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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.
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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 hospitali- ty 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
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
Table 1: Four Types of Organizational Culture

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

Adapted from Cameron and Freeman (1991).

The 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**

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.
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 ($p \leq 0.05$). 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 ($p \leq 0.05$). 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

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

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 increasing 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 5
Regression Analysis for Interpersonal Trust Factors Affecting Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>25.783**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>−0.435</td>
<td>−0.210 −3.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>−0.349</td>
<td>−0.168 −2.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.269; R² = 0.072; adjusted R² = 0.065; F = 9.718; sig. F = 0.000.
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.001.

Table 6
Regression Analysis for Organizational Culture Factors Affecting Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>26.023**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>−0.462</td>
<td>−0.223 −3.68**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>−0.357</td>
<td>−0.172 −2.85*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>−0.271</td>
<td>−0.131 −2.15*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.020 0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.311; R² = 0.097; adjusted R² = 0.082; F = 6.615; sig. F = 0.000.
*p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.001.
Second, a dynamic perspective of turnover intention is worth exploring. Recently, Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, and Bliwise (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.

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.


