Cause of Attrition in an Information Technology-Enabled Services Company: A Triangulation Approach

Saswat Barpanda, Goa Institute of Management, Sanquelim, India*  
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0379-737X  
Athira S., Amrita University, India

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to identify the human resource and the contextual factors that catalyze employee attrition in an ITES organization. A triangulation approach is used to understand the reasons for employee attrition including conducting structured interviews with the employees upon the intimation of their intention to leave the organization as well as a follow up semi-structured interview six months after their official resignation. The study was analyzed using the word cloud qualitative data analysis technique, radar chart, correlation, paired sample t-test, chi-square, and ANOVA. This exploration affirms that human resource factors impact attrition while contextual factor generation influences the human resource factors. The study also indicates that employees feel comfortable to reveal their actual reason for leaving the organization only after a certain period post resignation. Managers should prioritize maintaining relationships with employees to provide employees with enriching job content and learning opportunities for career growth.
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INTRODUCTION

An organization’s most important asset is its talent pool, which is one of the most demanding components for the management. To maintain the competitive advantage the organization, need to focus on motivating and inspiring the talents. Compromising with employee skills will have a detrimental effect on the business in long term effect (Schneider and Bowen, 1993). Many factors contribute to attrition and employers are keen and conscious about those which can keep the employee dedicated and engaged. Attrition can be described as subtle reduction in membership or personnel as through resignation, retirement or death (Sengupta and Gupta, 2012). They can also be explained in terms to number of employees voluntarily or involuntarily leave the organization. When any undesired factors
occur, the employee-employer relationship get worse and employees tend to leave the organization. Employee attrition is approaching epidemic proportions with many companies trying to sustain a stable standard of employment in a competitive job market (Bennett et al., 1993; Bender et al., 2018). The companies make use of policies and practices to prevent employees leaving them and are referred as employee retention. With regards to holding employees’ managers ought to seek as many choices as possible while at the same time building up and maintaining their confidence and loyalty so that they have less incentive to leave in the future for the success of their organization (Singh, et al.; 2012). Employee attrition leaves with a higher cost and effort for an employer, to overcome, resist and tackle the situation it is highly essential to know the reasons of attrition, their expectations from employer (Olubiyi, et al., 2019). So, it is crucial for management to create a system within the organization that can appeal for diverse workforce, meet their needs that drive motivation and keep them associated with the organization. It is an important factor as companies have to prepare to start recruiting for the positions which are critical and cannot be left vacant. Increasing attrition rates are the warnings to the company as it incurs additional cost to them. The company losses the amount of time and money spent for recruitment, training, if the issue of attrition is not addressed properly. An organization’s talent management is most successful when it effectively integrates rapid allocation of talent, positive experience for employees, and a strategic human resource team. Academic researches (Bennett, et al., 1993; Thite and Russell, 2010; Gilbert, 2011; Bisht and Singh, 2012; Haldorai, et al., 2019; Olubiyi et al., 2019) validates a number of factors that have a positive and negative effect on both voluntary and involuntary attrition, including employee morale, consistency of job knowledge, quality of partnership, work satisfaction, work demands, and emotional fatigue (Brown et al., 2015). According to Eby, Burk and Maher (2010) there is a difference between voluntary and involuntary attrition and this paper mainly focuses on voluntary attrition; which happens as employees want to resign on their own.

The Business Process Organization (BPO) / Information Technology Enabled Services (ITES) sector is a diverse and rapidly-expanding offshore market with an expected economic growth rate of 60 per cent (Sengupta and Gupta, 2012). After progression of the Indian economy, the effects of privatization, the economic transition to a competitive economy and an intensified external and internal demand placed pressure on all organization functions (Bhatnagar, 2007, Budhwar et al., 2006). There has been proof of a general need for management systems for capacity building, capital, competencies, approaches and macro as well as micro human resource operations (Bhatnagar and Sharma, 2005). The Indian Information Technology - Business Process Management (IT-BPM) sector continues to be one of the world’s biggest employers employing up to 3 million professionals directly. Attrition in this multimillion-dollar industry gives the industry’s doyens something to worry about (Adhikari, 2009). Several leading Indian businesses have faced new challenges in handling their HR job in a strategic way. In this paper, an attempt has been made to fill this gap and address emerging resource management, morale and employee engagement concerns in the BPO / ITES industry. In fact, the Indian Information Technology - Information Technology Enabled Services (IT-ITES) industry is on a fast track and the rapid pace has given rise to a number of challenges. The largest of them refers to professional human capital. India not only needs to maintain its large pool of trained ITES experts, but it also needs to ensure IT remains “industry-relevant” and “rightly skilled” (Mehta et al., 2006). More recently, the National Association of Information and Services Companies (NASSCOM) HR Summit 2006 looked closely at the changing image of HR and the transformational role that IT-ITES would play in making workers and their organizations more competitive internationally (Budhwar and Bhatnagar, 2007). This is clear from the study to date that BPOs are not always run in the same manner and that managers make different decisions on the forms of job strategies that they choose to use in such operations (Thite and Russell, 2010).

According to Budhwar and Bhatnagar (2007), this sector’s peak attrition rate is about 30-35 per cent and in BPOs / ITES based in South India attrition rate may been around 35-40 per cent. Indian ITES sector, the erosion of the talent pool has already overshot the target. When the talent
pool moves out of the organization, they not only take expertise and experience, but also confidential and sensitive information with them, as they normally move to a competitor’s company (Abassi and Hollman, 2000). There is a rising need to understand the reason for the high attrition rate. So, the current research focuses to address the issue of attrition which is a very generic problem in the ITES industry by analysing the case of a single ITES company where attrition is a major concern. Hence, in order to gain insight into these issues the main objective of this research is:

1. To identify the human resource (HR) factors that affect the employee attrition.
2. To identify the contextual factors that contribute to attrition.
3. To identify if any discrepancy abides with the exit reasons collected through the different interview process.

In the light of the above, the paper is structured as follows: the first section lays out the reason for the need to research this problem in the BPO / ITES sector in India. The next section discusses the literature by focusing on the theoretical framework and addressing the major HR factors and contextual variables the employees consider for the long term stay in the organization. The third section encapsulates research methodology, results and finally discuss the relevant contribution of the paper.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review is broken down into two key areas. The first area focuses on the theoretical framework on attrition and the second core area relates to the HR variables and the contextual variables that influence attrition. The key causes for attrition according to the various literatures discussed in this paper are lack of incentives for personal and professional growth, problems relating to professional relationships, pay and benefits. Based on the early researches (Trevor, 1997; Bennett, et al., 1993; Thite and Russell, 2010;) the HR variables considered in this study are career prospects, promotion, compensation and benefits, performance appraisal, relationship with manager, autonomy and freedom, work environment, organizational stability and brand image, higher studies and other personal reasons. The most influential contextual variables that contribute to employee attrition are the employees’ gender, generation and tenure (Malhotra and Gautam, 2016; Brown et al., 2015; Sengupta and Gupta, 2012; Mehta et al., 2006)

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Griffeth and Gaertner (2001) in their research found a substantial relationship between equity and turnover. Employee views of the fairness of pay laws and Equality of pay between colleagues and supervisory control of the work pace were strongly predictive factors for Turnover forecasting. The research also specifically suggests connections between equity and turnover that include equity perception as an exogenous variable that impacts turnover through work satisfaction and leave intentions. Equity Theory (Adams, 1965), with its concepts of equality and justice, is directed at explaining relational contracts. An employee may feel unhappy with pay and yet do not need to accept that the employer has an intention of making a rise. Unfulfilled expectations slowly result in disappointment, emotional abuse of perceived inequities, and behavioral change and leads to decreased work efficiency, and to attrition (Pritchard, 1969). When inequity is observed, a raise in pay, a shift in work assignments, or some other disciplinary measure will regain fairness. While people withdraw from organizations because of inequity, the principle of equality is that resignation is typically the last choice (Rousseau, 1989). Individuals who have been paying less than market wages that feel unjustly treated; others that have been offered a raise for hard work and are unable to do so are likely to feel incorrect.
Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory insights into the various variables that affect the attrition rate include the physiological needs (increment, location preference, salary structure and band change), safety and security needs (personnel bonds, process and performance linked growth), social needs (team building, cultural events and professional membership), self-esteem (reward and recognition and promotion), self-actualization (role/responsibility change and job rotation). According to Herzberg theory, there are two categories in which factors are divided that is hygiene and motivators. Hygiene factors will not motivate an employee but its absence will make an employee unhappy. One of the ways to motivate employees is by providing them a challenging work which in-turn will make enrich their jobs. Also, to motivate an employee it’s very important to fulfill their self-esteem and self-actualization and to meet and offer all hygiene factors (Hinton,1968). This states that management should not depend only on hygiene factors but combine hygiene as well as motivators to retain an employee.

People management has a strong negative relationship with employees (Hoffman and Tadelis, 2018). Theory X Managers perceive their workforce as incompetent and uncompromising, so they believe that employees need to be managed through discipline in order to be efficient (Neuliep,1996). On the other hand, Theory Y managers regard their employees as energetic, hardworking, creative employees who seek out responsibility. Its noticeable how Theory X centers on the two lower levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs: physiological and security. Theory X managers are autocratic, while Theory Y managers are democratic. Theory Y managers will succeed more at having motivated employees (Rausch and Russ, 2011). Attrition rate can be minimized if employees are satisfied with job. The need of employees should be fulfilled to increase the employee retention. Our current study also goes in line with these early research findings as relationship with managers plays a vital role in employee attrition.

In line with the principle of social information processing theory (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978; Baronand Pfeffer,1994) transparent and public obligations have greater effect on perception and actions of employees than on implicit or private ones. Both psychological and Implicit contract, play a significant role in the relation of employees with the organization and in corporate study and theory. Implied contract is the mutual obligation existing at the level of the relationship. Long-term jobs give rise to mutual commitments, encouraging employees to work diligently in their workplace and employers interest to retain employees and care for them (Rousseau and Anton, 1988; 1991). The theory of a psychological contract is related to the commitment of the employee to the organization. The dedication was characterized by three factors: the recognition of the beliefs of the company, the determination to make an effort on behalf of the company and the ability to remain an employee (Mowdayet al., 1982). Commitment does not tackle questions of reciprocity or responsibility and, at the same time, requires the recognition and internalization of the principles of the company which do not appear to be part of a psychological contract. Through behavioral analysis and philosophy, the word “psychological contract” has typically been used to refer to unwritten agreements between employees and managers (Argyris, 1960; Levinson et.al, 1962). These early researches support with the objective of our research which focuses on identifying the most impactful contextual and human resource factors that contribute to employee attrition. A person may feel obligated to give notice to the employer after leaving the company and still oppose its principles and objectives. The employee may simply be quitting because there is a lack of personal loyalty to the company (Rousseau, 1989).

Human Resource Variables That Influence Attrition

There are certain researchers such as (Bennett, et al.,1993; Thiteand Russell, 2010; Gilbert, 2011; Bisht and Singh,2012; Haldorai, et al., 2019; Olubiyi et al.,2019) claim that human resource variables such as career prospects, compensation benefits, performance appraisal system, higher studies, personal reasons, work environment, autonomy and freedom, organizational stability and brand image, relationship with manager influence employee attrition.
Career Prospects/Promotion

If promotion is offered for a successful result, the reasons constituting both promotion and good results may be perceived very differently by the employee and the manager. In such a dynamic social interaction, cognitive constraints and various frames of reference make it difficult to concentrate on any item (Haldorai, et al., 2019; Kalodimos and Leavitt, 2020). Cognitive constraints have an influence on the problems discussed in the open agreements, and frames of reference have an influence on their understanding (Miller et al., 1979).

Learning and increasing opportunities are critical in recruiting and maintaining the talent pool and if the company is unable to provide ample opportunities for career development employees then begin to consider other options. Often employees are not conscious of the areas in which they will develop within the company and who are role models inside the company. This kind of constant confusion and lack of career preparation instigates an employee to search for other employment (Bisht and Singh, 2012).

Compensation and Benefits

Another aspect responsible for turnover of employees is the desire of greater remuneration and improved compensation and opportunities. Typically, most of the incentive programs don’t satisfy the employees expectation. Employees may much often demand a hike in salary and, if that does not happen, they continue to switch to other companies that provide them with greater remuneration. Employees are motivated to stay with the organization mainly because of financial concerns. Since there is no standardized way of salary structure followed in the industry, an appealing pay is a significant discretionary aspect liable for attrition. The negative effect of salary growth on turnover will be greatest at high performance levels (Trevor, 1997). Bennett (1993) reported that only poor performer turnover was associated (positively) with the presence of individual incentives.

Performance Appraisal System

Employees usually did not grasp the organization’s evaluation process. They are not explicit regarding the evaluation criteria and the manner in which they are measured by an organization leading in an accumulation of regrets over it. Many times, the provision of reviewing the appraisal process remains solely as a mechanism in the appraisal life cycle. If the talent pool believe that they are more deserving and undervalued and unhappy with the manner in which they have been measured in an organization, they tend to move to a company that will appreciate their involvement a little better. There will be a curvilinear relationship between job performance and voluntary turnover. Specifically, turnover will be highest among low and high performers, and lower among average performers (Trevor, 1997). High performer turnover should tend to be high under the condition of low reward contingency because movement desirability should increase as reward inequity increases (Singh et al., 2012; Conte, 2017) thereby joining high movement ease in precipitating turnover.

Higher Studies

Most of the organizations have Gen Y and Gen Z population and they tend to switch back to education. An increase in attrition is observed mainly as there is a seasonality in the movement of employees during certain period of the year. To balance it the organization has to provide opportunities for higher education within the organization (Augustin and Mohanty, 2012). It is predicted that individuals who have achieved higher levels of education would have higher perceived personal work inputs than individuals with lower levels of education. This suggests employees with higher education levels may have higher expectations of their employer’s benefits than those with lower education levels (Balkin and Griffeth, 1993).
Personal Reasons
Employees even though satisfied with the job may need to quit because of their personal reasons. This may not be related to job but because of any health concerns, relocation, family problems. These are not under the control of the organization and they can only support the employees with the necessary requirements (Haldorai, et al., 2019).

Work Environment
Employees generally take time to adjust with the work environment that is constantly changing. As the industry demand requires the employees to work in different shifts and the additional responsibilities and process places extra strain and pressure on the employees (Begley and Czajka, 1993). Most of the employees respond to these shifts and some consider it impossible to adapt to the changing environment and they leave out of dissatisfaction and frustration. When workplace tension invades personal life, employees start pursuing new opportunities and sometimes turn to other careers, particularly though they have to rely on their salaries and benefits for a career where they might spend more time with their family (Olubiyi et al., 2019).

Autonomy and Freedom
Employees prefer the flexibility and freedom to plan and organize their jobs and determine how to do it at their discretion. When comes to productivity and for the organizational benefit it is actually a positive attribute for the teams, employees and managers. When employees lack their desired autonomy and freedom, they tend to be inefficient and dissatisfied and leads to the churn in the industry. Employees tend to appreciate their creativity and freedom more than income, and opt out in the absence of flexibility and independence (Balkin and Griffeth, 1993).

Organizational Stability and Brand Image
Employees determine the importance of the organization’s values, organizational philosophy, organizational procedures and reputation. Many of them are not encouraged to operate in organizations that are not up front regarding the degree of security within the company (Olubiyi et al., 2019). The chaotic working climate and the potential possibility of more transition provoke the employees to resign. Brand image of the organization is also an important factor for attrition. Presence of consistent vision, strategic strategies and initiatives, and employee-friendly practices are important for building successful brand identity within and outside the company and will lead to long term stay of the employees.

Relationship With Manager
Given the availability of formal contracts outlining pay rates and other types of remuneration, long-term employees may feel that there is more to their work than just the salary they earn. These partnership-based relationships go beyond mutual benefit, bind the parties to sustaining a partnership such as continuing employment and allow for a sort of cooperation (e.g., hard work, loyalty), often indefinitely (Gilbert, 2011).

Where interactions exist over time with employee-employer relationships and continuing encounters are anticipated over time, assumptions on what they owe each other that emerge from both overt commitments of support or loyalty and various considerations that they might take for granted such as good faith or fairness (Adhikari, 2009). The intention to withdraw from the organization also captures the reliance of employees on their supervisors and employers (Tepper, 2009).

Contextual Variables
Some of the research indicates a strong degree of association between attrition and certain variables of job satisfaction in terms of age, gender, tenure, marital status, and native place location (Malhotra and Gautam, 2016; Brown et al., 2015; Sengupta and Gupta, 2012; Mehta et al., 2006).
Generation

As Wey Smola and Sutton (2002) clearly describes in their paper ‘Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium’ that each generation have different set of work values and Managers are encouraged to resolve the differences between the generations that seem to exist among employees. A generation is characterized as a recognizable group sharing birth years, age place, and significant life events at crucial developmental stages, divided into the first wave, central group, and last wave by five to seven years (Kupperschmidt, 2000). A generational community, also called a cohort, includes people who share similarities of historical or social life, the consequences of which remain fairly constant over their lives. Such life events help to make a difference between one generation and another (Jurkiewicz and Brown, 1998). A cohort creates a temperament that affects the emotions of individual against authority and species, what they want from life, and how they expect to meet those desires (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Today’s workforce comprises of employees of all generations. When the Sages (born between 1925-1945) and the Baby Boomers (born between 1946-1964) continue to leave the workforce, the remaining members of Generation X (born from 1965-1980) and Generation Y (born from 1981-2000) will be working for the near future. With this in mind, it is important to identify different attributes that these generations have in common, and how they differ (Brown et al., 2015). Currently, Millennials become a bigger proportion of the overall workforce. So, it is important that they get the work friendly environment. This is crucial for managers to recognize these employees’ times and generational characteristics, and to ensure that workers understand and appreciate the disparity between themselves. Kupperschmidt (2000) suggests that recognizing these generational gaps can be a tactic that managers can use to build more efficiency, creativity and creative citizenship for employees. Managers must promote open discussion of how attitude to work and organization is affected by generational differences. They will have incentives for workers of different generations to give their best at the same time as achieving the organizational target. Managers must employ leadership strategies that promote dispirited employee hearts (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

A cross-sectional research reveals correlations and discrepancies on 15 motivating variables across the different generations (Jurkiewicz and Brown, 1998). Like cohort-specific sociological factors, the few variations observed can be directly linked to life and career stages. The key implications are explored for the mechanisms of recruiting, motivation, development, productivity of the human capital (Brown et al., 2015). Based on the premise that Generation X employees need extra consideration, supervisors try to discourage potential behavioral deterioration among the leaders of this community with a view to promoting new human resource programs (Emmert and Taher, 1992; Kovach, 1995; Medcof and Hausdorf, 1995). Exposure to these concerns is said to jointly take 68 per cent of the manager’s time (Katou and Budhwar, 2006; Heckhausen and Krueger, 1993).

The relationship between age and workplace productivity is an exceedingly relevant issue and is expected to remain so for at least the next two decades. The degree of commitment to work will predict success, absenteeism and turnover (Wiener and Vardi, 1980). It is believed that jobs and attrition are moderated by the quantity and nature of alternatives used by employees in their work environment (Carsten and Spector, 1987; Hulin et al., 1985).

Gen-X are described as self-driven individualist ferociously autonomous, who tend to set their own targets, deadlines and hours of service (Jurkiewicz and Brown, 1998). Gen-X joined the workplace with a comparison structure that did not include job security, insurance or a conventional employment pattern. Generation Y members appreciate integrity and dignity in their organization. Loyalty is focused on their integrity, not on the duration of their work (Brown et al. 2015). Generation Y leaders are conditionally committed to their organization as long as they meet their own personal goals. In fact, they are likely to try a new career if they believe like their desired terms are not fulfilled. While they enjoy leisure and holidays, Generation Y have strong standards of promotion and wage rises (Hill, 2002). Many studies have found lower rates of corporate engagement and higher attrition in Generation Y employees relative to other generations in a number of industries (Twenge, 2010). The
high attrition rate of the Generation Y leaders may be attributed to their poor psychological bond with the organization, which could decrease their organizational dedication and their level of organizational loyalty (Blomme et al., 2009; Rousseau, 1989). The paper titled ‘Generational comparisons of public employee motivation’ by Jurkiewicz and Brown (1998) clearly points out the difference among the attitudes of Baby boomers, Gen X and Gen Y towards Career progression, Salary, Organizational commitment, learning nature, Supervisor approach, Involvement in decision making. Hence it is highly important to formulate different human resource strategies for the long term stay of employees within the organization.

Gender

Employees behaviors and attitudes in the organization rely on the interpretation of the workplace culture that treats men and women equally. Adams (1996) reported that females were around 37% more likely than males to leave their job. However, males tend to be more inclined to shift positions in their career and step up the job ladder (Quartz et al., 2008). It is observed that the two genders did not vary in their plans to quit their organization, but female were slightly more inclined to shift roles (Xu, 2008). Research conducted among private law practices shows that, for both men and women, the time leading up to partnership decisions sees many lawyers leaving private practice, but women continue to leave private practice long after partnership decisions are made. The study also reinforces arguments that a discrepancy in gender exists in attrition from law firms (Kay, Alarie, et al., 2016). Women quit employment because of factors such as less opportunities to work on challenging projects, and lack of recognition for achievements (Williams and Richardson, 2010). The most commonly cited reason why women quit their job in large numbers than men are workplace discrimination and work-family conflict. Studies show that the challenge of coordinating two professions usually related to work-family conflict led women to quit their profession (Deutsch and Yao, 2014).

Tenure

The theory of the life cycle indicates that the career of an individual goes through multiple phases analogous to the biological model of development and decay (Wagner et.al, 1987). Various developmental roles, interests, desires, principles and behaviors are correlated with each career stage (Morrow, 1983; Van Maanenand Katz, 1976). Individuals seek out various career paths, professions, and organizations during the early stages of the work life cycle (Stumpf and Rabinowitz, 1981). This is a time when a person can change his or her profession many times. This stage is related to insecurity and the need for mobility. During discovery and evaluation, workers have little need for security and may be assumed to be less concerned by their benefits (Wagner et.al, 1987).

Thus, the present study hypothesized:

**H₁:** The human resource (HR) factors influence the employee’s decision to stay within the organization.

**H₂:** The contextual factors contribute to employee attrition.

**H₃:** There is substantial difference in the data pertaining to certain period after post resignation interview (telephonic interview) compared to the other exit interview process by HRBP and line manager.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Type of Research**

This is a triangulation research which uses both qualitative and quantitative techniques to gather and analyse the data (Creswell and Clerk, 2017). This study uses qualitative data to explore quantitative findings and hence follows triangulation research. That is a way to guarantee the integrity of studies (Creswell and Miller, 2000). In qualitative analysis, using triangulation principle several approaches
are sometimes used in one study (Flick, et al; 2012). The insights of triangulation methodology may become a systematic framework for studies on mixed approaches (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2010). Triangulation involves looking at the same phenomena or study from more than one data base (Decrop, 1999). In triangulation approach researchers have various viewpoints on the topic under study or in addressing study questions more generally. By the use of multiple strategies and several analytical methods, these viewpoints can be substantiated (Flick, et al; 2012). Qualitative approaches are used as a precursor to quantitative techniques. Qualitative approaches are used to provide knowledge to help improve quantitative analysis (Riley and Love, 2000). Campbell and Fiske (1959) presented the term, as a synonym for convergent validity, in the introduction of a multi-method / multi-treat matrix. Jick (1979) improved triangulation as a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches, arguing that both would be seen as complimentary rather than competing groups. Earlier, triangulation gained further interest in qualitative analysis as a way to create the recognition of qualitative methods (Denzin, 1978; Rossman and Wilson, 1985). The researcher can therefore guard against the allegation that the results of the analysis are merely an artifact of a single process, a single data base, or a single investigator bias. Triangulation will be considered from the very beginning of the study process, but the technique of triangulation only pays off in the data review. Triangulation helps the researcher to increase the accuracy of results by relying on data from more than one method (Denzin, 1978). In this paper, by proposing triangulation as a means to make qualitative results sounder and to achieve wider recognition of qualitative studies in the field of human resource management.

Sample Design
An online survey using google forms was sent to the Ex-Employees of the organization. In addition, semi-structured telephone interviews were also conducted with the ex-employees.

Type of Sampling
Convenience sampling was used since only accessible employees were tested. The google form was circulated to employees of a particular grade range who left the organization six months back and are currently employed to similar organization. Telephonic interview was conducted with the rest of the ex-employees. These data pertain to past employees with good performance rating who have left the company between April 2017 and March 2019.

Population and Sample
500 employees were taken for telephonic interview of which 68% of the employees were successfully contacted. This questionnaire was sent to 150 respondents and 50% of them responded.

Data Sources
Primary data was collected through surveying and interviewing the employees. Secondary data was accessed through the company records of exit interview data collected by HR business partner and line manager.

Analysis Method
Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis was done on the data. Using QDA Miner Lite software the qualitative analysis was performed and generated a word cloud of factors employees mentioned as the main reason to leave the organisation. Figure 1 depicts the word cloud generated which is based on the data collected from the ex-employees through telephonic interview after a specific time frame once they have left the organization. Of the twelve HR factors considered, the major reasons identified were relationship with manager, better career prospects, rewards and appreciation, compensation and job content. This supports our first objective to identify the major HR factors contributing to attrition.

In order to obtain an accurate result, the analysis data pertaining to the main reason employee mentioned to quit the organization was collected mainly through four different interview mode. The
exit interview data is the exit reasons employees mentioned on their last day at work. The data obtained from line manager interview and human resource business partner (HRBP) interview are the reasons specified by the employees during the notice period. The telephonic interview data pertains to the data collected from the employees after as specific time frame (more than six months) once they have left the organization. By doing a simple radar chart (Kalonia et.al,2013) visualization technique, the chart clearly depicts that there exist deviations in the reasons mentioned by the employees during the four different interview mode. Figure 2 describes that the radar chart shows a greater deviation in exit reasons mentioned by the employees especially during the telephonic interview mode. On comparing the reasons mentioned by employees during the four different interview process, a drastic difference seen with the results of telephonic interview with HRBP and line manager interview. This indicate that employees tend to open up only once they have moved out of the organization. This also links to the finding that the employee’s relationship with manager and management is an important HR factor to be considered. The difference in the ratings provided by the ex-employees of the organization understudy for their past and present company in terms of these HR factors has been taken with 5point Likert Scale.

Figure 1. Word Cloud generated based on the data

Figure 2. Radar Chart shows a greater deviation in exit reasons
Analysis

Descriptive analysis: Table 1 explains the descriptive statistics with insights into the statistics of different interview process done to collect the attrition data and explains the statistics of HR factors and the contextual factors. Standard deviation is a number used to say how measurements are spread out from the mean or anticipated value for a group. A small standard deviation implies that most figures are near to the average. A high standard deviation implies that the figures are more widespread. In order to understand the relationship between the contextual variables and HR variables a correlation analysis was conducted. The result of correlation analysis as depicted in table 2, describes a relationship exist between the HR factors and the contextual factors. A positive correlation is seen between the contextual variable gender with better career opportunities, enriching job content, rewards and recognition, work life balance, appraisal process, relationship with manager and negative with compensation package, opportunities for career advancement. The generation variable shows association with opportunities for career advancement and relationship with manager, enriching job content. Tenure variable is correlated with the HR factors like compensation package, relationship with manager. This correlation result in table 2 shows that the HR factors influence the contextual factors.

This discrepancy explained using the radar chart can be seen with the descriptive statistics as shown in table 1, the standard deviation is higher and indicates that this was attributed to greater differences in data. So, a greater deviation is seen for data collected through HRBP and telephonic interview process.

In order to statistically analyse whether the results obtained from the telephonic interview is associated with the other three different interview modes a chi-square analysis was conducted. Chi-square test analyses whether these interview results are independent or associated. Chi-square result is shown on table 3.

Since the p-value is less than our chosen level of significance (α = 0.05), we conclude that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the telephonic interview is associated with the other three interview process. Hence, it is statistically concluded that there is no connection between the telephonic interview result and the other interview results. Thus, it is clear that more transparent reasons for leaving the organization are obtained through an interview after a certain time post resignation. Employees may not feel free to open up their exact actual reasons for quitting the job to their manager while working in the organization.

Using the SPSS software, the quantitative analysis was conducted. To validate the first objective, that is to understand influence of HR factors on attrition, a paired sample t-test was conducted. The paired sample t test was conducted on the data that was collected through online surveys from ex-employees with a time frame of more than six months and are currently working in similar sector organizations. Paired sample t-test was carried out to ascertain the extent to which the ratings differ on individual elements of attrition for the organization under study and with the employee’s present organization. By comparing the ratings given by the employees for the previous and current organization for the twelve HR factors such as better career opportunity, job Security, compensation package, innovative and forward-thinking nature, enriching job content, rewards and recognition, work life balance, inspirational mentorship, appraisal process, opportunity for career advancement, manager relationship, preferred location which were taken based on earlier research studies stating that employees considered these are very vital to stay within an organization.

A paired sample t-test was conducted on the sample to determine whether there was a statistically significant mean difference exists between the organization under study and competitor organization. Participants felt that mainly for the seven HR factors such as the better career opportunity, compensation package, enriching job content, rewards and recognition, inspirational mentorship, appraisal process, manager relationship, the employees felt better satisfaction in the new firm as opposed to their previous organization. And with the statistically significant values obtained from the t-test, the mean difference is analyzed, the mean value for the HR factors is considered for the previous organization (M1) and
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of contextual variable

| Descriptive Statistics |          |         |
|------------------------|----------|---------|
| **Interview Mode**     |          |         |
| Exit Interview         | 3.843    | 3.2234  |
| Line Manager Interview | 3.898    | 3.1988  |
| HRBP Interview         | 4.076    | 3.1614  |
| Telephonic Interview   | 6.277    | 3.4398  |
| **HR factors**         |          |         |
| Better Career Opportunity | 2.83     | 2.836   |
| Job Security           | 2.27     | 0.475   |
| Compensation Package   | 2.84     | 0.747   |
| Innovative and forward thinking | 2.56 | 0.412 |
| Enriching Job Content  | 2.18     | 0.602   |
| Rewards and Recognitions | 2.10    | 0.490   |
| Work life balance      | 3.25     | 0.842   |
| Inspirational mentorship | 2.37     | 0.774   |
| Appraisal process      | 2.45     | 0.760   |
| Opportunities for career advancements | 2.38 | 0.770 |
| Relationship with manager | 2.51   | 0.848   |
| Preferred Location     | 2.15     | 0.749   |
| **Contextual Factors** |          |         |
| Gender                 |          |         |
| Female                 | 34.1     | 0.66    |
| Male                   | 65.9     | 0.475   |
| Generation             |          |         |
| Gen X                  | 15.7     | 0.35    |
| Gen Y                  | 74.6     | 0.647   |
| Gen Z                  | 9.6      |         |
| Tenure                 |          |         |
| 0-1                    | 4.4      |         |
| 0-2                    | 26.5     |         |
| 0-3                    | 15.7     |         |
| 0-4                    | 26       |         |
| 0-5                    | 14.6     |         |
| 0-6                    | 6.1      |         |
| 0-7                    | 2.3      |         |
| 0-8                    | 2.3      |         |
| 0-9                    | 0.6      |         |
| 0-10                   | 0.6      |         |
| 10-more                | 0.9      |         |
| **Percent**            |          |         |
|                        |          |         |
|                        | 5.17     | 2.836   |
|                        | 0.66     | 0.475   |
### Table 2. Correlation Table

|                | 1         | 2         | 3         | 4         | 5         | 6         | 7         | 8         | 9         | 10        | 11        | 12        | 13        | 14        | 15        |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Gender         | 1         | 1         | -0.14     | 0.04      | -0.11     | 0.02      | -0.01     | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      | 0.07      |           |
| Experience     | 0.15      | 0.03      | 0.01      | 0.02      | -0.01     | 0.01      | -0.03     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Compensation   | 0.06      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Promotion      | 0.04      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Social         | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Job security   | -0.10     | 0.04      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Income         | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Satisfaction   | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Health         | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |
| Age            | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.01      | 0.01      | -0.01     | 0.01      | 0.01      | 0.02      | 0.03      | 0.04      | 0.05      | 0.06      |           |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *** Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).

### Table 3. Chi-Square Test Result

|                         | value    | df  | Asymp.Sig |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|-----------|
| **Telephonic interview * Exit interview** |          |     |           |
| Pearson Chi-Square      | 1345.169 | 110 | 0.000     |
| Likelihood Ratio        | 692.225  | 110 | 0.000     |
| Linear by Linear        | 33.282   | 1   | 0.000     |

|                         | value    | df  | Asymp.Sig |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|-----------|
| **Telephonic interview * Manager interview** |          |     |           |
| Pearson Chi-Square      | 1315.509 | 88  | 0.000     |
| Likelihood Ratio        | 673.493  | 88  | 0.000     |
| Linear by Linear        | 26.661   | 1   | 0.000     |

|                         | value    | df  | Asymp.Sig |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|-----------|
| **Telephonic interview * HRBP interview** |          |     |           |
| Pearson Chi-Square      | 1440.484 | 99  | 0.000     |
| Likelihood Ratio        | 760.748  | 99  | 0.000     |
| Linear by Linear        | 39.18    | 1   | 0.000     |
with the current organization (M2) as described in Table 4. It can be concluded that because of the influence of these factors the employees decided to quit the organization.

Hence both the qualitative and quantitative analysis has identified similar HR factors that contribute to attrition. And this supports our hypothesis that the human resource (HR) factors influence the employee’s decision to stay within the organization.

The second main objective of this research is to identify the contextual variables that contribute to attrition. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a collection of statistical models and their associated estimation procedures (such as the “variation” among and between groups) used to analyse the differences among group means in a sample. ANOVA is done here to analyse whether there exists a significant relation between the Contextual factors and employee attrition.

From table 1, the descriptive statistics of the contextual variables can be identified. From the Table 5 ANOVA result with total degree of freedom 310 and 10 degree of freedom for between groups and 300 for within group, as p value < 0.05, for variables like gender, generation and tenure that is p=0.021, p=0.011 and p=0.001 respectively which is below 0.05 and therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis that there exists statistically significant relation exists between gender, generation and tenure with the attrition factors.

Discussion of Results

This research stands out from the aboriginal studies related to attrition as in our study both the human resource factors and the contextual factors are considered to be the most influential root cause behind the increasing attrition rate. One imperfection in most scholarly work is that the data pertaining to reasons why employee leave the organization is collected from employees when they are working within the organization, which prohibits the employees to reveal the accurate reason and thus limits the data’s reliable frameworks for quantitative evidence. By collecting the data from employees when they are in the organization and also after a specific time frame once they have left the organization gives this research more insight into the accurate reasons for attrition. A comparison between the two have proved that there exists discrepancy in the information provided by employees. By using triangulation research approach, this study proves that attrition is influenced by HR variables and contextual variables. Perhaps most specifically, our findings offer proof that these variables interact to influence attrition.

Table 4. Result of paired sample t-test with degrees of freedom 75 and with 95% confidence interval

| HR Factors                           | M1   | M2   | t      | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Better Career Opportunity            | 2.83 | 3.62 | -10.434| 0.000           |
| Job Security                         | 2.26 | 2.25 | -7.286 | 0.002           |
| Compensation Package                 | 2.84 | 4.24 | -17.512| 0.000           |
| Innovative and forward thinking      | 2.54 | 2.47 | -1.395 | 0.167           |
| Enriching Job Content                | 2.17 | 3.72 | -5.742 | 0.000           |
| Rewards and Recognitions             | 2.09 | 2.88 | -6.331 | 0.000           |
| Work life balance                    | 3.24 | 2.83 | 4.102  | 0.200           |
| Inspirational mentorship             | 2.49 | 2.57 | -0.155 | 0.877           |
| Appraisal process                    | 2.36 | 2.53 | -1.745 | 0.085           |
| Opportunities for career advancements| 2.43 | 2.41 | -0.782 | 0.436           |
| Relationship with manager            | 2.37 | 3.87 | -4.48  | 0.000           |
| Preferred Location                   | 2.51 | 2.50 | -2.98  | 0.004           |
Through this study major reasons for employee’s attrition are related to the human resource variables such as relationship with manager, better career prospects, compensation, rewards and appreciation, job content supporting the findings of (Bender et al.,2018; Kumar and Yakhlef, 2016) which provide evidence that direct line managers and their relationship with employees are very critical factors, while countering those of (Olubiyi et al.,2019)which argues that friendly work environment and job security are the critical factors for the longer term stay in the organization. The role of line managers in companies is critical in ensuring the effective execution of the HRM practices and policies (Gilbert et al., 2011). The findings also suggest that employees feel more comfortable with exit interviews conducted after a specific time frame, once they have left the organization. The study supports most of the research findings that gender, tenure and generation has influence over attrition factors. The results of our research go in line with the result brought in by (Augustin and Mohanty,2012) which discuss a comparative approach by analysing the past employee’s reason for leaving the organization with their current organization and the findings demonstrated that attrition is directly linked to HR factors such as better career prospects and compensation. The paper links gender and tenure with attrition. Our current research has brought in a new variable that is generation of the employees also influence the attrition behaviour.

By focusing on the Indian HRM, (Bhatnagar, 2007) points out that organizational commitment is a crucial factor for the employees to retain in an organization. His research has clearly linked that this organizational commitment is achieved through the HR factors discussed in our research. The motivating mechanisms of the philosophy of social exchange and the principle of reciprocity that clarify the relationship between human resource activities, trust-in-management and employee commitment. There is a strong amount of work showing that corporate management strategies and the design and style of leadership can have an indirect effect on personal satisfaction through their effects on employee commitment. This also supports our finding that relationship with manager is crucial factor for in building commitment for the employees that leads to longer term stay in the organization. Implications for an increasing employee commitment (Glazer, 2004) there by addressing the important HR factors are critical for HR practitioners to tackle, especially to recognize and attract highly engaged workers and to shield them from possible talent raids.

Blomme and Rheede (2009) has investigated the relationship between employee commitment and turnover intention and a strong connection has been formed between the intrinsic facets of the work and the decision to quit. A collaborative mechanism between the individual and the manager, which sometimes occurs through recruiting which can be affected by a variety of other human

|                | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| Gender         |                |             |       |       |
| Between Groups | 4.512          | 0.451       | 2.033 | 0.021 |
| Within Groups  | 66.581         | 0.222       |       |       |
| Total          | 71.093         |             |       |       |
| Generation     |                |             |       |       |
| Between Groups | 6.355          | 0.636       | 1.774 | 0.011 |
| Within Groups  | 107.49         | 0.358       |       |       |
| Total          | 113.846        |             |       |       |
| Tenure         |                |             |       |       |
| Between Groups | 797.12         | 79.712      | 13.824| 0.001 |
| Within Groups  | 1729.864       | 5.766       |       |       |
| Total          | 2526.984       |             |       |       |
resource activities, such as performance, rewards and appreciation, compensation benefits and learning opportunities.

DiPietro and Condly (2007) discussed about a Commitment And Necessary Effort (CANE) model of motivation in their research that support our research findings such as career prospects, managerial relationship, enriching job content and rewards are highly motivating factors for the employees to stay in an organization. When employees are dissatisfied with these factors they tend to quit.

This research has identified that each generation has unique characteristics that influence them to stay with the organization and thus generation is a very important contextual variable that influence the attrition behaviour. Generation Y members are the hardest to retain in the workplace compared to other generation as Gen Y respect their personal lives and are prepared to leave their current job if the change is more beneficial for them to adjust. Second, in the workplace, they face the biggest age gap, that can be a key determinant of the intention to quit the job. Generation Y members appreciate integrity and respect in their organisation and highly value personal life, promotion and pay rise, flexibility and challenges in their jobs. Employees of Generation Y who are happy with their jobs will be loyal to the company, which may develop higher levels performance and lower turnover rates and intentions in the workplace. This support the result of a recent research (Brown, et al.,2015) that has identified that each generation has different motivating factors and the workplace behaviour approach also varies drastically. As discussed in that paper the millennials tend to seek more career prospects and a good relation with managers and along with appreciation for their work in the form of performance appraisal and rewards.

As a final conclusion this study has identified the main HR variables that lead to employee attrition as better career prospects, relationship with manager, job content, rewards and appreciation. Another most important result this research has put forth is that the contextual variables such as the gender, generation and tenure has influence over attrition among employees. This leads to the conclusion that in order to retain the employees in the organization different motivating approaches and training has to be followed based on the contextual variables and their interconnection with the HR variables to increase the organizational commitment of the employees and ensure a long term stay within the organization.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the results of the study contributed to understand that both the human resource factors and the contextual factors are considered to be the most influential root cause behind the increasing attrition rate in IT/ITES sector. Through this research, key reasons for employee’s attrition are related to the human resource variables such as relationship with manager, better career prospects, compensation, rewards and appreciation, job content supporting the findings of (Bender et al.,2018; Kumar and Yakhlef, 2016) which provide evidence that direct line managers and their relationship with employees are very critical factors, while countering those of (Olubiyi et al.,2019)which argues that friendly work environment and job security are the critical factors for the longer term stay in the organization.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This research is constrained by its samples. The study was confined to a single ITES organization which was geographically limited to Kerala and therefore, the results might not be generalizable as the study’s sample may not represent the population of ITES employees across nations. However, the findings of this study provide a framework for future research to use methods that can be uniformly generalized. Prospective researchers should consider worldwide sampling in order to achieve a more representative sample of all ITES employees and decide whether attrition of employees depend on geographical and cultural differences.
A research study into the relationship between contextual variables and HR variables is also recommended, in addition to the research studies suggested above. To retain the employees for a longer tenure with the organization, the findings of this research study can be used. Based on the results of this study better retention methods can be put forth and more exploration of the contextual variables gives employers a better understanding of their influence on employee turnover and employee performance.
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