
Published by: Abhinav Publication

***Abhinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in
Commerce & Management***

**THE POTENTIAL CAUSE OF EMPLOYEE TURNOVER:
IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR**

Dr. Ashutosh Shukla

Associate Professor and Head (Management), Indian Naval
Academy, Ezhimala, India
Email : ashutoshwshukla@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT

The rate of change in the working staff of a concern during a definite period is called Employee Turnover. It signifies the shifting of the work force into and out of an organization. It is a measurement of inarticulate employee unrest due to loss of trust and confidence in immediate managers, lack of clarity about expectations of immediate supervisor, lack of freedom/opportunity to the employee to speak his or her mind freely, lack of freedom/opportunity for talent & skill utilization, public humiliation, undervaluing employee due to employer failing to provides the right immediate supervisor which in turn leading to employee turnover and loss to the organization in many ways.

Keywords: Employee Turnover; Employee Retention;, Immediate Supervisor; Exit Interview; Job Rotation

INTRODUCTION

Employee retention is critical to the long term health and success of organization. Employee retention matters. Organizational issues such as training, time & investment, lost knowledge, insecure coworkers and a costly candidate search aside, failing to retain a key employee is costly. Immediate supervisor readily agree that retaining key employees ensures success of organization. If immediate supervisors know this fact so well, why do they behave in ways that so frequently encourage great employees to quit their jobs?

In spite of Better Pay, Better Profile, Employee friendly Human Resource Policy, Modern office, and other required necessary facilities, GOOD PEAOPLE DO LEAVE ORGANISATIONS, WHY?

The present study is of exploratory nature rather than an experimentative study or a historical research, conducted with the objective of identifying the potential cause of employee turnover and to find out whether there is any relation between employee turnover and immediate supervisor.

The answer lies in one of the largest studies undertaken by the Gallup Organization. The study surveyed over a million employees & 80,000 managers and was published in a book titled "First Break All the Rules".

It came up with surprising findings, if you are losing good people look to their immediate supervisor. More than any other single reason, he is the reason employee stay and develops in the organization and he's the reason why they quit.

By using data obtained from the Saratoga Institute, California, which is a division of Price Waterhouse Coopers and is considered to be the world leader in third-party exit interviewing and employee commitment surveying Leigh Branham, the author of the book "The 7 Hidden Reasons Employee Leave" has also validated this reason among other 6 hidden reasons why employee leave.

The loss of trust and confidence in Immediate Managers occur for the very same reasons that it happens in the case of Senior Managers. These are lack of competence, lack of a genuine caring attitude towards employees, inability to trust and have confidence in their employees, and inconsistencies between their actions and their professed good intentions or the professed values of the organization. Employees want caring yet capable leaders. They want them to have a clear and achievable vision, confidence in their capacity to achieve the vision, the ability to transform the vision into a workable strategy and plan, the right team of people in place to carry it out, and the ability to follow through with persistence to achieve the plan without compromising on honesty, integrity and consideration for others. Employees want to be assured of their jobs and future prospects. If the immediate supervisor cannot inspire such confidence, employees may leave and join other organizations.

Lack of Clarity about Expectations

Management thinkers agree that a motivated employee knows clearly what is expected from him every day at work, but immediate supervisor's changing expectations keep people on edge and create unhealthy stress. They rob the employee of internal security and peace and make the employee feel unsuccessful. Job rotation is fruitful for both the employee and the organization but there should be a specific framework within which people clearly know what is expected from them. Frequent employee complaints against immediate supervisor center on these following areas:

- Lack of clarity about expectations of immediate supervisor,
- Lack of feedback about performance,
- Failure to provide a framework within which the employee perceives he can succeed.

Quality of Supervision

The quality of the supervision an employee receives is critical to employee retention. People leave C.E.O's, Managers and Immediate Supervisors more often than they leave job or the organizations. It is not enough that the supervisor is well-liked or a nice person, starting with clear expectations of the employee, the Immediate Supervisor has a critical role to play in retention. Anything the immediate supervisor does to make an employee feel unvalued will contribute to turnover.

According to a survey conducted by Fortune magazine some years ago found that nearly 75% of employees have suffered at the hands of difficult immediate supervisor. Beyond a point, an employee's primary need has less to do with money, and more to do with how he's treated and how valued he feels. Much of this depends directly on the immediate manager and yet bad immediate supervisor seem to happen to good people everywhere. Of all the workplace stressors, a bad immediate supervisor is possibly the worst, directly impacting the emotional health and productivity of employees.

Talent & Skill Utilization

Talent & skill utilization is another environmental factor key employee seeks in workplace. A motivated employee wants to contribute to work areas outside of his specific job description. How many people could contribute for more than they currently do? Immediate supervisor need to know their skills, talent and experience and take the time to tap into it.

Lack of Freedom / Opportunity to the Employee to Speak

Lack of freedom / opportunity to the employee to speak his or her mind freely with immediate supervisor is another key factor in employee turnover. Does the immediate supervisor solicit ideas and provide an environment in which subordinates are comfortable providing feedback? If so, employees offer ideas, feel free to comment to continuous improvement. If not, they bite their tongue or find themselves constantly "in trouble" until they leave.

Mr. Ajay who has recently joined an educational institute as an Asst. Professor after eight years of industry experience in Human Resource field at managerial level was shocked to see the discipline level in the Institute. He understands that it is not possible for the management to implement the same alone. He understands that it should be a collective endeavor of all the employees to implement discipline in Institute. So he started checking the acts of indiscipline among students. Though checking indiscipline among students is also an important function of a faculty but his act was questioned by an immature, inexperienced and reckless Dy. Director of the institute. The Dy. Directors point was – “Who has asked you to do this”? Mr. Ajay thought to explain McClelland Theory to the manipulative Dy. Director but kept his mouth shut.

One day Mr. Ajay got an opportunity to interact with Dy. Director, and he tried to convince the immediate supervisor by using ulterior transactions that if the faculty is disciplined then only he can teach discipline to others. As a result of transactions the Dy. Director who always uses to come late started coming in time to the Institute. Mr. Ajay dared to speak up his mind but how many employees dare to open up their mouth.

Public Humiliation

As per the findings of a survey conducted by me among randomly selected sample of 100 non managerial employees of a private company engaged in manufacturing of Mild Steel in Meghalaya, using interviewing method, states that of all the abuses, employees find public humiliation the most intolerable. The first time when an employee is humiliated by immediate supervisor, an employee may not leave the organization, but the act plants a thought in the grey cells of the employee. When the act is repeated second time, it supplies blood to the thought and the thought gets strengthened. The third time act of public humiliation by the immediate supervisor compels the employee to look for another job. When the employees can not express their anger openly, they do so by passive aggression. They slow down their work and they do only what they are told to do and no more. They avoid giving crucial important information to immediate supervisor. Different immediate managers harass employees in different ways – by being too autocratic, too free rein, too critical but they forget that employees are not the fixed assets of the organization but they are just like working capital of the organization. When the act of public humiliation goes on for long an employee will quit often over trivial issues.

Undervaluing Employee

Number of reasons compels an employee to leave job like- better opportunities, better salary, better profile, better organizational culture, etc. but many who leave would have stayed- had it not been for one man i.e. immediate supervisor constantly telling them “I can find hundreds like you”.

Lack of Competent Immediate Supervisor

When an employee is failing at work, we ask questions. The HR Department finds the answers in terms of tools, training, temperament or talent. The easiest way to solve the problem is to first look at the immediate supervisor who can be the main cause of the employee failure. Most frequently, even if the employee knows what he is supposed to do, but he is unable to do the same because of the poly tricks of the immediate supervisor. The HR Department can provide the best tools and training but failing to provide the right immediate supervisor compels the employee to move to an employer who provides the right supervisor.

Effects of Turnover

Every employee who leaves an organization becomes its ambassador for worse. Plus, there is the cost of finding a replacement. The cost of training a replacement. The cost of not having someone to do the job in the meantime the loss of clients and contacts the person had with the industry. The loss of morale in co-workers & insecurity in them. The loss of trade secrets this employee may now share with others. And not only this, the loss of companies reputation, which is irreparable.

Jack Welch of GE once said “Any company trying to compete must figure out a way to engage the mind of every employee. Much of company’s value lies between the ears of its employees. If it’s bleeding talent, it’s bleeding value.

CONCLUSION

There are many reasons for employee turnover like lack of recognition, lack of job satisfaction, limited career advancement, poor management practices and a non functional work culture but it isn’t the 100th blow that knocks a good man down. It’s the 99 that went before. The immediate supervisor believe that it is the “Pull Factor” that influences an employee’s decision to leave his job, but they fail to understand that the “Push Factor” are the initial triggers that open the gateway to the “Pull” of outside opportunities and that they are the main thrust and potential energy of that “Push Factor”. If they do some introspection the problem of employee turnover can be contained to very large extent.

REFERENCES

1. Arnold, H.J. and Feldman, D.C. 1982. A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3): 350-360.
2. Aryee, S., Wyatt, T. and Min, M.K. 1990. Antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intentions among professional accountants in different employment Settings in Singapore. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 5: 603-609.
3. Blau, G. and Boal, K. 1989. Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, 15(1): 115-127.
4. Bluedorn, A.C. 1982. A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35(2): 135- 153.
5. Campbell, D.T. and Campbell, K.M. 1997. Employee turnover in Singapore: Some interim findings”. Working paper RPS #97-28. Faculty of Business Administration, National University of Singapore.
6. Cotton, J.L. and Tuttle, J.F. 1986. Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1): 55-70.
7. Dailey, R.C. and Kirk, D.J. 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to turnover. *Human Relations*, 45(3): 305-317.
8. Koh, H.C. and Goh, C.T. 1995. An analysis of the factors affecting the turnover intention of non-managerial clerical staff: A Singapore study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(1).
9. Michaels, C.E. and Spector, P.E. 1982. Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67:53-59.
10. Mobley, W.H., Griffeth, R.W., Hand, H.H. and Meglino, B.M. 1979. Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86: 493-522.
11. Moorman, R.H. 1991. Relationship between organizational justice and behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5): 845-855.
12. Shaw, D.J., John, E.D., Jenkins, G.D., Jr. and Nina, G. 1998 An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(5): 511-525.
13. Shore, L.M. and Martin, H.J. 1989. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 42(7): 625-638.
14. Tett, R.P. and Meyer, J.P. 1993. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2): 259-293.
15. Wong, C.S., Chun, H. and Law, K.S. 1996. Casual relationship between attitudinal antecedents to turnover. *Academy of Management BEST PAPERS PROCEEDINGS 1995*, 342-346, Vancouver, British Columbia Canada.