Rosen Faculty Scholarship and Creative Works   Rosen College of Hospitality Management

Interpersonal Trust, Organizational Culture and Turnover Intention in Hotels: A Cross Level perspective

Ahmet Ozturk
University of Central Florida, Ahmet.Ozturk@ucf.edu

Murat Hancer

Yao-Chin Wang

Original Citation

INTERPERSONAL TRUST, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, AND TURNOVER INTENTION IN HOTELS: A CROSS-LEVEL PERSPECTIVE

AHMET BULENT OZTURK,* MURAT HANCER,† AND YAO-CHIN WANG†

*Rosen College of Hospitality Management, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, USA
†School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA

The aim of the present study was to understand the influence of interpersonal trust and organizational culture on employees' turnover intention. The data of the study were collected from 252 hotel employees in Turkey. Study results showed that both affective trust and cognitive trust were negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intention. Furthermore, clan organizational culture, adhocracy organizational culture, and market organizational culture were also negatively related to turnover intention of hotel employees. However, the results indicate that hierarchy organizational culture does not have a significant impact on hotel employees' turnover intention. The findings provide valuable theoretical and practical implications and suggestions for future research.

Key words: Interpersonal trust; Organizational culture; Hotel employee; Turnover intention

Introduction

An employee's decision to leave the organization is an employee behavior that has received significant scholarly attention. The potential consequences for both the organization and the individual have motivated researchers to identify the factors that affect employee turnover (Anderson & Milkovich, 1980). Based on previous studies about the antecedents of turnover intention, factors influencing turnover intention at the individual level, such as age, ability, satisfaction, and marital status, are mostly shaped by employees themselves. On the other hand, factors at the team and organizational levels are more likely to transfer into human resource policies or leadership skills for the organization to strategically reduce turnover intention (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; Jiang, Liu, McKay, Lee, & Mitchell, 2012; McEvoy & Cascio, 1985; Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007; Steel & Ovalle, 1984; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Zimmerman, 2008).

For managers and employees, developing and maintaining relationships of trust is important for sustaining individual and organizational effectiveness. According to Lewicki, Tomlinson, and Gillespie (2006),

the trustor (the focal decision maker) must decide how much to cooperate with the trustee (the receiver of the trust) and is assumed to make this decision rationally. From this perspective, the trustee's intention, motives, and trustworthiness are inferred from the frequency and level of cooperative choices made. (p. 995)

To provide a productive work environment within organizations, interdependent actors must work together effectively and interpersonal trust between such actors is a determining factor in their success (McAllister, 1995). In addition, researchers have argued that interpersonal trust not only plays an important role in shaping employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance (Mayer & Gavin, 2005), but it also affects employee–manager relationships in organizations (Tzafrir & Dolan, 2004).

Previous studies have found that trust is significantly related to team performance (Mach, Dolan, & Tzafrir, 2010), interpersonal cooperation (McAllister, 1995), team creativity (Tsai, Chi, Grandey, & Fung, 2012), and turnover intention (DeConinck, 2011). Due to the effects of interpersonal trust on team performance, some researchers have also attempted to explore actions in the building of interpersonal trust (Six, Nooteboom, & Hoogendoorn, 2010; Six & Sorge, 2008). Organizational trust has also been studied in the hospitality industry, and researchers have analyzed organizational trust from different perspectives. For instance, in the study of Chathoth, Mak, Sim, Jauhari, and Manaktola (2011), three dimensions of organizational trust (i.e., integrity, commitment, and dependability) were compared across the two samples from the US and India hotel employees to highlight how employees perceive the level of each of the three dimensions across cultures. Hon and Lu (2010) examined the roles cognitive and affective trust play in mediating the relationship between hotel expatriate supervisors and their local employees in China.

As noted by Hartnell, Ou, and Kinicki (2011), organizational culture is also an important construct that affects organizational, group, and individual behavior. In simple terms, organizational culture can be defined as widely shared values and ways of behaving that are common to the organization (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Ogaard, Larsen and Marnburg (2005) stated that "organizational culture has been assumed to have important implications,

not only for the organizational performance, but also for the employees' affective reactions to organizational life" (p.214). Therefore, management should recognize the fundamental dimensions of their organization's culture and its influence on employee-related variables such as commitment, satisfaction, and turnover intention (Lund, 2003).

Several studies have been conducted to analyze organizational culture and its relationship with employee-related variables. For example, Jacobs and Roodt (2008) determined if organizational culture predicts turnover intentions of professional nurses. Devi, Chong, and Lin (2007) examined the relationship between organizational culture and knowledge management in the higher education setting. Mahal (2009) studied the influence of organizational culture and climate on the motivation level of employees. Additionally, recent hospitality studies have also studied organizational culture and its relationship with different constructs. For instance, Asree, Zain, and Razalli (2010) investigated the operations strategy of hotels in order to determine whether the infrastructural aspects of their operational practices (i.e., leadership competency and organizational culture) would affect their responsiveness to their employees and customers. Another study conducted by Hon and Leung (2011) analyzed the effect of three types of cultures (innovative, traditional, and cooperative culture) on employees' creativity by using data obtained from 50 service and hospitality firms in China.

Despite innumerable studies examining employee turnover intention from different perspectives, relatively little research has been conducted to analyze its relationship with interpersonal trust and organizational culture in the hospitality industry. In this study, based on the above arguments, employee turnover intention was examined from a cross-level perspective. For this purpose, interpersonal trust was identified as the main antecedent of turnover intention at the team level and organizational culture was identified as the main antecedent of turnover intention at the organizational level.

The commitment-trust theory proposed by Morgan and Hunt (1994) is the theoretical foundation for this study to set both interpersonal trust and organizational culture as antecedents of turnover intention. Employees' decisions to commit to a relationship with a firm are influenced by both

shared values and trust whereas trust is influenced by shared values (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). In some studies, shared values were studied as foundation of organizational culture (Enz, 1988; Wiener, 1988). Examining the effect of interpersonal trust on turnover intention reveals reasons to explain employee turnover intention at the team level; analyzing the organizational culture as antecedent of employee turnover intention can provide answers from the organizational level. This cross-level perspective provides valuable strategies to hotel managers to reduce employee turnover in their organization.

The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between interpersonal trust and hotel employees' turnover intention?
2. What is the relationship between organizational culture and hotel employees' turnover intention?

Literature Review

Interpersonal Trust and Turnover Intention

Lewis and Weigert (1985) stated

> from a sociological perspective, trust must be conceived as a property of collective units (ongoing dyads, groups, and collectivities), not of isolated individuals. Being a collective attribute, trust is applicable to the relations among people rather than to their psychological states taken individually. (p. 968)

Additionally, interpersonal trust can be separated into cognitive trust and affective trust (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). In cognitive trust, Lewis and Weigert (1985) argued that

> trust is based on a cognitive process which discriminates among persons and institutions that are trustworthy, distrusted, and un-known. In this sense, we cognitively choose whom we will trust in which respects and under which circumstances and we base the choice on what we take to be 'good reasons,' constituting evidence of trustworthiness. (p. 970)

In affective trust, Lewis and Weigert (1985) noted that

> this affective component of trust consists in an emotional bond among all those who participate in the relationship. Like the affective bonds of

friendship and love, trust creates a social situation in which intense emotional investments may be made, and this is why the betrayal of a personal trust arouses a sense of emotional outrage in the betrayed. (p. 971)

Social exchange theory explains the relationship between interpersonal trust and turnover intention. Befu (1977) measured social exchange in the sociocultural context using norms of reciprocity, cultural rules, and strategies. Reciprocity is defined as the actions of people to help and to avoid injuring those who have helped them in the past (Befu, 1977; Gouldner, 1960). Cultural rules are defined as give, take, or return action in a certain situation for a specific relationship (Befu, 1977). The role of cultural rules can shape cognitive trust in interpersonal relationships. Sociocultural context refers to the cultural and social environment in which a model of social exchange is constructed (Befu, 1977). In the service industry, reciprocity is a key factor that shapes trust, cultural rules are tools to practice trust, and sociocultural context is the climate in a service team. Gratitude and affect created through reciprocity can lead to affective trust. Moreover, the process of social exchange involves dynamic developments and implies that high-quality social exchanges should lead to awareness of risk about nonreciprocation and trust (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Jon, 1998). Thus, high interpersonal trust ensures the stable gain of current benefits in a social exchange. The higher the interpersonal trust, the greater the employee benefits and the fewer the costs for employee turnover. To continue to receive benefits through the current social exchange, employees must have high interpersonal trust and low turnover intention.

In testing the relationship between trust and turnover, most studies have shown statistically significant results. Costigan, Insinga, Berman, Kranas, and Kureshov (2012) conducted a four-country study and found that affect-based trust and turnover intention have a negative relationship in Turkey, Poland, and the US, and a U-shaped relationship in Russia. In addition, Hemdi and Nasurdin (2006) conducted an empirical study in Malaysia and found that human resources management (HRM) practices (such as performance appraisal, training and development, and career advancement) can shape interpersonal trust to significantly reduce turnover intention.

Moreover, Dirks and Ferrin (2001) pointed out that trust can predict employees' turnover intention.

Due to the hotel industry's nature, hotel employees sometimes have long working hours and most social interactions occur among employees and managers in the course of daily work. These interactions affect interpersonal trust, which in turn affects employees positively or negatively. The level of interpersonal trust with managers and peers determines the quality of social exchanges in a team. High trust can shape strong social support for employees in stressful work conditions and can also enrich mental resources. In contrast, low trust can result in employees having difficulty in cooperating and accelerate the speed of reductions in mental resources. Thus, high interpersonal trust can ensure that an employee is willing to stay while low trust will generate that employee's intention to leave.

In sum, high interpersonal trust can lead to low turnover intention through social exchange. The higher the interpersonal trust in a team, the lower the employees' turnover intention. High trust ensures predictable benefits through social exchange with other people in a team, making turnover a high-cost behavior. Based on the reasoning outlined here, we hypothesized the followings:

H1: Affective trust is negatively related to turnover intention.
H2: Cognitive trust is negatively related to turnover intention.

Organizational Culture and Turnover Intention

Allaire and Firsirotu (1984) conceptualized organizational culture by four schools of thought:

> for functionalist, culture is an instrumental apparatus by which a person is put in a better position to cope with the concrete specific problems faced in the course of need satisfaction; for structural-functionalist, culture is an adaptive mechanism by which a certain number of human beings are enabled to live a social life as an ordered community in a given environment; for ecological-adaptationist, culture is a system of socially transmitted behavior patterns that serve to relate human communities to their ecological settings; for historical-diffusionist, culture is consisting of temporal, interactive, super-organic and autonomous configurations of forms produced by historical circumstances and processes. (p. 197)

Additionally, Cameron (2008) argued that "the two main disciplinary foundations of organizational culture are sociological (e.g., organizations have cultures) and anthropological (e.g., organizations are cultures)" (p. 3). Cameron (2008) added that "most discussions of organizational culture agree with the idea that culture is a socially constructed attribute of organizations which serves as the 'social glue' binding an organization together" (p. 3).

Organizational culture is measured based on two dimensions (Cameron, 2008). Cameron (2008) explained that

> the framework consists of two dimensions, one that differentiates a focus on flexibility, discretion, and dynamism from a focus on stability, order, and control. The second dimension differentiates a focus on an internal orientation, integration, and unity from a focus on an external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry. (p. 433)

These two dimensions create four types of organizational culture: clan organizational culture (internal maintenance and organic process), adhocracy organizational culture (external positioning and organic process), hierarchy organizational culture (internal maintenance and mechanistic processes), and market organizational culture (external positioning and mechanistic processes) (Cameron & Freeman, 1991). Based on Cameron and Freeman's (1991) study, four types of organizational culture are explained in Table 1.

Applying Ravasi and Schultz's (2006) argument, culture is a "sensegiving function of organizational identities, linking identity construction to the need to provide a coherent guide for how the members of an organization should behave and how other organizations should relate to them" (p. 435). Additionally, Ravasi and Schultz (2006) pointed out that "organizational culture supplies members with cues for making sense of what their organization is about and for 'giving sense' of it as well" (p. 437). Moreover, Sheridan (1992) also found that organizational culture varies among firms and can influence retention across different cultural values. Tepeci and Bartlett (2002) emphasized the importance of organizational culture in the hotel industry for employees to match person–organization fit and evaluate job satisfaction and behavioral intentions. Studies in the hospitality industry have also found significant

Table1
Four Types of Organizational Culture

Type	Dominant Attributes	Leader Style	Bonding	Strategic Emphases
Clan culture	Cohesiveness, participation, teamwork, sense of family	Mentor, facilitator, parent-figure	Loyalty, tradition, interpersonal cohesion	Toward developing human resources, commitment, morale
Adhocracy culture	Creativity entrepreneurship, adaptability, dynamism	Entrepreneur, innovator, risk taker	Entrepreneurship, flexibility, risk	Toward innovation, growth, new resources
Hierarchy culture	Order, rules and regulations, uniformity, efficiency	Coordinator, organizer, administrator	Rules, policies and procedures, clear expectations	Toward stability, predictability, smooth operations
Market	Competitiveness, goal achievement, environment exchange	Decisive, production and achievement oriented	Goal orientation, production, competition	Toward competitive advantage and market superiority

Adapted from Cameron and Freeman (1991).

effects of organizational culture on creativity and motivation (Hon & Leung, 2011) and performance (Asree et al., 2010).

Taken together, four types of organizational culture can help to reduce employee turnover intention; each employs different approaches. The effectiveness of each type of organizational culture in influencing turnover intention will be based on person–organization fit. How good the fit is between a hotel and an employee will dictate how much the employee wants to stay or leave. Thus, empirical examination becomes important to determine which strategy is most effective for hotel employees. Given the above, we hypothesize the following:

H3: Clan organizational culture is negatively related to turnover intention.

H4: Adhocracy organizational culture is negatively related to turnover intention.

H5: Hierarchy organizational culture is negatively related to turnover intention.

H6: Market organizational culture is negatively related to turnover intention.

Methodology

Instrument

This study employed a self-administered, closed-ended questionnaire for data collection. The questionnaire consisted of four parts: interpersonal trust, organizational culture, turnover intention, and demographic characteristics of the respondents. In the first part, interpersonal trust was measured with an 11-item scale (i.e., six items for cognition-based trust and five items for affective-based trust) adapted from McAllister (1995). In the second part, organizational culture was measured by four constructs (clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market) adapted from Cameron and Freeman (1991). Each of the organizational culture constructs was measured by four items. The third part consisted of two items and measured hotel employees' turnover intention. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with all of the items by using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 7 = *strongly agree* to 1 = *strongly disagree*. The last section of the questionnaire gathered the respondents' demographic data, including gender, age, education, and experience in their current hotel and in the hotel industry.

Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the reliability of measurement scales. Values greater than 0.70 were considered to be reliable (Nunnally, 1959). The reliability coefficients for the scales (i.e., interpersonal trust, organizational culture, turnover intention) ranged from 0.79 to 0.88. Considering the minimal acceptable level of alpha coefficient (i.e., 0.70), the scales were reliable and appropriate for use in further analysis.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

Data were collected from 17 five-star hotels in the Aegean region of Turkey selected from the *Hotel and Motel Guide of Turkey*. The researchers sent letters to these hotels explaining the study purpose and inviting their participation. The researchers

then made follow-up telephone calls to the department managers of each hotel to solicit a participation agreement. These efforts resulted in 15 hotels participating in the study.

The researchers mailed or delivered a package with 40 surveys to each hotel's various departments. Department managers agreed to manage the distribution of the questionnaires. Some managers distributed the questionnaires immediately following departmental meetings; others distributed the surveys as they saw employees. Participants' confidentiality and anonymity were ensured by not identifying them by name. In addition, employees were instructed to put the completed surveys in a provided envelope, seal the envelope, and place the sealed envelope in a bigger envelope. Each participant received an explanation of the study and was free to decline to participate. The researchers visited some of the hotels to collect the completed surveys while others mailed the surveys to the researcher's address. The data collection process took 4 weeks. Six hundred questionnaires were distributed and 252 were returned, representing a response rate of 42%.

Results

Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

Most of the respondents were male (67%) and 49% were between the ages of 24 and 29. Thirty-eight percent of the participants had a bachelor's degree and 35% were high school graduates. Among the participants, 32% had 1–3 years of experience in their current hotel and 22% had less than 6 months of experience. Whereas 30% of the participants had 3–5 years of experience in the hotel industry, 21% had 5–10 years of experience in the industry. Twenty-five percent were working in the front office department and 18% were working in the food and beverage department (Table 2).

Factor Analyses

The researchers performed two exploratory factor analyses with varimax rotation method to determine the dimensional structures of interpersonal trust and organizational culture. Only the items with a factor loading of 0.5 or greater were considered for determining the items within each dimension.

Table 2
Sociodemographic Variables

Sociodemographic Variables	n (%)
Gender	
Male	169 (67.1%)
Female	82 (32.5%)
Missing value	1 (0.4%)
Total	252 (100%)
Age	
18–23	73 (28.9%)
24–29	123 (48.9%)
30–35	37 (14.7%)
36–40	9 (3.5%)
41 and older	9 (3.5%)
Missing value	1 (0.4%)
Total	252 (100%)
Education	
High school	89 (35.3%)
Community college	62 (24.6%)
Bachelor	96 (38.1%)
Graduate	2 (0.8%)
Missing value	3 (1.2%)
Total	252 (100%)
Length of service in the current hotel	
Less than 6 months	55 (21.8%)
6 months–1 year	54 (21.4%)
1–3 years	80 (31.7%)
3–5 years	37 (14.7)
5–10 years	13 (5.2%)
More than 10 years	5 (2.0%)
Missing values	8 (3.2%)
Total	252 (100%)
Length of service at the hotel industry	
Less than 6 months	30 (11.9%)
6 months–1 year	29 (11.5%)
1–3 years	39 (15.5%)
3–5 years	76 (30.2%)
5–10 years	53 (21.0%)
More than 10 years	15 (6.0%)
Missing values	10 (4.0%)
Total	252 (100%)
Department	
Front office	64 (25.4%)
Kitchen	25 (9.9%)
Sale	8 (3.2%)
Service	20 (7.9%)
Housekeeping	37 (14.7%)
Food and beverage	44 (17.5%)
Accounting	4 (1.6%)
Maintenance	11 (4.4%)
Security	15 (6.0%)
Other	10 (4.0%)
Missing values	14 (5.6%)
Total	252 (100%)

A total of 11 interpersonal trust attributes from the factor analysis resulted in two factors and explained 69.414% of the variance. The overall significance of the correlation matrix was 0.000 with a Bartlett test of sphericity value of 1981.259. Factor 1 (cognition-based trust) explained 52.5% of the variance; factor 2 (affect-based trust) explained 16.8% of the variance (Table 3).

Factor analysis of the organizational culture items yielded a four-factor model and explained 71.607% of the variance. The overall significance of the correlation matrix was 0.000 with a Bartlett test of sphericity value of 2548.125. Factor 1 (clan) explained 42.1% of the variance, factor 2 (adhocracy) explained 11.8%, factor 3 (hierarchy) explained 10.5%, and factor 4 (market) explained 7.0% of the variance (Table 4).

Regression Analyses

Two multiple regression analyses were conducted on the data to analyze the effect of each dimension derived from the factor analyses on turnover intention. The value of each dimension in the model was the orthogonal factor scores derived from the factor analyses.

The results of regression of the two *interpersonal trust* dimensions against the dependent variable of *intention to turnover* are listed in Table 5. The results indicated that 65% of the variation in *turnover intention* was explained by the model (adjusted $R^2 = 0.065$). Multiple regression analysis indicated that both *cognition-based* and *affect-based trust* had beta coefficients that are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Regression analysis indicated that *affect-based trust* had the strongest negative impact on *turnover intention* (standardized $\beta = -0.210$), followed by *cognition-based trust* (standardized $\beta = -0.168$) (Table 5).

The results of regression of four *organizational culture* dimensions against the dependent variable of *intention to turnover* are listed in Table 6. The results revealed that 82% of the variation in *turnover intention* was explained by the model (adjusted $R^2 = 0.082$). The results of the regression analysis indicated that *clan*, *adhocracy*, and *market* had beta coefficients that are statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). In addition, the results revealed that *clan* had the strongest negative impact on *turnover intention* (standardized $\beta = -0.223$), followed by *adhocracy* (standardized $\beta = -0.172$) and *market* (standardized $\beta = -0.131$). One of the

Table 3

Results of Factor Analysis for Interpersonal Trust

Factors	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Factor 1 (Cognition-based trust)		5.778	52.5
1. I can rely on my executive not to make my job more difficult by careless work.	0.835		
2. Given my executive's track record, I see no reason to doubt his/her competence and preparation for the job.	0.785		
3. My executive approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication.	0.774		
4. If people knew more about my executive and his/her background, they would be more concerned and monitor his/her performance more closely.	0.768		
5. Other work associates of mine who must interact with my executive consider him/her to be trustworthy.	0.761		
6. Most people, even those who aren't close friends of my executive, trust and respect him/her as a coworker.	0.734		
Factor 2 (Affect-based trust)		1.858	16.8
1. I would have to say that my executive and I have both made considerable emotional investments in our working relationship.	0.890		
2. If I shared my problems with my executive, I know he/she would respond constructively and caringly.	0.871		
3. My executive and I will both feel a sense of loss if one of us is transferred and we can no longer work together.	0.839		
4. I can freely talk to my executive about difficulties I am having at work and know that he/she will want to listen.	0.801		
5. I have a sharing relationship with my executive. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.	0.742		

Table 4

Results of Factor Analysis for Organizational Culture

Factors	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Factor 1 (Clan)		6.747	42.1
1. My organization is a very personal place. It is like an extended family. People seem to share a lot of themselves.	0.880		
2. The head of my organization is generally considered to be a mentor, sage, or a father or mother figure.	0.857		
3. The glue that holds my organization together is loyalty and tradition. Commitment to this firm runs high.	0.804		
4. My organization emphasizes human resources. High cohesion and morale in the firm are important.	0.772		
Factor 2 (Adhocracy)		1.898	11.8
1. My organization is a very dynamic and entrepreneurial place. People are willing to stick their necks out and take risks.	0.895		
2. The head of my organization is generally considered to be an entrepreneur, an innovator, or a risk taker.	0.849		
3. The glue that holds my organization together is a commitment to innovation and development. There is an emphasis on being first.	0.819		
4. My organization emphasizes growth and acquiring new resources. Readiness to meet new challenges is important.	0.635		
Factor 3 (Hierarchy)		1.682	10.5
1. My organization is a very formal and structured place. Established procedures generally govern what people do.	0.824		
2. The head of my organization is generally considered to be a coordinator, an organizer, or an administrator.	0.818		
3. The glue that holds my organization together is formal rules and policies. Maintaining a smooth-running institution is important here.	0.659		
4. My organization emphasizes performance and stability. Efficient, smooth operations are important.	0.560		
Factor 4 (Market)		1.129	7.0
1. My organization is very product oriented. A major concern is with getting the job done, without much personal involvement.	0.842		
2. The head of my organization is generally considered to be a producer, a technician, or a hard-driver.	0.808		
3. The glue that holds my organization together is an emphasis on tasks and goal accomplishment. Employees share a production orientation.	0.691		
4. My organization emphasizes competitive actions and achievements. Measurable goals are important.	0.573		

organizational culture factors, *hierarchy*, did not have a significant impact on *turnover intention* ($p > 0.05$) (Table 6).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined possible strategies to reduce turnover intention from a cross-level perspective. At the team level, interpersonal trust was taken as a key construct to reduce turnover intention on the basis of social exchange theory. At the organizational level, person–organization fit and organizational learning theory explained the role of organizational culture in reducing turnover intention. Empirical results of this study revealed that both affective trust and cognitive trust are significantly negatively related to turnover intention. Additionally, clan organizational culture, adhocracy organizational culture, and market organizational culture are also significantly negatively related to turnover intention. However, this study did not find any significant relationship between hierarchy organizational culture and employee turnover intention.

Such findings are not only consistent with previous studies but also contribute new knowledge. First, the significant relationship between interpersonal trust and turnover intention is consistent with previous research findings (Costigan et al., 2012; DeConinck, 2011; Hemdi & Nasurdin, 2006). Through social exchange, interpersonal trust can

Table 5

Regression Analysis for Interpersonal Trust Factors Affecting Turnover Intention

Variable	B	Standardized Beta	t
(Constant)	3.256		25.783**
Affect-based trust	−0.435	−0.210	−3.44**
Cognition-based trust	−0.349	−0.168	−2.75*

$R = 0.269$; $R^2 = 0.072$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.065$; $F = 9.718$; sig. $F = 0.000$.
*p 0.05, **p 0.001.

increase psychological well-being, reduce negative events in peer interaction, and lower people's intention to quit. Additionally, this study extended the concept of trust from the leader–member relationship to both the leader–member and the member–member relationship.

Second, the significant negative relationship between organizational culture and turnover intention is consistent with Sheridan's (1992) study. The person–organization fit explains the external pull power to attract people to stay in an organization with a cultural fit. Clan, adhocracy, and market organizational culture fit the needs of hotel employees and effectively reduce their turnover intention. Based on Table 1, hotel managers should further apply the findings to leadership style and organizational policy to effectively reduce turnover intention. Moreover, the failure of hierarchy organizational culture in reducing turnover intention may be due to the characteristics of the hospitality industry. In the hospitality industry, elasticity is a main idea in service delivery. Employees should be empowered to freely respond to customer needs. In a hierarchy organizational culture, every new service employee's actions should be condoned by managers or higher levels of management in the hotel.

The above findings suggest two main academic implications. The first issue concerns the use of interpersonal trust in this research model. Cognitive trust and affective trust play different roles to jointly shape interpersonal trust. Cognitive trust provides a predictable relationship between employee and manager. It reduces additional costs for employees to adapt to the leadership style or unpredictable decision making of their manager. In hospitality, cognitive trust saves time and energy in

communicating all the procedures of daily work. Employees understand clearly that what they do will be praised by their manager and thus are more willing to be empowered to provide creative services. On the other hand, affective trust shapes a strong mental linkage within a service team. Employees with high affective trust perceive work as a way to improve mental wealth. Friendship and support of the manager allow employees to become engaged with their work in a hotel and to think of themselves as a member of the hotel family. Thus, both cognitive and affective trust can significantly reduce turnover intention.

The second issue involves the approaches applied to explain the influence of organizational culture on turnover intention. Person–organization fit explains employees' identity with and commitment to an organization that keep them in their current job (O'Reilly III, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Such approach is widely applied to explain why fit with organizational culture can make an employee willing to stay (Vandenberghe, 1999). On the other side, organizational learning theory explains employees' goals and needs for learning (Yuhee & Takeuchi, 2010). Some types of organizational culture represent high special resources and experiences included in that organization. Employees who want to accumulate working experiences, especially newcomers, may decide to stay for learning. These two approaches are based on different theories of shaping turnover intention. By combining these two approaches, this study provides a more complete justification for why high organizational culture can reduce turnover intention.

Table 6

Regression Analysis for Organizational Culture Factors Affecting Turnover Intention

Variable	B	Standardized Beta	t
(Constant)	3.256		26.023**
Clan	−0.462	−0.223	−3.68**
Adhocracy	−0.357	−0.172	−2.85*
Market	−0.271	−0.131	−2.15*
Hierarchy	0.042	0.020	0.33

$R = 0.311$; $R^2 = 0.097$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.082$; $F = 6.615$; sig. $F = 0.000$.
*p 0.05, **p 0.001.

The findings of this study lead to a number of practical implications. First, managers should efficiently establish interpersonal trust in service teams. According to Six and Sorge (2008), managers can build up interpersonal trust by providing positive feedback in a private meeting, delegating responsibility to the other person, demonstrating care and concern for the other person, and being open and direct about task problems. In addition, managers should maintain consistency in the perceived interpersonal trust among employees. Consistent trust shared in a service team acts as a norm in social exchange in employees' daily interactions. Through trust building, managers can enhance employees' relationship with the service team and reduce their turnover intention as well.

Second, person–organization fit should be considered in interviewing and selecting newcomers. Empirical results of this study revealed the same findings as previous studies about the effects of person–organization fit in employee retention (Sheridan, 1992). Different from most selections that focus on employee competency through person–job fit, managers should also consider person–organization fit, especially in job positions that need low turnover rates (Sekiguchi & Huber, 2011). Managers should clearly inform applicants about their organizational culture and use effective methods to realize applicants' personality, values, and work style or preference. By recruiting employees who fit organizational culture, organizations can effectively reduce employee turnover intention.

Limitations and Future Research

Although this study has revealed a great deal about effective ways to reduce turnover intention, more research is called for to expand our understanding. First of all, cultural differences can be explored to enrich knowledge of this research model. Costigan et al. (2012) found that the relationship between trust and turnover intention is different among countries. Huff and Kelley (2003) conducted a cross-nation study and found differences of organizational trust between individualist and collectivist societies. Because this study only collected data in one nation, future studies are encouraged to explore cross-nation differences.

Second, a dynamic perspective of turnover intention is worth exploring. Recently, Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, and Bliese (2011) and Becker and Cropanzano (2011) analyzed the dynamic relationship between turnover and its antecedents. Such perspective can contribute more information about how turnover intention is shaped. Use of cross-sectional data is a limitation of this study that makes it difficult to provide dynamic information of variables.

References

Anderson, C. J., & Milkovich, T. G. (1980). Propensity to leave: A preliminary examination of March and Simon's model. *Industrial Relations*, *35*(2), 279–294.

Allaire, Y., & Firsirotu, M. E. (1984). Theories of organizational culture. *Organization Studies*, *5*(3), 193–205.

Asree, S., Zain, M., & Razalli, M. R. (2010). Influence of leadership competency and organizational culture on responsiveness and performance of firms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *22*(4), 500–516.

Becker, W. J., & Cropanzano, R. (2011). Dynamic aspects of voluntary turnover: An integrated approach to curvilinearity in the performance–turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(2), 233–246.

Befu, H. (1977). Social exchange. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *6*, 255–281.

Cameron, K. (2008). A process for changing organizational culture. In T. G. Cummings (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational development* (pp. 429–445). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cameron, K. S., & Freeman, S. J. (1991). Cultural congruence, strength, and type: Relationships to effectiveness. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, *5*(1), 23–58.

Chathoth, P. K., Mak, B., Sim, J., Jauhari, V., & Manaktola, K. (2011). Assessing dimensions of organizational trust across cultures: A comparative analysis of U.S. and Indian full service hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *30*(2), 233–242.

Chen, G., Ployhart, R. E., Thomas, H. C., Anderson, N., & Bliese, P. D. (2011). The power of momentum: A new model of dynamic relationships between job satisfaction change and turnover intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(1), 159–181.

Costigan, R. D., Insinga, R. C., Berman, J. J., Kranas, G., & Kureshov, V. A. (2012). A four-country study of the relationship of affect-based trust to turnover intention. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *42*(5), 1123–1142.

Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(1), 55–70.

DeConinck, J. B. (2011). The effects of ethical climate on organizational identification, supervisory trust, and turnover

among salespeople. *Journal of Business Research*, *64*(6), 617–624.

Devi, S. R., Chong, C, S., & Lin, B. (2007). Organizational culture and KM processes from the perspective of an institution of higher learning. *International Journal of Management in Education*, *1*(1), 57–79.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, *12*(4), 450–467.

Enz, C. A. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*(1), 284–304.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, *25*(2), 161–178.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 463–488.

Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organizational culture and organizational effectiveness: A meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(4), 677–694.

Hemdi, M. A., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2006). Predicting turnover intentions of hotel employees: The influence of employee development human resource management practices and trust in organization. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, *8*(1), 21–42.

Hom, P. W., Caranikas-Walker, F., Prussia, G. E., & Griffeth, R. W. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*(6), 890–909.

Hon, A. H. Y., & Leung, A. S. M. (2011). Employee creativity and motivation in the Chinese context: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *52*(2), 125–134.

Hon, A. H. Y., & Lu, L. (2010). The mediating role of trust between expatriate procedural justice and employee outcomes in Chinese hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *29*(4), 669–676.

Huff, L., & Kelley, L. (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven-nation study. *Organization Science*, *14*(1), 81–90.

Jacobs, E., & Roodt, G. (2008). Organizational culture of hospitals to predict turnover intentions of professional nurses. *Health SA Gesondheid*, *13*(1), 63–78

Jiang, K., Liu, D., McKay, P. F., Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (2012). When and how is job embeddedness predictive of turnover? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*(5), 1077–1096.

Kotter J. P., & Heskett J. L. (1992). *Corporate culture and performance*. New York: The Free Press.

Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management*, *32*(6), 991–1022.

Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, *63*(4), 967–985.

Lund, B. D. (2003). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *18*(3), 219–236.

Mach, M., Dolan, S., & Tzafrir, S. (2010). The differential effect of team members' trust on team performance: The mediation role of team cohesion. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(3), 771–794.

Mahal, K. P. (2009). Organizational culture and organizational climate as a determinant of motivation. *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, *8*(10), 38–51.

Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(4), 874–888.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(1), 24–59.

McEvoy, G. M., & Cascio, W. F. (1985). Strategies for reducing employee turnover: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *70*(2), 342–353.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *58*(3), 20–38.

Nunnally, J. C. (1959). *Test and measurements*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Ogaard T., Larsen, S., & Marnburg, E. (2005). Organizational culture, and performance—Evidence from the fast food restaurant industry. *Food Service Technology*, *5*, 23–24.

O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comarison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*(3), 487–516.

Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(2), 438–454.

Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: Exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(3), 433–458.

Sekiguchi, T., & Huber, V. L. (2011). The use of person–organization fit and person–job fit information in making selection decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *116*(2), 203–216.

Sheridan, J. E. (1992). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*(5), 1036–1056.

Six, F., Nooteboom, B., & Hoogendoorn, A. (2010). Actions that build interpersonal trust: A relational signalling perspective. *Review of Social Economy*, *68*(3), 285–315.

Six, F., & Sorge, A. (2008). Creating a high-trust organization: An exploration into organizational policies that stimulate interpersonal trust building. *Journal of Management Studies*, *45*(5), 857–884.

Steel, R. P., & Ovalle, N. K. (1984). A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(4), 673–686.

Tepeci, M., & Bartlett, A. L. B. (2002). The hospitality industry culture profile: A measure of individual values, organizational culture, and person–organization fit as predictors of job satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *21*(2), 151–170.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*(2), 259–293.

Tsai, W.-C., Chi, N.-W., Grandey, A. A., & Fung, S.-C. (2012). Positive group affective tone and team creativity: Negative group affective tone and team trust as boundary conditions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(5), 638–656.

Tzafrir, S. S., & Dolan, L. S. (2004). Trust me: A scale for measuring manager–employee trust. *Management Research: The Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, *2*(2), 115–132.

Vandenberghe, C. (1999). Organizational culture, person–culture fit, and turnover: A replication in the health care. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *20*(2), 175–184.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Jon, M. W. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(3), 513–530.

Wiener, Y. (1988). Forms of value systems: Focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. *Academy of Management Review*, *13*(4), 534–545.

Yuhee, J., & Takeuchi, N. (2010). Performance implications for the relationships among top management leadership, organizational culture, and appraisal practice: Testing two theory-based models of organizational learning theory in Japan. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *21*(11), 1931–1950.

Zimmerman, R. D. (2008). Understanding the impact of personality traits on individuals' turnover decisions: A meta-analytic path model. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(2), 309–348.