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ABSTRACT

This study explores the factors contributing to organizational commitment among employees in organization in Malaysia. It helps to identify the effect of affective commitment and person-organization fit on turnover intention among employees in Malaysia. It also looks at whether Person-Organization fit interact with knowledge sharing on its relationship with turnover intention. The research also helps to study the effect of knowledge sharing on the relationship between affective commitment factors and employee turnover intention as well as knowledge sharing effect on the relationship between person-organization-fit and employee turnover intention. This research attempts to dissect the underlying factors that influence employee turnover intention. A theoretical foundation was compiled for the study based on the literature review.

The research report indicates that affective commitment dimensions are made of two factors; Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment which measures emotional attachment of the individual to the organization and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment which measures involvement. The study also proves that affective commitment, person-organization fit and knowledge sharing dimensions; self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit and knowledge sharing opportunity correlates negatively with turnover intention. It also indicates that knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between affective commitment factors and person-organization fit with turnover intention.
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1.0 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

In today’s dynamic global economy, knowledge is viewed as a key strategic and competitive resource by organizations, and effective management of individual knowledge within the workplace has become critical to business success (Cohen and Leventhal, 1990; Grant, 1996; Ipe, 2003; O’Neill and Adya, 2003). Knowledge is one of the most strategically important resources and a competitive advantage to firms that successfully leverage on it. The sharing of knowledge between individuals and departments in the organization is considered to be a crucial process here (O’Dell and Grayson, 1998; Osterloh and Frey, 2000; Hooff and Ridder, 2004). People have been emphasized time and time again as being important organization resources. Furthermore research has demonstrated that the nature of employment relationships has an important effect on employees’ actual turnover (Shaw et al., 1998) or turnover intention (Tsui et al., 1997). (Wang & Guo, 2003)

Malaysia’s aspiration to achieve the status of developed country has led to the nation moving towards borderless communities and changes in employees working habits and loyalty to their organization. The nature of work has changed from worker or labour intensive industrial society toward automated information and knowledge based organizational where technology and knowledge is a valuable resources and its retentions is no longer assured. Surveys done by the Malaysian Employee Federation and National Productivity Centre indicates that many organizations face skilled employees shortage, due to the willingness of employees to change employers resulting from low
organizational commitment. (Muthuveloo and Che Rose, 2005) Organizational outcomes are directly proportional to organizational commitment therefore organizational commitment can be improved by increasing employees’ organizational commitment. (Muthuveloo and Che Rose, 2005)

In addition to this in depth analysis of person-organization-fit has become increasingly important aspect in employment relationship as previous studies by Hoffman & Woehr (2006) and Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson (2005) has indicated that good person-organization-fit has been linked to organizational attraction and retention, recruiters’ selection decisions and employees’ work-related attitudes and actions.

1.1 PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to study the impact of knowledge sharing on the relationship between affective commitment and person-organization fit to turnover intention. This study result will help identify the importance of knowledge sharing factors in reducing turnover intention among employees in Malaysia. This study will also add to the existing body of knowledge in the area of human resource development by focusing on factors that influence turnover intention. From a practical point of view, organizations can use the results and recommendations of this study to reduce employee turnover in their organization.
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Annual surveys by Malaysian Employers Federation (MEF 2004, 2005) report that the annual labour turnover rates for 2003 and 2004 were high, approximately 17 per cent and 16 per cent respectively. (Chew, 2005) It has also been reported that Malaysian respondents are only willing to stay with their current organizations for less than three years. (Lim, 2001; Chew, 2005) The above trend reported in previous research studies are worrying trend as turnover intention reduces overall effectiveness of an organization as it distract organization from the main goal as they have keep replacing leaving employees. Managing turnover is expensive as it not only covers the cost associated with recruiting and training employees but also the hidden costs such as loss of valuable knowledge from the organization which is not as easily quantifiable. Therefore it is important to understand the factors that influence turnover intention among employees in Malaysian organizations. The success of identifying factors that influence turnover intentions is as important if not more to effectively manage and reduce actual turnover.

Knowledge sharing benefits has been extensively studied in relation to its benefit economically to the organization. Study by Jacobs and Roodt (2007) proves that knowledge sharing negatively influence turnover intention among professional trained nurses in South Africa. Therefore it is important to understand if knowledge sharing also negatively influences turnover intention among employees in Malaysia. This understanding is crucial for organizations and managers to address turnover intention effectively in their organization.
Studies on person-organization-fit supports findings that increase person-organization (P-O) fit to increase job satisfaction and to decrease intent to turnover, with the converse of those relationships being true, as well (Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer & Sablynski, 2007; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003).

Identification of the factors are important but it is also important to understand the extent to which each of the factor influences turnover intention in order for the factors to be addresses based on priority list for a particular organization. Addressing these factors will effectively reduce turnover intention as findings have been consistent that turnover intention is the strongest cognitive precursor of turnover. (e.g.. Lee & Mowday, 1987; Michaels & Spector, 1982; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1981; Tett & Meyer, 1993)

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTION

This study is extended from previous relationship studies between organizational commitment and turnover intention. The study seeks to analyze the influence of affective commitment on turnover intention among employees in Malaysia. It further focuses on affective commitment in order to understand factors that makes up this variable. Then the researcher takes it a step further by looking into whether knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between affective commitment factors, person-organization fit with turnover intention.

This study attempts to answer the following questions.
1) What is the influence of affective commitment on knowledge sharing among employees in Malaysia?
2) Does person-organization-fit relates directly to employees knowledge sharing?
3) How does knowledge sharing relate to employees turnover intention?
4) Is the relationship between affective commitment factors and person-organization fit to employee turnover intention mediated by employee’s knowledge sharing?

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The objectives of this study are as per following:

1) To determine if affective commitment factors has a negative relationship with knowledge sharing among employees in Malaysia
2) To investigate whether Person-Organization fit is negatively related to employees knowledge sharing
3) To determine whether knowledge sharing is negatively related to employees turnover intention
4) To determine whether knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between affective commitment factors and person-organization fit to employee turnover intention

This study seeks to prove the importance of knowledge sharing factors in the presence of person-organization fit and affective commitment factors to an organization in order to reduce turnover intention. The purpose of this paper is to study the extent
which knowledge sharing mediates the relationship of person-organization fit, affective commitment factors and turnover intention among employees in various job sectors in Malaysia. It aims to provide human resource practitioners with guidance so that they can effectively manage turnover in their organization.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study covers white collar employees who are currently working in various industries and services in Malaysia. Some of the industries are manufacturing industry, education industries and finance industry. This study does not cover the blue collared workers in Malaysia. The study does not cover employees who are currently not working, who are employed on part-time basis or currently in between job.

1.6 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

The research study has been organized into 5 main parts which are as per following.

Chapter 1 the introduction discusses the importance of this study to the HRM practitioner as well as its contribution to social science literature. It also looks into the research questions that this study is going to unravel.
Chapter 2 focuses on the literature review on previous studies where the construct affective commitment, knowledge sharing behaviour, person-organization-fit and turnover intention was studied in depth. This chapter presents the theories, previous studies on the construct as well as conceptualization of the research framework.

Chapter 3 cover the research methodology which elaborates further on the hypothesis formation, research methods and instruments used as well as sampling method and data analysis methodology used.

Chapter 4 follows on to discuss in depth the descriptive statistic, data analysis, hypothesis testing as well as research results. Research findings are also discussed in this chapter.

Finally Chapter 5 concludes the entire research by looking at the limitation of this research, the conclusion and recommendation made by the author. It also looks into the practical implications of the findings from this study.
2.0 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter elaborates on earlier studies where the construct affective commitment, knowledge sharing factors, person-organization-fit and turnover intention was studied in depth. It presents the theories, previous studies on the construct as well as the conceptualization of the research framework.

2.2 CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

The concept of knowledge sharing and variables are affective commitment, turnover intention and person-organization fit. The concept of knowledge sharing were elaborated into four factors; which are self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit and knowledge sharing opportunity. The variable affective commitment was investigated to understand factors that form this concept. The variables affective commitment factors, turnover intention, person-organization fit and the four factors of knowledge sharing which are self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit and knowledge sharing opportunity are further elaborated below.
2.2.1 AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

Commitment is a kind of desire to develop a stable relationship, a willingness to make sacrifices on short-term benefits so as to maintain the relationship, and confidence in the stability of the relationship. (Weitz, 1992)

Blau and Boal (1987) defined organizational commitment as a psychological state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and desires to maintain membership with the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) summarized the major definitions of organizational commitment provided by different theorists and categorized them under the three broad themes which are the affective orientation theme, the cost-based theme and the obligation or moral responsibility of commitment theme. The most prevalent theme is through the affective orientation, in which commitment is considered as an affective or emotional attachment to the organization.

Mowday et al. (1979) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in a particular organization”. Meyer and Allen (1997) distinguished three different kinds of commitment which are affective commitment which is related to identification and involvement with the organization, a feeling of emotional attachment to that organization – affective commitment leads to a feeling of wanting to continue employment in the organization; continuance commitment is created by high costs associated with leaving the organization and creates a feeling of needing to continue employment; normative
commitment is related to a feeling of obligation towards the organization, and creates a feeling that one ought to continue employment.

Affective commitment is also defined in studies as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday et al., 1982, p.27; Yui-Tim, Wong, 2002; Porter et al., 1974, p. 604; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Arnold, J. & Davey, K. M. 1999). Tett & Meyer, 1993 defined affective commitment as being related to identification and involvement with the organization, a feeling of emotional attachment to that organization. They also stated that affective commitment leads to feeling of wanting to continue employment in the organization. The affective component of organizational commitment is defined as employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization. (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lok & Crawford, 2001)

Meyer and Allen (1991) considers’ affective commitment to be more effective measure of organizational commitment than the other two types of commitment which are continuance and normative commitment. Research also provides evidence that employee with higher levels of affective commitment to their work, their job and their career exhibit higher levels of continuance and normative commitments. (Cohen, 1996; Boles, Madupalli, Rutherford & Wood, 2007) While the three dimensions of organizational commitment are important, this research focuses on affective organizational commitment since it appears to directly influence effort as well as
indirectly influence the other forms of commitment. (Boles, Madupalli, Rutherford & Wood, 2007)

Affective or attitudinal commitment refers to an individual’s identification with an organization and his/her commitment to maintaining membership to pursue the organization’s goals (McGee and Ford, 1987). Affective commitment results from an agreement between individual and organizational value that makes it possible for one to be come emotionally attached to and enjoy membership in an organization (O’Reilly and Chatman 1986; Meyer and Allen, 1984) Porter and his associates (e.g. Mowday et al., 1982) characterize affective commitment as involving a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and a desire to stay with the company.

For the purpose of this study, affective commitment is defined as employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization as defined by Allen & Meyer (1990).

2.2.2 TURNOVER INTENTION

The turnover intention, belonging to the category of voluntary turnover, refers to the thought that the working staff deliberately made a determination to leave the organization where he had been working for a period after careful consideration (Mobley, 1977). However, it is generally considered to be the last phase after the employee gets
the idea of turnover for attempting to seek for a new post as well as the best way of predicting turnover behaviours. (Cai Kunhong, 2000; Guan & Wu, 2008)

Turnover intentions refer to an individual's estimated probability that he or she will leave an organisation at some point in the near future. (Mei & Gin, 2008) Turnover intentions is seen by (Sager et al., 1998; Jacobs and Roodt, 2007) as a mental decision intervening between an individual’s attitude regarding a job and the stay or leave decision. It also assessed as the employee’s intention to leave the organization (Bigliardi et al, 2005). Tett and Meyer (1993) conceived turnover intention to be a conscious and deliberate wilfulness to leave the organization. It has been described as the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognitions, a set to which thinking of quitting and intent to search for alternative employment also belong (e.g., Mobley, Homer, & Houingsworth, 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993)

Previous research strongly support that intention to leave is strongly and consistently related to voluntary turnover (Steel and Ovalie’s 1984; Dalessio et al., 1986; Griffeth and Hom, 1988; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Hung and Ching, 2006). Bluedorn (1982) and Coverdale and Terbord (1980) have recommended using intent to leave attitudes rather than actual staying or leaving behaviour because it is relatively less expensive to collect data on turnover intentions than actual turnover and since the use of an individual level predictive model can create the problem of temporarily dispersed leaving episodes. Turnover is referred as an individual’s estimated probability that they will stay in an employing organization. (Cotton and Turtle, 1986; Samad, 2006)
Mobley et al. (1979) suggested that intentions offer a better explanation of turnover because they encompass one’s perception and judgement. Turnover intentions are perhaps the best indicator of future turnover. (Futrell and Parasuraman, 1984; Boles, Madupalli, Rutherford & Wood, 2007) Turnover intentions are the immediate precursor to turnover behaviour (Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Based on this findings turnover intention was used as a dependent variable in this study. For the purpose of this study turnover intention is defined as an individual's estimated probability that he or she will leave an organisation at some point in the near future. (Mei & Gin, 2008)

2.2.3 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT

The organizational behaviour scientists have introduced the concept of Person-Organization fit into management science in 1950s. Kristof (1996) proposed an Integrated Model for Fit after he had integrated the concept of person-organization fit on basis of the previous research conclusions. Fit is divided into two between objective fit and perceived (or subjective) forms of fit. Objective fit involves gathering separate information about the person and the organization, then assessing their congruence (e.g., Cable & Parsons, 2001; O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). Perceived fit involves asking people directly whether or not they believe they are a good fit with an organization and its members (e.g., Cable & DeRue, 2002; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001).
The fundamental premise of Person-Organization fit theories is that different types of people are attracted to different types of organizations (Kristof, 1996; Schneider, 1987). Kristof (1996) reckoned the person-organization fit exists to some extent when one of the following conditions fulfilled:

(a) Person and organization, at least either of them is able to provide the counterpart with required resources;

(b) Person and organization hold similarities in certain characteristics;

(c) or the above both 2 conditions fulfilled.

Kristof wins agreement of majority scholars because of its comprehensive nature, in practical research, most people shall adopt the other definition of Person-Organization fit proposed by Chatman (1991), who considered that Person-Organization fit refers to the identity between the individual value model and organization value model.

Similar to Schneider's (1987) ASA framework, Chatman (1989) describes Person-Organization fit as "the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and of persons" because Person-Organization fit focuses on the values of the individual and the organization, researchers commonly view Person-Organization fit as a representation of how well employees feel they fit with the organizational culture (Chatman and Jehn, 1994). More specifically, people are attracted to firms with values and behavioural norms that they view as important and to firms that provide opportunities for goal attainment. (Chatman, 1989; Pervin, 1989; Turban, Lau, Ngo, Chow and SI, 2000)
Person-Organization fit takes an interactionist view of the organization (Chatman, 1989). O'Reilly, Chatman, and Caldwell (1991) and Cable and Judge (1996) conceptualize Person-Organization fit as "person-culture" fit, which implies that expectations of norms, roles, and behaviours are agreed upon. Chatman (1989) defines person-organization fit "as the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons". Person-Organization fit is also defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: at least one entity provides what the other needs, or they share similar fundamental characteristics or both”. (Kristof, 1996; Resick, Baltes and Shantz, 2007)

Person-Organization fit is as a person’s perception of his or her compatibility with an organization’s culture and members which also referred as perceived supplementary fit. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) suggested that objective congruence between a person and an organization must first be filtered through that person’s perceptions. In turn, these perceptions are likely to be more cognitively accessible (Judge & Cable, 1997) and therefore more proximally related to attitudes and decisions than objective Person Organization fit would be (Cable & DeRue, 2002).

For the purpose of this study, Person-Organization fit is defined as the compatibility between norms and values of the organization and the person’s values which is adopted from definition by Chatman (1989)
2.2.4 KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Knowledge is defined as information that is validated and endowed with meaning through experiences, beliefs, values and insights. (Davenport and Prusak, 1999; Chua, 2003) Knowledge or expertise is a source of power, the disclosure of which might lead to erosion of individual power, thereby partly explaining an individual’s reluctance to share it with others (Bartol and Srivastava, 2002). A common classification of organizational knowledge (Nonaka, 1991) comprises explicit knowledge, which can be documented and shared, and implicit or tacit knowledge, which resides in the minds, cultures, and experiences within the organization. (Rowley, 2003)

Individual knowledge is the critical resource which is the foundation of a team’s competitive advantage. The movement of knowledge across the individual and geographical boundaries is dependent on knowledge sharing behaviors. (Chen, Vogel, Zhang & Zhao) Individual employees, teams, organization and the experience, value and expertise in the organization are collectively known as organizational knowledge. It comes from the minds of individual knowledge workers and emerges when knowledge workers interact with each other or with the environment. (Cook & Brown, 1999)

Davenport and Prusak (1998) defined knowledge sharing as a process that organizational knowledge is interchanged in the knowledge market. They viewed knowledge sharing as a process of knowledge transferring and knowledge absorption. Holtshouse (1998) promoted that knowledge sharing is the process of converting personal
knowledge into group knowledge. Nonaka (1994) defined knowledge sharing as converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge. Knowledge sharing is the process by which individuals collectively and iteratively refine a thought, an idea or a suggestion in the light of experiences. The original idea may be progressively modified or gradually rejected until a shared perspective emerges (Rogers, 1986; West and Meyer, 1997; Chua, 2003).

According to Yoo et al (2007) knowledge sharing is process of creating a mutual stock of knowledge among individuals or groups which refers the knowledge that someone in the organization already knows through direct or indirect interaction. The difficulties of knowledge sharing are well documented (von Hippel, 1994; Szulanski, 1996). Knowledge sharing process involves channelling knowledge between a source and a recipient. Cummings and Teng (2006) in their research stated that regardless of the company’s role, the objective of any knowledge-sharing process is to transfer source knowledge successfully to a recipient.

Until quite recently much of the research of knowledge sharing has focused on the economic benefits, such as being competitive (Gupta et al., 2000; Husted and Michailova, 2002; Jacobs and Roodt, 2007). Jacobs and Roodt (2007) reported Hislop (2003) as having reviewed a significant number of studies in knowledge management and reported that these studies have a limited empirical basis and the majority can typically be described as “exploratory studies”, which illustrates the lack of depth in contemporary understanding of how human and social factors affect knowledge management and sharing initiatives.
For the purpose of this study knowledge sharing is defined as the process of converting personal knowledge into group knowledge adopted from Holtshouse (1998)

2.3 AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Based on the organization theory, organizational commitment has been reported as an important variable in explaining knowledge sharing in quite a number of studies (Jarvenpaa and Staples, 2001; Van den Hooff and Van Weenen, 2004). Organizational commitment is accordingly expected to be linked to willingness to donate and receive knowledge (Van den Hooff and Van Weenen, 2004). It is also supported by O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) and Van den Hooff and Van Weenen (2004) that the nature and pattern of individual behaviour on knowledge sharing is influenced by the individuals’ commitment to their immediate organizations.

Individuals who have a feeling of emotional attachment to their organization are likely to share their knowledge whenever they realize that they share their knowledge in an environment where doing so is appreciated and where their knowledge will be actually used and eventually be beneficial to their organization (Hall, 2001; Van den Hooff and Van Weenen, 2004; Chieh, 2007). Given that individuals who are strongly committed to their organization may attach substantial importance to their organizational membership and to their relationship with other members (O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986) individuals’ organizational commitment is likely to facilitate their intentions of tacit knowledge
sharing with other members, which may benefit their organization in the long-run horizon. For instance, it was reported that organizational commitment is strongly linked to sales force contexts with various supportive spirits (e.g., tacit knowledge sharing), including those directed to co-workers (MacKenzie et al., 1998), indicating that organizational commitment may be significantly related to tacit knowledge sharing with others, which reflects a crucially supportive context.

This phenomenon may be further supported by Jarvenpaa and Staples (2001) strong organizational commitment engender beliefs that the organization has the right to the information and knowledge one has created or acquired. Research by Chieh (2007) supports findings that low tacit knowledge sharing is likely attributed to a lack of organizational commitment and trust in co-workers. Significant positive correlations were also found between knowledge sharing and organisational commitment, job satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour’s. (Jacob and Roodt, 2007)

Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that affective commitment is positively related to individuals’ willingness to commit extra effort to their work and this is the kind of commitment that can be expected to be related to willingness to donate and receive knowledge. Hall (2001) argues people are more willing to share their knowledge if they are convinced that doing so is useful – if they have feeling that they share their knowledge in an environment where doing so is appreciated and where their knowledge will actually be used.
Jarvenpaa and Staples (2001), who state that “greater commitment may engender beliefs that the organization has rights to the information and knowledge one has created or required”. Therefore it leads to the formation of the following hypothesis that affective commitment has a positive relationship with knowledge sharing. The relationship has been previously investigated (Hislop, 2002; Kelloway and Barling, 2000; Scarbrough, 1999; Smith and McKeen, 2002). Smith and McKeen (2002) stated that commitment to the organization is an important part of a knowledge sharing culture. Hooff and Ridder (2004) research findings support that commitment to the organization influence knowledge sharing. Chieh (2007) in his research model studied whether organization–person, personal, and interpersonal influences affect tacit knowledge sharing through the meditation of organizational commitment and trust in co-workers.

Von Krogh et al. (2000) found that, the employment relation between organization and employees plays an important role in developing worker’s emotions of trust and commitment to the organization. The emotion will then affect the workers’ attitude towards knowledge sharing. (Zhao, 2006) Aiwu (2006) further proved this view from the aspect of psychological contract by statistical analysis. (Lao, Xiao, Wang & Qin) Wang and Yang (2008) research findings commitment is significantly associated with knowledge sharing behaviour (path coefficient $= 0.394$, $t = 4.723$).

Even though organizational commitment has interested researchers due to its positive effects on business organizations, relatively little has been studied on its relationship and effect on organizational commitment moreover in the context of
affective commitment. As such, this study contributes to the literature on affective commitment by assessing its relationship with knowledge sharing behaviour.

2.4 KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Research by Jacob and Roodt (2007) supported the findings that knowledge sharing and turnover intention. The findings yielded important result that there is a significant negative relationship between knowledge sharing and turnover intentions was found for factor 1 \( r = 0.418; p< 0.05 \) and factor 2 \( r = 0.234; p< 0.05 \), meaning that the more positive professional nurses were about knowledge sharing, the less inclined they were to turnover intentions. (Jacob and Roodt, 2007) The research on professional nurses in South Africa gave significant negative relationship between knowledge sharing and turnover intentions. (Jacobs & Roodt, 2007)

Turnover intention has been studied many times over. Meanwhile knowledge sharing is a lesser studied field comparatively. To date very little study has been done on the relationship between knowledge sharing and turnover intention.

2.5 AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT, KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND TURNOVER INTENTION
These signals elicit attitudinal and, presumably, behavioural responses such as increased commitment, continued service to the organization, and a lower intent to quit which results in lowered actual turnover. (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al, 1993; Mohamed, Taylor & Hassan, 2006) Satisfaction and commitment, for instance, have invariably been reported to be negatively related to turnover and intent to leave. (e.g., Arnold & Feldman, 1982; Bluedorn, 1982; Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986; Tett & Meyer, 1993)

Past research findings showed that turnover intention is negatively, significantly, and consistently related to affective commitment. (Allen and Lee, 1993; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Yui-Tim, Wong, 2002) In particular, affective commitment construct has consistently been shown to correlate negatively with turnover intention or actual turnover (Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993). Chen and Francesco (2000) reported a strong negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions based on a survey of Chinese employees. (Yui-Tim, Wong, 2002)

Knowledge sharing has been shown to have a positive correlation to turnover intention and affective commitment. A significant negative relationship was found between knowledge sharing behaviour and turnover intentions. Therefore it would be logical to suggest that knowledge sharing might have a mediating effect on the relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention. Organizational commitment was found to be negatively associated with turnover intention. (Ahuja, Chudoba, George, Kacmar & Mcknight, 2002). Igharia and Greenhaus (1992) found that
organizational commitment was a strong predictor of turnover intentions ($r = .38$), second only to job satisfaction. Mobley, et al. (1979), reviewed several studies that showed that commitment was related to either turnover intention or turnover itself. Meta-analysis has also confirmed the link between commitment and turnover intention (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986).

2.6 PERSON-ORGANIZATION-FIT AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

Person-Organization fit impact on knowledge sharing is one of the fields that has not been studied extensively.

Achieving a high degree of P-O fit is viewed in many quarters as desirable in terms of positive work-related outcomes, especially in the context of a tight labor market and the war for talent (Ng and Burke, 2005) and in buttressing organizational culture. Morley (2007) in this study has stated that much has been claimed for person-organization fit in terms of its potential impact on inter alia, job seeking intentions, both job and career satisfaction, psychological strain, organizational citizenship behaviors, knowledge acquisition and knowledge sharing, ethical conduct, organizational identification, job performance, and turnover.

Therefore it would be interesting to understand from this study how much is the impact of person-organization fit on knowledge sharing and further understand the relationship.
2.7 PERSON-ORGANIZATION FIT AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Person-to-Organization Fit Theory posits that high compatibility between an individual and an organization is negatively related to turnover. (Argyris 1957; Pervin 1989; Arthur et al. 2006; Hoffman and Woehr 2006; Lacity, Iyer & Rudramuniyaiah, 2008) In particular, person-organization-fit is associated with greater organizational commitment and lower turnover (e.g., Cable and Judge 1996; O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell 1991). In general, positive responses are believed to occur when individuals fit or match the requirements of a situation (O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell 1991).

The analysis on survival ratio made by O'Reilly (1991) and other scholars indicates that the value fit is a major factor to influence the flow of employees; according to the analysis on value fit level, the employee’s turnover trend can be predicted effectively within 2 years. Meanwhile, it was also proved by Chatman (1991) that at the beginning of the new employee’s entry to an enterprise or that the new employee had undergone interviews and socialized process for one year, the employee’s turnover intention can be predicted effectively according to the fit level between the enterprise and the employee.

The research of Voncouver and Schmitt (1991 &1994) shows that: between superior and subordinate or, between colleagues, the high-level fit for goal has negative relations with turnover intention; whereas the employees with low-level fit show relatively high turnover intention. In addition to this, the attraction-selection-attrition
approach to the etiology of organizational climate (Schneider, 1987) suggests that perceived mis-matches between the individual's and the organization's values may be the impetus for turnover. (Schwepker, 1999)

Among these relationships, Person-Organization fit has been found to positively relate to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement (Saks and Ashforth, 1997) and been found to negatively relate to stress and intent to turnover (Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991; Autry & Wheeler, 2005) Outcomes of employees’ Person-Organization fit perceptions is that employees sharing the values of their organizations are more satisfied with their jobs, and are less likely to quit. (Bertz & Judge, 1993; Chatman, 1989, 1991; Meglino, Ravlin &Adkins, 1989; O’Reilly et al., 1991)

In addition recent studies by Van Vianen, De Pater and Van Dijk (2007) supported relationship where Person-Organization fit was found to be significantly related to turnover intention. \( r = 0.22, p < 0.05 \). Guan and Wu (2008) reported findings conducted by three Chinese scholars Zhang Mian, Zhang De and Yu Dan who have taken 742 enterprise employees from Xi’an as samples and discovered that the expected fit has positive influence on job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment while having negative influence on turnover intention.
2.8 PERSON-ORGANIZATION-FIT, KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Person-Organization fit research has successfully improved the prediction of important work outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003).

Person-Organization fit has been found to negatively relate to stress and intent to turnover (Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991). (Autry & Wheeler, 2005) An important expansion of Person-Organization fit research is to examine whether employees’ organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions are a function of their explicit Person-Organization fit perceptions. The findings indicated that employees’ perceived Person-Organization fit perceptions significantly predict their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions and willingness to recommend their organization to others.

Increase person-organization-fit to increase job satisfaction and to decrease intent to turnover, with the converse of those relationships being true, as well (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Verquer et al., 2003; Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer and Sablynski, 2007). When there is an absence of a strong personal tie that warrants listening to or helping each other, knowledge sharing is hampered (Wiig, 1999).
Based on the literature review research, it was found that very few studies have been conducted to study the interaction between knowledge sharing, person-organization fit and turnover intention. Therefore this study on the above relationship will contribute significantly to the academician in this area.

2.9 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Upon providing a background and the definition to the key concepts used in this study, the theoretical model that proposes the mediating relationship of knowledge sharing that explains the relationship between employee’s affective commitment factors, person-organization fit and turnover intention is introduced.

Figure 1: Research Study Conceptual Framework
The affective commitment construct and the person-organization fit act as the independent variables in this study which predicts the dependent variable turnover intention. Knowledge sharing acts as the mediating variable in the relationship between affective commitment factors and person-organization fit to turnover intention.
3.0 CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The research methodology elaborates further on the hypothesis formation, research methods and instruments used as well as sampling method and data analysis methodology used.

3.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework is made up of knowledge sharing concept which is divided into four dimensions which are self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing opportunity and knowledge sharing benefit. The framework is further linked to the turnover intention.
benefit. The variables are affective commitment, person-organization fit and turnover intention. The affective commitment variable is measured by eight elements which will be further analyzed to investigate the presence of more than one factor measuring it. Meanwhile the person-organization fit and turnover intention is both measured by three elements.

3.3 DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESIS

H1: An employee’s affective commitment factors has a positive effect on knowledge sharing

H1a: An employee’s affective commitment has a positive impact on employee’s perception on self knowledge sharing behaviour

H1b: An employee’s affective commitment has a positive impact on employee’s perception on others knowledge sharing behaviour

H1c: An employee’s affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing benefit

H1d: An employee’s affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing opportunity

H2: An employee’s person-organization fit has a positive effect on knowledge sharing

H2a: An employee’s person-organization fit has a positive impact on employee’s perception on self knowledge sharing behaviour
H2b: An employee’s person-organization fit has a positive impact on employee’s perception on others knowledge sharing behaviour
H2c: An employee’s person-organization fit has a positive effect on knowledge sharing benefit
H2d: An employee’s person-organization fit has a positive effect on knowledge sharing opportunity

H3: Employees knowledge sharing has a negative relationship with turnover intention
   H3a: Employees self knowledge sharing behaviour has a negative impact on turnover intention
   H3b: Employees others knowledge sharing behaviour has a negative impact on turnover intention
   H3c: Employees knowledge sharing benefit has a negative impact on turnover intention
   H3d: Employees knowledge sharing opportunity has a negative impact on turnover intention

H4: Knowledge sharing factors has a mediating affect on affective commitment relationship with turnover intention

H5: Knowledge sharing factors has a mediating affect on person-organization fit relationship with turnover intention
3.4 SELECTIONS OF MEASURES

In this research, there are four key variables which are affective commitment, turnover intention, knowledge sharing and person-organization fit were studied. This study measures were generated from well established measurement scales for affective commitment, turnover intention and person-organization-fit. The questionnaires used in this study can be referred at Appendix 1.

Organization affective commitment was measured using 8 item scale developed by Allen & Meyer (1990). Participant responded to a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 5(strongly agree). The reliability for this scale is 0.87. For the purpose of this study a factor analysis will be done on the affective commitment scale to investigate the presence of more than factor that forms this construct.

Person Organization Fit was measured using a 3-item scale derived by combining the items from Cable & Judge and Saks and Ashforth (1997). The internal consistency for this scale is 0.87. Participant responded to a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Turnover intention was measured using a 3-item scale adapted from Chiu and Francesco 2002. The scale is made up of three items: “In the last few months, I have seriously thought about looking for a new job”, which was an item developed for Chiu and Francesco’s study, “Presently, I am actively searching for other job” from the work
of Jenkins (1993), and “I intend to leave the organisation in the near future” from the work of Kransz et al. (1995). The respondents were asked to indicate their responses on a five-point Likert scale with endpoints of 1, strongly disagree, and 5, strongly agree.

Knowledge sharing, there are 4 dimension to the knowledge sharing concept which are self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit and knowledge sharing opportunity which is measured using a 23-item scale developed by Jacobs & Roodt (2007). Each of the items was measured on 5-point Likert scale anchored at extreme poles ranging from ‘disagree’ (low intensity) to ‘agree’ (high intensity).

3.5 SAMPLING DESIGN

Source of data collected was primary data taken from respondents using the questionnaire. The target population consists of white collar employees currently employed on a full-time basis in any organization. Method of sampling used is convenience sampling due to time limitation. Based on this sampling more than 250 respondents were selected.
3.6 **DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE**

The sample comprises of full time employed white collar employees from various organizations. A total of 250 questionnaires were distributed to employees in general administration, supervisory, managerial, technical and professional position within these organizations. From the 250 questionnaire distributed 200 questionnaires were completed and returned on time.

Survey questionnaire was distributed personally by researcher and also through friends and colleagues. Questionnaire was also distributed via mail and electronic mail. Participation in this survey was entirely voluntary on the part of respondents which present difficulty in obtaining cooperation from respondents to complete the questionnaire.

3.7 **DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES**

Survey questionnaires were collected and the responses to the studies variables are analyzed using the SPSS 6.0 for statistical analysis. Primary data gathered from the questionnaire are processed using four phases namely coding, editing, data reliability testing and then analyzing. Factor analysis was done on the affective commitment items to study the factor structure of this scale. The statistical test of correlation coefficient and multiple regressions was used to test the validity of the hypotheses.
4.0 CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH RESULTS

This chapter focuses on analysing the data collected. Firstly the data’s collected were prepared for analysis. Then the feel for data was gained by assessing the frequency distribution of the demographic variables, the mean and standard deviation of the dependent and independent variable as well as the inter-correlation of the variables. Factor analysis was conducted on affective commitment items to identify the underlying factor structure. The goodness of data was tested by testing the internal consistency reliability. The hypotheses were tested using statistical manipulation and the findings was analysed.

4.1 SUMMARY STATISTICS

Table 1: Description of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample (n = 200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥50</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and below</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate/Diploma</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Professional</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to eliminate any bias between actual perceptions based on experience and hear say we only considered respondents who are currently working in different organizations. The questionnaires were self-administered and interviewer was present to clarify any doubts and queries. The sample is divided between with 42.0% being males and 58.0% female. The largest group of respondents fell into the 20-29 years age group (45.0%) followed closely by the 30 – 39 age group at 41.5%. In terms of marital status,
59.0% of the respondents were married, 39.5% were single and 1.5% of them were either divorced/separated/widowed.

In reference to the sample 74.0% have degrees/professional qualifications, 15.5% have post-graduate qualifications, 8.0% have certificates/diplomas, while 2.5% were educated up to secondary school level only. The sample distribution is such due to the fact that the questionnaires were distributed to fellow colleagues, students and friends who are working in various organizations. For current job position, the largest group was in middle management (69.0%), followed by skilled professional group (19.0%), technical employee (5.5%), non management (3.5%), top management (0.5%) and others (2.5%).

The respondents are from various job sectors to reduce the biasness of the sampling with majority from education industry (28.0%), manufacturing - food, beverages and tobacco industry (23.0%), finance and insurance industry (13.0%), information and telecommunication (7.0%) and other industries among which are motor vehicle industry, electric and electronic industry, petroleum and natural gas industry and consultancy service industry.

All the respondents have working experiences and are currently employed. 49.0% of the respondents have less than 3 years working experiences, 28.5% of the respondents have 3-6 years experience, 11.0% have 7-10 working experiences and 11.5% have more than 10 years working experiences.
4.2 ANALYSIS OF MEASURES

SPSS software was used to test the measurement scales reliability, examine the validity of the theoretical framework and test the hypothesized relationships. The internal consistency of the measurement scale used to measure knowledge sharing, affective commitment, person-organization fit and turnover intention was measured using the Cronbach’s Alpha.

4.2.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC ANALYSIS

Factor analysis was conducted on the affective commitment questionnaire. The purpose of this factor analysis is to cluster the items that measure a specific concept and to reject those that do not contribute to the measuring of the concept. The questionnaire was factor analyzed using the principal axis factoring procedure in order to determine the factor structure of the instrument.

Findings indicate that Bartlett’s test of sphericity is significant and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy at 0.872 is far greater than 0.6. The inspection of the anti-image correlation matrix reveals that all the measures of sampling adequacy are well above the acceptable level of 0.5. The eigenvalues suggest two factors to be extracted based on the eigenvalues greater than 1. The principal axis factoring yielded two factors explaining about 50% of the variance in the factor space. The varimax rotation was used to identify items that make up the two factors.
The scale reliability of the Factor 1: Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment which measures the involvement and attachment to the organization is 0.76. Meanwhile the scale reliability of the Factor 2: Involvement and Attachment of affective commitment which measure the emotional attachment to the organization is 0.81.

Table 2: Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis for All Four Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment</td>
<td>Don't Feel I am part of the Family in current Org</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do Not Feel Emotionally Attached to Current Org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org Has Great Deal of Personal Meaning to me</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do Not Feel Strong Sense of Belonging</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Involvement and Attachment of affective commitment</td>
<td>Happy to Spend Rest of Career in Current Organization</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoy Discussing Organization with People Outside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel Organization Problem are My Own</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think Can Easily Be attached to another Org as current</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Descriptive Statistic of the Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>3.647</td>
<td>0.3877</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>3.528</td>
<td>0.4801</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing Benefit</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>0.5883</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing Opportunity</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>0.6946</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Organization Fit</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>1.0613</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scale reliabilities show slightly differing pattern as in the Jacobs and Roodt (2007) findings. The scale reliability of self knowledge sharing behaviour and
knowledge sharing opportunity is 0.66 which is acceptable in comparison to the findings from the study by Jacobs and Roodt (2007). Meanwhile the scale reliability of others knowledge sharing behaviour and knowledge sharing benefit is 0.81 and 0.86 respectively which is good scale reliability. The reliability of the knowledge sharing items ranged from 0.66 to 0.86. The scale reliability of person-organization fit and turnover intention is 0.820 and 0.858 respectively which indicates high scale reliability.

The assumption of normality was satisfied using the normality probability plots. Meanwhile the test for presence of outliers were addressed and removed by using the box-plot method. Whereas the test for linearity was satisfied using the scatter plot method. Normality test using the normal probability plots indicates that cases falls in more or less in a straight line.

4.3 TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with self knowledge sharing behaviour. \( r = .356, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation is \( r = .356 \) which indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable. Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with self knowledge sharing behaviour. \( r = .305, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation is \( r = .305 \) which indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable. This finding supports the H1a hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has
a positive effect on self knowledge sharing behaviour. Both affective commitment factors have significant positive relationship self knowledge sharing behaviour.

Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with others knowledge sharing behaviour. \( r = .435, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation \( r = .435 \) indicates a high correlation between these two variable. Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with others knowledge sharing behaviour. \( r = .451, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation \( r = .451 \) indicates a high correlation between these two variable. This findings supports the H1b hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on others knowledge sharing behaviour. Both the affective commitment factors have a significant positive relationship with others knowledge sharing behaviour.

Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing benefit. \( r = .166, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation \( r = .166 \) indicates a low correlation between these two variable. Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing benefit. \( r = .213, p < .01 \). The coefficient correlation \( r = .213 \) indicates a low correlation between these two variables. This finding supports the H1c hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing benefit.
Both the affective commitment factors have a significant positive relationship with knowledge sharing benefit.

Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing opportunity. \((r = .273, p < .01)\). The coefficient correlation \((r=.273)\) indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable. Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing opportunity. \((r = .290, p < .01)\). The coefficient correlation \((r=.290)\) indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable. This findings support the H1d hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing opportunity. Both the affective commitment factors have a significant positive relationship with knowledge sharing opportunity.

Person-Organization fit variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with self knowledge sharing behaviour. \((r = .333, p < .01)\). This finding supports the H2a hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on self knowledge sharing behaviour. The coefficient correlation \((r=.333)\) indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable.

Person-Organization fit variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with others knowledge sharing behaviour. \((r = .477, p < .01)\). This finding supports the H1b hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a
positive effect on others knowledge sharing behaviour. The coefficient correlation ($r=.477$) indicates a high correlation between these two variable.

Person-Organization fit variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing benefit. ($r = .134, p < .01$). This finding supports the H1c hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing benefit. The coefficient correlation is ($r=.134$) which indicates a low correlation between these two variable.

Person-Organization fit variable has a significant positive coefficients correlation relationship with knowledge sharing opportunity. ($r = .221, p < .01$). This finding supports the H1d hypothesis which sought to prove that affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing opportunity. The coefficient correlation is ($r=.221$) which indicates a low correlation between these two variable.

Employee self knowledge sharing behaviour variable has a significant negative coefficient correlation relationship with turnover intention. ($r = -.234, p < .01$). This finding supports the H3a hypothesis which sought to prove that employees self knowledge sharing behaviour has a negative effect on turnover intention. The coefficient correlation is ($r=-.234$) which indicates a low correlation between these two variable.

Employees perception on others knowledge sharing behaviour variable has a significant negative coefficients correlation relationship with turnover intention. ($r = -
.409, \( p < .01 \). This finding supports the H3b hypothesis which sought to prove that employees perception on others knowledge sharing behaviour has a negative effect on turnover intention. The coefficient correlation is \( r = -.409 \) which indicates a moderate correlation between these two variable.

Employee’s perception on knowledge sharing benefit variable has a significant negative coefficients correlation relationship with turnover intention. \( r = -.200, p < .01 \). This finding supports the H3c hypothesis which sought to prove that employee’s perception on knowledge sharing benefit has a negative effect on turnover intention. The coefficient correlation is \( r = -.200 \) which indicates a low correlation between these two variable.

Knowledge sharing opportunity variable has a significant negative coefficients correlation relationship with turnover intention. \( r = -.272, p < .01 \). This finding supports the H3d hypothesis which sought to prove that knowledge sharing opportunity has a negative impact on turnover intention. The coefficient correlation is \( r = -.272 \) which indicates a low correlation between these two variable.
Table 4: Correlation Matrix of Relationship between Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment, Self Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Others Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Knowledge Sharing Behaviour, Knowledge Sharing Opportunity, Person-Organization Fit and Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emotional Attachment of affective commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Involvement and Attachment of the Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.611*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.452*</td>
<td>0.484*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.356*</td>
<td>0.305*</td>
<td>0.333*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others Knowledge Sharing Behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.435*</td>
<td>0.451*</td>
<td>0.477*</td>
<td>0.550*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge Sharing Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.166*</td>
<td>0.213*</td>
<td>0.134*</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Knowledge Sharing Opportunity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.273*</td>
<td>0.290*</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>0.275*</td>
<td>0.473*</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.443*</td>
<td>-0.432*</td>
<td>-0.344*</td>
<td>-0.234*</td>
<td>-0.409*</td>
<td>-0.200*</td>
<td>-0.272*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
The coefficient correlation obtained was above 0. We are able to gauge the magnitude and the direction of the association between these variables. The closer the correlation is to either +1 or -1, the stronger the correlation. The direction of the correlation explains the relationship between variables. The findings in this study indicate positive correlation therefore the relationship between all the variables are positive relationship. The result obtained from this study supports the hypotheses drawn.

Regression analysis was conducted to test for the significance of knowledge sharing concepts as a mediating variable. The test was done using the four step method proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). The independent variable was regressed against the dependent variable. The data fulfil all the 4 assumptions that is the ratio of cases to independent variable is more than minimum requirement, normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and independence of residual has been tested and found to be conforming to the requirement, no outliers, and no multicolinearity

Table 6 indicates that the independent variables Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment correlates moderately to the dependent variable turnover intention ($R = .488$). The independent variables explain 23.8% of the variance of the dependent variable. The independent variables influencing turnover intention is significant at ($F_{2, 197} = 30.77, p < .05$).
Table 5: Correlation of Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment against Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.488(a)</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>2.79338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictor: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment
b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Table 6: Independent Variables (Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>240.119</td>
<td>30.773</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>7.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2017.420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictor: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment
b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Table 7: Coefficient Correlation and Significance for Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.791</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>15.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Then the independent variables were regressed against the mediating variables. Table 9 indicates that the independent variables Emotional Attachment of the affective
commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment correlates moderately to the mediating variable self knowledge sharing behaviour \((R = .527)\). The independent variables explain 27.8\% of the variance of the mediating variable. The independent variables influencing self knowledge sharing behaviour is significant at \((F_{2, 187} = 35.95, p < .05)\).

Table 8: Correlation of Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment against Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(R)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>Adjusted (R^2)</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R^2) Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.527(a)</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>7.0791</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment

b Dependent Variable: Knowledge Sharing

Table 9: Independent Variables (Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3602.860</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1801.430</td>
<td>35.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>9371.292</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>50.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12974.153</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment

b Dependent Variable: Knowledge Sharing
Then the mediating variable was regressed against the dependent variable. Table 12 indicates that the mediating variable knowledge sharing correlates moderately to the dependent variable turnover intention ($R = .382$). The mediating variables explain 14.60% of the variance of the dependent variable. It indicates significant relationship ($F_{1,188} = 32.20, p < .05$).

Table 11: Multiple Correlation of Knowledge Sharing against Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.382(a)</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>32.196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Sharing
b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

d Table 12: Independent Variable Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>274.563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>274.563</td>
<td>32.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1603.232</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>8.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1877.795</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge Sharing
b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention
Table 13: Coefficient Correlation and Significance for Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.475</td>
<td>2.175</td>
<td>8.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Then the independent variables and the mediating variable were regressed against the dependent variable. Table 15 indicates that the independent variable and the mediating variable correlates highly to the dependent variable turnover intention. \( R = .541 \) The mediating variable and dependant variable explain 29.2% of the variance of the dependant variable. It indicates significant relationship \( (F_{3, 186} = 25.61, p < .05) \).

Table 14: Correlation of Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and Knowledge Sharing against Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.541(a)</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>2.6729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and Knowledge Sharing

b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Table 15: Independent Variable Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>548.961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182.987</td>
<td>25.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1328.834</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>7.144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1877.765</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and Knowledge Sharing

b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention
Table 16: Coefficient Correlation and Significance for Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.416</td>
<td>1.991</td>
<td>9.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Based on the final regression in the presence of independent variable, the mediating variable knowledge sharing is a significant predictor of turnover intention. This indicates that the model with knowledge sharing concepts as the mediating variable is fully supported. The analysis indicates that in this case knowledge sharing and affective commitment factors remains significant predictors of turnover intention.

Both Table 8 and Table 17 show that the independent variables Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment correlate negatively and significantly with the dependant variable which is turnover intention. Table 17 also indicates that mediating variables Knowledge Sharing correlate negatively and significantly with the dependant variable turnover intention. The independent variable Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and Knowledge Sharing contributes significantly to the prediction of turnover intention.
The β value for Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment also indicates that a unit increase in Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment will see a decrease in turnover intention by a standard deviation of 0.26 without out the presence of mediating variable and 0.29 with the presence of mediating variable. The β value for Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment also indicates that a unit increase in Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment will see a decrease in turnover intention by a standard deviation of 0.25 without the presence of mediating variable and 0.26 with the presence of mediating variable.

Table 17 shows that the mediating variable knowledge sharing correlates negatively and significantly with the dependant variable turnover intention. The mediating variable knowledge sharing contributes significantly to predicting turnover intention. The β value for Knowledge Sharing indicates that a unit increase in Knowledge Sharing decreases turnover intention by a standard deviation of 0.15.

The research findings indicate that independents variable; Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment, Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment and mediating variable knowledge sharing are significant predictors of turnover intention. The independent variables Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment explain 23.8% of the variance of the turnover intention and it’s significant. The independent variables Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the
affective commitment together with knowledge sharing explain 29.2% of the variance of the turnover intention and it is significant.

Table 18 indicates that the independent variable Person-Organization Fit correlates moderately to the dependent variable turnover intention ($R = .344$). The independent variable explains 11.8% of the dependent variable variance. The independent variable influencing turnover intention is significant at ($F_{1, 194} = 26.06, p < .05$).

**Table 17: Correlation of Person-Organization-Fit against Turnover Intention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.344(a)</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>2.9563</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>26.059</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Predictor: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit  
*b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

**Table 18: Independent Variables (Person-Organization-Fit)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>227.743</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>227.743</td>
<td>26.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1695.497</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>8.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1923.240</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Predictor: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit  
*b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

**Table 19: Coefficient Correlation and Significance for Independent Variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>11.918</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>12.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-Organization-Fit</td>
<td>-.450</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention
Then the independent variable was regressed against the mediating variable. Table 21 indicates that the independent variable person-organization-fit correlates moderately to the mediating variable knowledge sharing \((R = .448)\). The independent variables explain 20.1% of the variance of the mediating variable. The independent variables influencing knowledge sharing is significant at \((F_{1,186} = 46.81, p < .05)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.448(a)</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>7.4094</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>46.808</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Predictors: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit  
*b Dependent Variable: Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2569.743</td>
<td>46.808</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>54.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>12780.995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Predictors: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit  
*b Dependent Variable: Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>67.489</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>26.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-Organization-Fit</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Knowledge Sharing
Then the mediating variable was regressed against the dependent variable. Table 12 indicates that the mediating variable knowledge sharing correlates moderately to the dependent variable turnover intention ($R = .382$). The mediating variables explain 14.60% of the variance of the dependant variable. It indicates significant relationship ($F_{1,188} = 32.20, p < .05$).

Then the independent variables and the mediating variable were regressed against the dependent variable. Table 24 indicates that the independent variable and the mediating variable correlates moderately to the dependent variable turnover intention. ($R = .454$) The mediating variable and dependant variable explain 20.6% of the variance of the dependant variable. It indicates significant relationship ($F_{2,185} = 23.97, p < .05$).

**Table 23: Correlation of Person-Organization-Fit and Knowledge Sharing against Turnover Intention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.454(a)</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>2.8100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a Predictors: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit and Knowledge Sharing**

**b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention**

**Table 24: Independent Variable Variables (Person-Organization-Fit and Knowledge Sharing)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>378.449</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>189.225</td>
<td>23.965</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1460.758</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7.896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1839.207</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a Predictors: (Constant), Person-Organization-Fit and Knowledge Sharing**

**b Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention**
Table 25: Coefficient Correlation and Significance for Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>19.721</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>9.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization-Fit</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-3.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-3.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention

Both Table 18 and Table 26 show that the independent variable Person-Organization-Fit correlate negatively and significantly with the dependant variable which is turnover intention. Table 26 also indicates that mediating variables Knowledge Sharing correlate negatively and significantly with the dependant variable turnover intention. The independent variable Person-Organization-Fit and Knowledge Sharing contributes significantly to the prediction of turnover intention.

The $\beta$ value for Person-Organization-Fit also indicates that a unit increase in Person-Organization-Fit will see a decrease in turnover intention by a standard deviation of 0.34 without out the presence of mediating variable and 0.28 with the presence of mediating variable. Table 26 shows that the mediating variable knowledge sharing correlates negatively and significantly with the dependant variable which is turnover intention. The mediating variable knowledge sharing contributes significantly to the prediction of turnover intention. The $\beta$ value for Knowledge Sharing indicates that a unit increase in Knowledge Sharing will see a decrease in turnover intention by a standard deviation of 0.26.
The research findings indicate that independents variable; person-organization-fit and mediating variable knowledge sharing are significant predictors of turnover intention. The independent variable person-organization-fit explains 11.8% of the variance of the turnover intention and it is significant. The independent variables person-organization-fit together with knowledge sharing explains 20.6% of the variance of the turnover intention and it is significant.

Based on the final regression in the presence of independent variable, the mediating variable knowledge sharing is a significant predictor of turnover intention. This indicates that the model with knowledge sharing concepts as the mediating variable is fully supported. The analysis indicates that in this case affective commitment factors and person-organization-fit remains significant predictors of turnover intention.

4.4 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH RESULTS

The statistical analysis results support all the hypotheses which are H1, H2, H3, H4 and H5.

Hypotheses 1 that an employee’s affective commitment has a positive effect on knowledge sharing was supported. Employee’s affective commitment factors have positive effect on knowledge sharing factors. All the sub-hypotheses H1a to H1d were supported. Hypotheses 2 that an employee’s person-organization fit has a positive effect
on knowledge sharing are supported. Employee’s person-organization fit have positive effect on knowledge sharing factors. All the sub-hypotheses H2a to H2d were supported.

Hypotheses 3, Employees knowledge sharing factors has a negative relationship with turnover intention was supported. Employee’s knowledge sharing factors; employees self knowledge behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit and employees knowledge sharing opportunity has a negative impact on turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4 was fully supported. Hypotheses (H4) Knowledge sharing factors has a mediating effect on affective commitment factors relationship with turnover intention was fully supported. Knowledge sharing has a mediating affect on Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment relationships with turnover intention.

Hypothesis 5 was fully supported. Hypotheses (H5) knowledge sharing has a mediating effect on Person-Organization-fit relationship with turnover intention was fully supported. Knowledge sharing has a mediating affect on Person-Organization-Fit relationships with turnover intention.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter covers the summary of this study and seeks to propose some recommendation on future studies that can be conducted to expand on this research.

5.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study contributes to a better understanding of the relationship between affective commitment, knowledge sharing factors, person-organization fit and turnover intention. The objective of this research was to prove that affective commitment has a positive relationship with knowledge sharing among employees in Malaysia, that Person-Organization fit has a positive relationship with employees knowledge sharing, knowledge sharing is negatively related to employees turnover intention, and knowledge sharing mediates the relationship between affective commitment factors and person-organization fit to employee turnover intention. All the Hypothesis 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 was fully supported by the data gathered for this study.

Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment correlates positively with knowledge sharing factors; self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit, knowledge sharing opportunity at \((r = .356, p <.01)\), \((r = .435, p <.01)\), \((r = .166, p <.01)\) and \((r = .273, p <.01)\) respectively. Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment correlates positively with knowledge sharing factors; self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing
behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit, knowledge sharing opportunity at \( r = .305, p < .01 \), \( r = .451, p < .01 \), \( r = .213, p < .01 \) and \( r = .290, p < .01 \) respectively. This indicates that employees with higher affective commitment display positive knowledge sharing behaviour. It shows that it’s good practice to promote activity that increases employee’s affective commitment to the organization.

Knowledge sharing factors; self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit, knowledge sharing opportunity correlates negatively with turnover intention at \( r = -.234, p < .01 \), \( r = -.409, p < .01 \), \( r = -.200, p < .01 \) and \( r = -.272, p < .01 \) respectively. This indicates that organizations which have employees with positive knowledge sharing factors will experience lower turnover intention. Therefore it is good for organization to promote knowledge sharing factors because it reduces turnover intention among workers.

Person-Organization fit correlates positively with knowledge sharing factors; self knowledge sharing behaviour, others knowledge sharing behaviour, knowledge sharing benefit, knowledge sharing opportunity at \( r = .333, p < .01 \), \( r = .477, p < .01 \), \( r = .134, p < .01 \) and \( r = .221, p < .01 \) respectively. This research has proven that employees with high Person-Organization fit display high knowledge sharing in an organization. Therefore it is important to ensure Person-Organization fit in employee selection process and continue to promote it after the recruitment process.
Knowledge sharing as a mediating variable significantly predicts turnover intention in the presence of Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment. The independent variable Emotional Attachment of the affective commitment and Involvement and Attachment of the affective commitment together with knowledge sharing explains 29.2% of the variance of the turnover intention. Further study has to be conducted with other variables to explain the rest of the 70.8% that contributes to turnover intention.

Knowledge sharing as a mediating variable significantly predicts turnover intention in the presence of person-organization-fit. The independent variable person-organization-fit together with knowledge sharing explains 20.6% of the variance of the turnover intention. Further study has to be conducted with other variables to explain the rest of the 79.4% that contributes to turnover intention.

5.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Even though this study expands our knowledge about the relationship between organizational commitment, knowledge sharing and person-organization-fit and turnover intention there is still viable prospect for future research to be conducted. As we try to unravel the secret in reducing turnover intention among the employees more in depth studies has to be conducted.
For the context of this study time has been one of the limiting factors. The time frame to conduct this research was 8 months which is a relatively short period of time when it is compared with other similar studies that have been carried out in the past. A longer period of time would have enable the researcher to distribute the questionnaire to larger sample size (n<500) therefore reducing sampling error. The time constraint led the researcher to select convenience sampling as the sampling pattern. A longer time would have enabled the researcher to conduct a simple random sampling which would have reduced the biasness of the sample.

5.3 SUGGESTIONS OF FUTURE RESEARCH

Apart from time, this study had limitations that further introduce new future research opportunities. For the purpose of this the researcher has concentrated on employees from different job sectors. In order to further understand knowledge sharing impact on affective commitment relationship and person-organization fit to turnover intention future research should focus on specific job sector. This study did not focus on blue collared worker which is another interesting element to be studied.

The researcher’s findings are based on cross-sectional data and every effort has been made to provide the theoretical underpinnings of causality however a longitudinal data would provide supplementary evidence that further confirms the validity of the conceptual framework. This can be another area for future research.
The model explains the cause of variation to employees’ turnover intention. There are other variable apart from person-organization-fit, affective commitment and knowledge sharing that can be studied in terms of its impact on the relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention. The other variables are organization culture, personal characteristics such as age, race, religion and gender, job satisfaction, leadership, work environment, organizational citizenship behaviour, organizational climate, job stressor and job involvement. This is particularly so as the affective commitment, knowledge sharing and person-organization-fit each explains the variance to employee turnover intention for this research paper.

Furthermore this research only looks at affective commitment of organizational commitment. Even though affective commitment has been indicated as having a critical link in the development of normative and continuance commitment, it might be important to test the relationship of these two other dimensions of commitment against different factors of knowledge sharing and turnover intention.

5.4 IMPLICATIONS

This study has several implications on the human resource management in organization in Malaysia. It is logical to deduce that affective commitment, knowledge sharing factors and person-organization fit has a negative impact on employee’s turnover intention in an organization. This is more so considering employees nowadays have
more choices in terms of the organization they work for. It is crucial for organization to leverage on every advantage that they have to increase employee retention.

This study has enabled human resource practitioners to identify factors that have influence on turnover intention in order to help them increase employee retention in an organization. Since it is proven through this study that high affective commitment, person-organization fit and knowledge sharing leads to lower employee turnover intention. Human resource practitioner can utilise this scale to gain better understanding of their employees.

This scale can also be used as a benchmarking tool for organizations to measure the impact of their employees’ team building programme. It can also be used as a decision making tool. A particular organization can choose which dimension they want to focus on based on the findings as it will indicates which dimension they should focus on improving.

This study also highlighted the important fact that can be utilized by organizations. It showed the importance of understanding factors that influences turnover intention. The independent variable affective commitment factors and person-organization fit as well as the mediating variables the knowledge sharing factors are all negatively related to turnover intention. Organizations can look at improving their employee retention rate by focusing on improving their affective commitment factors, person-organization-fit and knowledge sharing.
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7.0 APPENDICES

7.1 APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
The Faculty of Business and Accountancy
Master of Business Administration

Survey on “Affective Commitment and Turnover Intention”

Dear Respondent,

This survey is conducted as part of a research project, which shall be submitted in partial fulfillment for the Degree of Master of Business Administration from the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

The purpose of this study is to study the relationship of affective commitment and turnover intention of employees when it is influenced by knowledge sharing behavior and person organization fit.

I am therefore inviting you to participate in this survey by filling up the attached questionnaire. Please take 15 minutes of your time to fill up this survey questionnaire.

Please be advised that all information given will be treated with the strictest confidentiality and only the aggregate data will be analyzed. Kindly answer all the questions in all the sections (Section 1 to Section 3).

Thank you for your cooperation and valuable assistance in participating and completing this survey.

Vimalambigai a/p Mathumary (ambigai11@yahoo.co.uk)
Master of Business and Administration
Faculty of Business & Accountancy
University of Malaya

This research is done under the expert guidance of

Professor Madya Dr. Sharifah Latifah Binti Syed A Kadir
Associate Professor
Department Of Finance And Banking
Faculty Of Business And Accountancy
Tel: +603-79673815 / Email: sshadie@um.edu.my

72
SECTION 1
The following questions are included only to help us interpret your responses on other questions. Please TICK in the box corresponding to the category which most closely describes yourself or your organization.

1. Age

- [ ] 20 - 29 years
- [ ] 30 - 39 years
- [ ] 40 - 49 years
- [ ] 50 and above

2. Highest education level

- [ ] Secondary or below
- [ ] Certificate/Diploma
- [ ] Degree/Professional
- [ ] Post Graduate

3. Gender

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

4. Marital status

- [ ] Single
- [ ] Married
- [ ] Divorced/separated/widowed

5. Job Sector

- [ ] Finance & Insurance Industry
- [ ] Manufacturing – Food, Beverage & Tobacco Industry
- [ ] Manufacturing – Electrical & Electronic Industry
- [ ] Manufacturing – Motor Vehicle Industry
- [ ] Education Service Industry
- [ ] Petroleum and Natural Gas Industry
- [ ] Information and Telecommunication Industry
- [ ] Construction Industry
- [ ] Others (Please Specify): ________________________________

6. Current job position

- [ ] Top Management (MD, CEO, Director, GM)
- [ ] Middle Management (Senior Manager, Manager, Executive, Coordinators)
- [ ] Technical Employee (Technician, electrician, etc.)
- [ ] Non-management (administration, clerical, etc.)
- [ ] Skilled professional (Doctor, Lawyer, Programmer, Consultant, etc.)
- [ ] Others

   Others (please specify): ________________________________

7. Department

- [ ] Production & Maintenance & QC
- [ ] Marketing
- [ ] Logistic
- [ ] Finance
- [ ] Sales
- [ ] Others

   Others (please specify): ________________________________

2
8. How many years have you worked for your current employment

- Less than 3 years
- 3-6 years
- 7-10 years
- 10 years and above

SECTION 2
The following items are designed to understand your feelings towards your organization. For each statement, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree by using the following scale.

Please TICK the number of your choice for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The values of this organization are similar to my own values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My values match those of current employees in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel my personality matches the &quot;personality&quot; or image of this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In the last few months, I have seriously thought of looking for a new job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Presently, I am actively searching for other job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I intend to leave the organization in the near future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3
The statements are designed to measure your perceptions about knowledge sharing in your organization. For each statement please decide the degree to which accurately describes your own situation and your feelings in evaluating the organization work in.

Please CIRCLE/CROSS the number of your choice for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A: For the following reasons, you share knowledge in your organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. to get recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. to be rewarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. to satisfy your self-fulfillment needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. to support management strategic objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. to enhance your career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B: For the following reasons, you experienced that others in your organization share knowledge because…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. of trust that exist in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. the likelihood that other colleagues will do likewise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. it is highly valued by management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. the organizational culture facilitates learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. people who share knowledge are regarded as expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. it contributes to positive performance appraisals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C: For the following reasons, you do not readily share information because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. you are afraid your career would be at stake if you make mistakes</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. not enough trust exists in the organization</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. others don't want to do likewise</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D: For the following reasons, you experienced that others in the organization do not readily share knowledge because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. they are afraid their careers would be at stake if they make mistakes</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. not enough trust exist in this organization</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. colleagues don't want to do likewise</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. How much do you agree that knowledge sharing contributes to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. the success of this organization?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. the competitiveness of this organization?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. the innovativeness of this organization?</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please TICK the number of your choice for each statement

F: How often do you have the opportunity...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Most of the times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. to attend training courses?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. to share your knowledge with colleagues?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. to attend informal gatherings where knowledge is shared?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!!