Team	60	70	10	
	Hierarchical relation	36	53	17	
Expectation	Clear expectations	55	65	10	
	Specific requirements	67	62	5	
Average		44	54	13,5	

Source of data: Author's survey

Average values reflecting the positive value of difference prove lower support of managers and organisation compare to the overall perception of employees. Referred managers support their employees in average in 44%, referred employees perceive support of an organisation (or feel satisfied) in 10% more than what is equal to support by the organisation. Thus, employees have optimistic expectations. Average difference between managers and employees point of view is 13.5%. Although the perceived support is higher than documented support, overall it is possible to summarize that

great part of employees is disaffected (in average 46%). They feel underestimated; perceive lack of evaluation and growth. Those employees are a threat for an organisation in the sense of high turnover rate. Considering higher subjectively perceived good organisational conditions by employees, even a little change made by the organisation to improve organisational practices leads to proportionately higher positive evaluation of work atmosphere by employees, as proved by regression coefficient. When a factor is improved by organisation by one unit, employees' expectation increase by more than one unit (1.255). Stated findings stimulate changes inside organisations in order to lower employee turnover, because even a minimum positive change of conditions bring greater effect than effort and costs to eliminate inconvenient practices.

One of the lowest differences in perception shows factor of recognition. Employees shown higher level of satisfaction in both of observed comparable attributes, nevertheless differences reaches 7% in Talent promoting and just 4% in possibility of Independent work of experts. Support of talents by managers is above average (57%), which was proved also by employees, who perceived possibility to growth in 64%. Low difference in this case show lack of possibility to intervention by organisation (unit change of condition will lead only to a little more than unit improvement). It can be also caused by overestimation of attributes by managers. Independent work is supported bellow average in referred organisations, as it was found in the analysis of managers who confirmed that organisations ensure strict corporate culture, directive communication and directive allocation of tasks. Employees see support to independent work almost at the lowest level of all tested attributes. Amount of employees, who support such statement, is deep bellow average (46%). Organisations have a plenty of possibilities for improvement, but as it is possible to conclude from small differences, employees themselves do not expect any change leading to better conditions.

Factor of communication has shown, that managers devise better about organisational situation. Directive communication is being used by meaning of managers only in 36% of cases, but employees see it as dominant in 53% of organisations they have worked for. Difference coefficient is much higher than it was in previous factor, it reaches 17%. Such as managers expected too optimistic scenario in case of directive communication, use of free discussion was also overestimated by managers compare to the employees' opinion. Referred sample of managers stated, that discussion is used in 64% of cases, but employees shown completely opposite attitude, difference is in this case negative. Common use of discussion is by meaning of employees only 60%, the rest of employees is disaffected with communication in organisation and consider it only as one direction from the top down. In that case a serious risk for organisation has shown up, because managers do not see the problem, which is seriously rising and employees perceive it as impulse to leave the organisation. Employees do not perceive factor of communication better, than the organisation itself, which is common in output of other factors.

Corporate culture is, such as communication, overestimated by managers. Managers stated, that autocratic style of management is not commonly used (only in

8% of organisations, where it can be necessary so it is not possible to eliminate it). Employees see it as dominant in 19% of organisations. This disproportion could be caused by distortion of data, because more employees were surveyed and so more of them could work in such kind of organisation. If this proportion has nothing in common with the results, summary managers treat employees poorly and inappropriately, but managers unfortunately do not realize it and such situation leads to wide disaffection among staff and possible unexpected leaves. This phenomenon is supported by directive way of dealing with employees in organisation, directive task assignment and communication, which is perceived better by managers, than what it seem to be from the employees' point of view. Again, referred sample of managers evaluated better than employees rate of use democratic or team style of management. This was stated by 87% of managers, but only 71% of employees. The difference is negative and the highest of all attributes.

Remuneration is evaluated better by employees than managers. Just 23% of organisations are focused on stimulating of employees by financial salaries. Managers stated, that their priority is firstly quality and than people. Anyway, 42% of employees are still satisfied with salaries. This percentage in deep bellow average, excluded autocratic style of management it reaches the lowest satisfaction of all attributes. Risk of unexpected leaves of employees is quite high (58% of employees are thinking about dismissal), as proved by all other results and conclusions in survey focused on employees. Every time a reason to leave was analysed, remuneration took the first place. Benefits are very often seen as inappropriate, unused or inadequate. Tab. 3 shows the reason why. Managers do not pay attention to benefits and its structure; benefits are used and supported only by 18% of organisations.

Factor of future certainty is overall positively perceived by employees, but closer look is not so consistent. A total of 61% of employees feel sufficient certainty in organisation, although managers stated, that they inform employees about situation in organisation and its future plans only in 18% of cases. It is obvious, that although the difference is quite deep (43%), employees are very stable. Possible turnover threat is 39% of employees. Support of future growth and possible promotion did not reach such optimistic values. Possible growth see only 46% of surveyed employees; most of them (54%) do not have any opportunity to grow on their job position and thus think about change of job position to another. Remarkable is the fact, that managers stated possibility to grow in 45%. Difference is just 1%. In that case support is perceived almost equal to the real situation.

Relationships were recognized as good (70% of employees stated, that relationships in team are good, although managers had the same impression in 60% of cases). Problem occurred while employees were asked for evaluation of relationships across hierarchic levels in organisation. A total of 19% of employees left their job position just because of problematic relationships with his/her supervisor. Tab. 3 shows support of hierarchic relationships by managers in 36%, employees perceive it in 53%. Quite high percentage of employees is threatened by turnover and the problem lies especially in the relationships between supervisor and subordinate and especially in large companies, where employees marked relationships as impersonal, demotivative, with

lack of communication about tasks and projects, feedback and consultations are limited.

Factor of expectations is evaluated by managers and employees relatively positive. There are no big differences and contradictions. Employees perceive higher rate of clear expectations (65%) about job positions than managers (55%). This phenomenon documents clearer ideas of employees about what they expected as job description than how managers think about detail job description. Specific requirements supported by managers seem to be overestimated and inadequate, because employees choose rate of concrete requirements by 5% lower than managers (67%). Still the fact is that employees react usually after impulse of unfilled expectations. Although only 30% of employees are disaffected, the impulse is so strong that it leads to lowering of work performance, demotivation or straight to turnover. Listed 30% of employees are very clear-cut in their opinions and thus are a high risk for the organisation.

Conclusion

Results of show considerable ignorance of referred sample of managers about turnover (in average 52% of organisations do not analyse employee turnover) in their organisations and those organisations are limited by vasting of information about potential problems and its solving. If turnover rate is monitored, it is usually just because of internal rules of the organisation, and managers in most of the cases do not pay attention to fill such rules and they work with interviews and other values just formally without any usable output or solving of the situation and results, which can help to decrease negative rate of turnover and cost saving.

Analysis of practical use of employee turnover rates in organisations revealed overview of structure and relations between organisational practices used to monitor employee satisfaction and disaffection which leads to turnover. Relations between monitored practices in organisations give us four possible approaches to employee turnover. Firstly, managers are monitoring employee turnover only formally, to follow internal organisational rules. They interview employees as requested, save the results, but nobody use them or analyse them and it does not affect consequential turnover rate. Secondly attitude is characterized by deeper analysis of results of leaving interviews, address comments, time series analyses and solving of attitudes of single managers or departments in order to eliminate negative turnover which was already found in organisation. Thirdly, a group of organisation profiled from those, who are trying to avoid negative turnover rate by the deep knowledge analysed from leaving interviews and employees' comments and impulses, following time series and other analyses and tests to apply the results. Fourthly, group of organisations (which is relatively large – in average 52% of all referred organisations) does not use leaving interviews or any other monitoring of employee turnover at all. Summary, turnover is not usually managed in referred organisations and effort to objectively solve negative employee turnover have only minimum of referred managers. Thus, intervention to the system of turnover management is suggested together with greater emphasis of top management to already existing practices, which are very often ignored by the line managers. Stated findings stimulate changes inside organisations in order to lower

employee turnover, because even a minimum positive change of conditions bring greater effect than effort and costs to eliminate inconvenient practices. When a factor is improved by organisation by one unit, employees' expectation increase by more than one unit (1.255).

Acknowledgement

This contribution is a follow-up to the research project of the Internal Grant Agency (IGA) of the Czech University of Life Sciences in Prague, Registration Number 201011140016 - Factors Affecting Staff Turnover.

References

- [1] ARMSTRONG, M. *Řízení lidských zdrojů : Nejnovější trendy a postupy*. Praha : Grada Publishing, 2007. ISBN 978-80-247-1407-3.
- [2] BENET-MARTINEZ, V.; JOHN, O. P. Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1998, 75, 729-750.
- [3] BĚLOHLÁVEK, F. *Jak vést a motivovat lidi*. Brno : Computer Press, 2008. ISBN 978-80-251-2235-8.
- [4] BOWES, B.J. *Legacy Bowes Group* [online]. 2010 [cit. 2010-06-30]. A Competitive Employee Market Compels Companies to Manage High Turnover. Dostupné z WWW:
<http://legacybowesgroup.com/component/content/article/43-retention/183-a-competitive-employee-market-compels-companies-to-manage-high-turnover.html>.
- [5] BRANHAM, L. *7 skrytých důvodů, proč zaměstnanci odcházejí z firem*. Praha : Grada, 2009. ISBN 978-80-247-2903-9.
- [6] BRANHAM, L. Employees often depart because they're pushed. *Kansas City Star*. 2005, 5.
- [7] BRANHAM, L. Employee Retention Requires More Than Good Benefits. *Kansas City Star*. 2006, 6.
- [8] CIPD - Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. *Fluktuace a retence zaměstnanců*. Personalista [online]. 2004, n. 7, [cit. 2010-06-07]. Dostupný z WWW:
<http://www.personalista.cz/index.php?ID=33&basket=b78c3e42f202e5f773f9fa5074e52209>.
- [9] COLLINS, J. *Good to Great*. London : Random House Business Books, 2001. ISBN 9780712676090.
- [10] DEIBLOVÁ, M. *Motivace jako nástroj řízení*. Praha : Linde, 2005. 126 s. ISBN 80-902105-8-9.
- [11] DISMAN, M. *Jak se vyrábí sociologická znalost*. Praha : Karolinum, 2008. ISBN 978-80-246-0139-7.
- [12] ERTL, J. PersonAll consulting [online]. 2005 [cit. 2010-03-28]. *Fluktuace – diagnóza a léčba*. Dostupné z WWW: http://www.personall.cz/Fluktuace_I.html.

- [13] GOSLING, S. D; RENTFROW, P. J; SWANN, W. B. A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*. 2003, 37, s. 504–528.
- [14] HAYES, N. *Základy sociální psychologie*. Praha : Portál, 1998. ISBN 80-7178-198-3.
- [15] HACKMAN, J. R., OLDHAM, G. R. Work redesign. *Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley*. 1980.
- [16] HEATHFIELD, S.M. Keep Your Best: Retention Tips : Retention in an Improving Job Market. *About.com : Small Business Information* [online]. 2010, [cit. 2010-06-30]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://humanresources.about.com/cs/retention/a/turnover.htm>.
- [17] HORALÍKOVÁ, M; ZUZÁK, R. *Talenty v podnikové praxi*. PEF ČZU, 2005. ISBN 80-213-1292-0.
- [18] JOHN, O. P.; NAUMANN, L. P.; SOTO, C. J. Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York : Guilford Press, 2008. s. 114-158.
- [19] KATCHER, B. L. – SNYDER, A. *30 důvodů, proč zaměstnanci nenávidí své vedoucí*. Brno : Computer Press, 2009. ISBN 978-80-251-1922-8.
- [20] KOCIANOVÁ, R. *Personální činnosti a metody personální práce*. Praha : Grada, 2010. ISBN 978-80-247-2497-3.
- [21] MASLOW, A. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*. 1943. 50, s. 370-396.
- [22] MCCLELLAND, D.C. *Human Motivation*. 1. New York : Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1987. 609 s. ISBN 0-521-36951-7.
- [23] MCGREGOR, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York : McGraw-Hill, 2006. 361 s. ISBN 0-07-146222-8.
- [24] MEYER, J.P., ALLEN, N.J. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1991. 1, s. 61-89.
- [25] PAUKNEROVÁ, D. *Psychologie pro ekonomy a manažery*. Praha : Grada, 2006. ISBN 80-247-1706-9.
- [26] PricewaterhouseCoopers. Saratoga - Human capital measurement. [online]. 2006 - 2010, 2010 [cit. 2010-06-01]. Dostupné z WWW: <http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/hr-management-services/saratoga-global-human-capital-measurement-benchmarking-services.jhtml>.
- [27] REIß, Ch. *Fluktuation*. [online]. 2. 1. 2008 [cit. 2010-03-30]. Dostupný z WWW: <http://www.personaler-online.de/typo3/nc/personalthemen/suche-in-artikeln/detailansicht/artikel/fluktuation.html>.
- [28] VROOM, V.H. *Manage people, not personnel : motivation and performance appraisal*. Boston : Harvard Business Review, 1990. 271 s. ISBN 0-87584-228-3.

[29] ZAHORSKY, D. Fighting Employee Turnover Costs : Reduce Employee Turnover. *About.com : Small Business Information* [online]. 2010, 1, [cit. 2010-06-16]. Dostupný z WWW:
<http://sbinformation.about.com/od/hiringfiring/a/reduceturnover.htm>.

Contact Address

Ing. Lucie Linhartová

University of Life Sciences in Prague, Faculty of Economics and Management,
Department of Management

Kamýcká 129, 165 21, Prague, Czech Republic

Email: linhartoval@pef.czu.cz

Phone number: +420 724 957 773

Received: 29. 09. 2011

Reviewed: 25. 11. 2011

Approved for publication: 16. 01. 2012