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Employee turnover is a major concern for organizations. Specifically, among private business schools, it is proved to be one of the major impediments in carrying out academic activities. This phenomenon creates a conundrum for both college administrations and students. Therefore, each academic unit must work to minimize employee turnover. This study aims to identify the elements that influence academicians’ turnover intentions and the ways to negate them. It used a random sample of 236 academicians (professors, assistant professors, associate professors, and lecturers) from various business schools in India. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were used to analyze the sample. In addition, the structural equation modeling (SEM) approach was used to examine the hypotheses. All variables studied had high loadings of 0.50 or more in CFA. The research model was shown to be fit on three important absolute fit indices: absolute, incremental, and parsimonious. The regression weights of hypotheses were also determined to be significant. The findings indicate that organizational support, compensation, and personnel management had a detrimental effect on turnover intentions at business schools. These results can be used by college administration and management in devising interventions that will assist them in retaining existing talented staff and avoiding the negative repercussions of future turnover.

INTRODUCTION

High employee turnover is a serious issue as it is considered one of the significant determinants of poor organizational performance specifically in the education sector. In the education sector, the relationship between students and faculty is crucial. A high turnover or intention to quit becomes a significant hindrance for exemplary academic performance and reputation across a country. Apart from this, it is also cumbersome recruiting and training new employees and involves more budgetary implications (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Roodt & Bothma, 1997; Robinson et al., 2014; Biron & Boon, 2013; Harhara et al., 2015; Jung et al., 2020; Faisal et al., 2020).

Good academicians are vital to any institution, mainly in business schools where faculties are in the central position in developing future human capital with good values. On the other side, before entering institutions, potential applicants look for the faculty profile as one of the significant determinants of business school selection. Therefore, management does not want to lose existing prominent faculty members. Business school academicians are invaluable assets for the development of a nation as they produce a competent professional workforce. Therefore, it is essential to determine the sig-
significant causes of turnover intentions to avoid it. Hence, the present study attempts to identify the significant antecedents of turnover intentions of various levels of academicians working in different private business schools.

Most of the available research on turnover intentions was conducted in the tourism and hospitality industry (Cho et al., 2009; Kim, 2014; Sims, 2007; Yang, 2008; Shi et al., 2021), healthcare and hospital institutions (Mosadeghrad et al., 2008; Kim & Kim, 2011; Hwang & Chang, 2009; Lee et al., 2013; Jacobs & Roodt, 2007; Jung et al., 2020; Yildiz et al., 2021), and pharmaceutical industry (Mishra & Bhatnagar, 2010; Anis et al., 2011; Nazim & Shahid, 2012). However, Saraih et al. (2017) and Rathakrishnan et al. (2016) researched turnover intentions in education institutions in the Malaysian context. Hofmann and Strobel (2020) studied how transparency in higher education affects the satisfaction level and turnover intentions of university professors. But no studies were conducted in the Indian context. Hence, there is a paucity of studies regarding turnover intentions, especially in business schools. Thus, managers need to know the attitude of employees well in advance. To assess or measure the employee intentions to quit or anticipated turnover, there is a need for the present study to explore different antecedents of turnover intention, especially for the private business schools where the turnover rate is higher in comparison to the public sector in India. This would provide input to higher-ups of organizations to react promptly before actual turnover. The study findings will contribute to the management of business schools in strategic formulation to minimize turnover intention and control the actual turnover of academic staff.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

1.1. What is turnover intention?

Employee turnover intention is a situation when an employee decides to leave an organization voluntarily. Mobley (1977) investigated turnover intentions and explained different reasons employees leave an organization. Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) suggested that turnover intention is based on behavioral intentions. They identified that beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors are linked with each other in a chain form. So, beliefs influence attitudes, and attitudes influence intentions and then behavior. The job demands-resources (JD-R) model by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) and Bakker et al. (2004) is one of the most prominent models that rely on the association of job demand and resources with turnover intention. It also explains why an employee leaves an organization. In the case of high job demand, limited or absence of job resources directly affects employee motivation and leads to disengagement, which triggers turnover intentions.

Turnover can be voluntary or involuntary when an employee decides to leave the organization on his own or is forced to terminate the contract of employment. Employee turnover involved unnecessary direct costs (hiring, training, and compensation) and indirect costs (poor impact on employee motivation and losing the expertise of experienced employees) to organizations (Harhara et al., 2015). Turnover intention is a step-by-step process. First, an employee feels dissatisfied with the job, develops a thought process about quitting the job, estimates the cost of leaving the current job, looks for available alternatives, and finally decides to stay or quit after careful evaluation of all alternatives (Mobley, 1977). Turnover intentions are the predecessor of turnover as behavioral intentions predict the actual turnover (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Mobley, 1977; Kim, 2014; Jeswani & Dave, 2012; McEntee et al., 2021). It was also argued that turnover intentions specify the employee attitude about the current job, and it is developed during a specific period after a complete thought process (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Chiu & Francesco, 2003). Turnover intentions give early signs of probable turnover. Therefore, management needs to take preemptive actions to overcome the probable loss of work because of turnover.

1.2. Organizational support theory

According to Kurtessis et al. (2017), organizational support theory (OST) proposes that employees form a generalized perception concerning the extent to which an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. Employees work
with a positive attitude for organizations once they receive an anticipated level of support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). OST is based on the mutual relationship of employer and employee as their dedication towards organizations depends on tangible and socioemotional benefits received from organizations (Baran et al., 2012). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) reviewed 70 studies related to employee's beliefs after meta-analysis. They found that four types of treatment, such as fairness, supervisor support, organizational rewards, and favorable job conditions, are connected with perceived organizational support.

1.3. Social exchange theory

The social exchange theory proposes that employee loyalty is connected to tangible benefits and social support from organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Relationship with an organization depends on what efforts one puts and what benefits one receives, and the relationship will be better when derived benefits are more than cost (Rathakrishnan et al., 2016). Cole et al. (2002) identified that turnover intentions would increase if employees do not have good social exchange relationships with an organization, supervisor, work teams, and other employees in an organization. Hence, it is clear that employees positively contribute to an organization in exchange for desired benefits. In the absence of this, they react in the opposite direction and look for other alternatives, and finally quit the job.

1.4. Equity theory

According to Adam (1963), equity theory means that employees maintain a balance between giving and receiving aspects with the organization and maintaining this balance with their colleagues. If employees do not find fair treatment or equality from an organization, that creates distress among them and consequences of negative behavior like turnover intentions or actual quit of the job. Equity theory motivates an individual to compare own ratio of input and output to others (Ryan, 2016).

1.5. Compensation and turnover intentions

Compensation is considered the most prominent factor of continuance or discontinuance of employment with an organization. Retention of employees highly depends on the compensation. This is also applicable to different academicians of private business schools as there is a scarcity of jobs in government colleges and universities. Therefore, masses of academicians rely on employment only in these private colleges. Although only a few institutions pay as per government norms, compensation is the most dominant factor and keeps embedded with jobs. Once they got reasonable jobs with a good salary, they want to stay with it. Rathakrishnan et al. (2016) describe that when lecturers feel that they are not paid fairly, they feel dissatisfaction and move to other universities for better packages. So, it is well-understood that compensation is one of the reasons for leaving an organization.

1.6. Organizational support and turnover intentions

Perceived organizational support (POS) generates positive outcomes in the form of job satisfaction, affective commitment, and decreased withdrawal behavior of employees (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Antecedents of POS are organizational justice (DeConinck & Johnson, 2009; Ambrose & Schminke, 2003) and supervisory support (Settoon et al., 1996; DeConinck, 2010). Once an organization encourages employees for their excellent work and provides adequate facilities along with appropriate financial benefits, employees’ probability of stay in an organization increased. Apart from those adequate opportunities to learn which prospects keep employees attached to an organization. Many studies found a negative relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions (Allen et al., 2003; DeConinck & Johnson, 2009; DeConinck, 2010; Oladunmoye, 2017; Randall et al., 1999).

1.7. Personnel management and turnover intentions

Personnel management emphasizes the development of employees through effective hiring and finally engenders a valuable workforce for the organization. It also focuses on fair recruitment as well as a promotion system. Employee anticipation of transparency and fairness at a workplace is termed as organization fairness. It also establishes a sense of equality among employees, which leads
to the accomplishment of organization and individual goals. Organizational fairness boosts organizational performance and promotes employee well-being (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Choi and Rainey (2014) described that the concept of organizational fairness is close to procedural justice. Procedural justice ensures fairness of processes adopted for decision-making (Greenberg, 1987). A high level of organizational fairness and diversity management leads to the enhancement of employee overall job satisfaction (Choi & Rainey, 2014). Procedural justice leads to job satisfaction, and employees positively interpret the organization (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Griffeth et al. (2000) found a negative relationship between procedural justice and turnover intentions. Alam and Asim (2019), Mobley (1977), and Price and Muller (1986) established a link between turnover intentions and job satisfaction. That is why the implication of organizational fairness practices reduces turnover intentions of a workforce. Being in the ethical profession of teaching, faculties also want fairness in the workplace. Amporful et al. (2018) found that if academicians are fairly treated in terms of their salary and promotion, their motivation for work will be higher. To accommodate the aforementioned discussions and pave the way for theoretic frameworks, the following hypotheses are proposed:

\[ H_1: \] A fairly good compensation package negates turnover intentions.

\[ H_2: \] A fairly good compensation package positively associated with organizational support.

\[ H_3: \] A fairly good compensation package positively associated with personnel management.

\[ H_4: \] Organizational support negates turnover intentions.

\[ H_5: \] Personnel management negates turnover intentions.

\[ H_6: \] Organizational support is positively associated with personnel management.

Figure 1 depicts the theoretical model that emerged in this study.

2. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The study is based on primary data collected from academicians (professors, assistant and associate professors, and lecturers) from private business schools in the National Capital Region (NCR) of India. A Google Form was created, and links were sent to around 350 people (male and female) working as faculty members. A total of 260 responses were collected, out of which 24 responses were removed. Only 236 responses were utilized for the final analysis.
2.1. Measurement scales

A broad pool of survey items used in the questionnaire was explored based on the literature review. The final survey instrument was carved by adopting four constructs from various sources. Turnover intention is measured using a 4-item scale adopted from Malek et al. (2018). Compensation satisfaction is measured using a 4-item scale by Kim (2014) while organizational support and personnel management are measured using a 8-item scale by Kim (2014). Overall there were 24 items in the final questionnaire, which were framed on a five-point Likert scale, where 5 meant “strongly agree”, and 1 – “strongly disagree”.

2.2. Data embodiment and analytical tools

Data thus collected was firstly refined for analysis. Outliers were detected using interquartile range and box plotting using SPSS. The identified outliers were removed. The study is interested in exploring how a positive construct negates the impact of a negative construct. Therefore, positive constructs like organizational support, personnel management, and compensation satisfaction were reverse coded. The final analysis was done firstly by conducting an exploratory factor analysis using the maximum likelihood extraction method rotated on a Promax rotation method. Factors with a threshold of ≤ 40 and below were removed. The factors thus obtained were confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS.

2.3. Demographics of the sample

The demographics section of the questionnaire includes gender, age, marital status, experience, highest qualification, etc. The demographic details of the sample are presented in Table 1.

Most of the respondents in the present study are males (154), hold the position of assistant professor – 138 (58.47 %), followed by associate professor – 50 (21.19 %), professor – 28 (11.86 %), and lecturer – 20 (8.47 %). The majority of respondents were married – 199 (84.32 %) and were 31-40 years old – 105 (44.49 %). Thus, demographic details specify that the data collected for the present study is representative in nature.

Table 1. Demographics of the sample (N = 236)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>58.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>65.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>84.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience with the current organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>48.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall job experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and above</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>48.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. RESULTS

3.1. Measurement model

The measurement model manifests the relationship between observed variables and latent variables. The value of factor loadings, composite reliability (CR) measures, and average variance extracted (AVE) was used to access the convergent validity test (Table 2). The rule of thumb for acceptable value for any factor loading is that factor value must be more than a threshold limit of 0.50 (factor loading > .50) (Bagozzi et al., 1991). CR value more than 0.70 (CR ≥ 0.70) and AVE value more than 0.50 (AVE ≥ 0.50) are acceptable; it is recommended by Hair et al. (2013), Hair et al. (2016), and Forner and Larker (1981).

The validity results show that all the items taken for final confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) indicate a value of factor loading more than 0.50 (≥ 0.50) except for PM4 and PM5, which are the nearest to the acceptable threshold limit. The personnel management scale was an 8-item scale initially adopted for the study, but 5 items were dropped due to low factor loading or because of cross-loadings. Though PM4 and PM5 have low loadings, they have been utilized for final CFA to maintain the relevancy of a scale. The organizational support construct obtained a CR value of 0.902 (0.902 > 0.70) and AVE value of 0.649 (0.649 > 0.50). Compensation satisfaction shows a CR value of 0.878 (0.878 > 0.70) and AVE value of 0.593 (0.593 > 0.50). Personnel management shows a CR value of 0.638 (near the threshold limit of 0.70), and AVE value of 0.372 (i.e. below the threshold limit). However, turnover intentions show a CR value of 0.880 (0.880 > 0.70) and AVE value of 0.650 (0.650 > 0.50). Therefore, almost all the observed constructs are reliable and valid.

3.2. Goodness of fit model indices

The robust approach to determine the goodness of fit for the model lies on several criteria. To access the goodness of fit of the measurement model comprehensively, the study has adopted the three categories of measurement fit indicators, namely absolute fit, incremental fit, and parsimonious fit measurement. The rule of thumb for these indicators is vastly mentioned in the literature. Table 3 indicates the details of the values required to be fit.

Table 2. Construct validity and reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Items description</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>An organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS2</td>
<td>An organization is willing to help its employees.</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS4</td>
<td>An organization has the proper environment for me to perform my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS6</td>
<td>An organization sees to value my contribution at work.</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS7</td>
<td>An organization provides adequate opportunities for me to improve my ability.</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM1</td>
<td>I am adequately paid.</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM2</td>
<td>My salary is relatively high compared to other organizations in the same field.</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM3</td>
<td>An organization provides an adequate monetary reward for my accomplishment.</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM4</td>
<td>An organization provides adequate non-monetary rewards for my accomplishment.</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM4</td>
<td>An organizational situation is not limited to doing a better job.</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM5</td>
<td>An organization considers individual character when distributing job tasks.</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM6</td>
<td>An organization has relatively high name recognition.</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>I have searched for another job.</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>I plan on quitting this job within the next year.</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>It would not take much to make me leave this organization.</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>I will probably look for a new job next year.</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The root mean square of approximation (RMSEA) is 0.067, a value less than 0.07 (0.067 ≤ 0.07), stressing the absolute fit of the model. Further, the study found the goodness of fit index (GFI) is 0.90, a value above or equal to 0.90 (0.90 ≤ 0.90), the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) is 0.864, a value above or equal to 0.864 (0.864 ≤ 0.90) and Chi-Square ($\chi^2$) is 2.050 (2.050 ≤ 3.84), emphasizing a good fit. Additionally, the relative fit measurement of the incremental fit measurement indices that are elucidated by the normal fit index (NFI), relative fit index (RFI), incremental fit index (IFI), Tucker Lewis index (TLI), and comparative fit index (CFI) are 0.906, 0.887, 0.950, 0.939, and 0.949 respectively. All the indices under the incremental fit measurement are greater than the threshold limit of 0.90. Furthermore, the parsimonious fit measurement indices are illustrated by the parsimonious normed fit index (PNFI), parsimonious comparative fit index (PCFI), parsimonious goodness of fit index (PGFI), and P Close and show values of 0.753, 0.789, 0.664, and 0.014, respectively. This indicates that all the values are above the threshold limit except for the P Close value that seems to be lacking but that satisfies the assumption of close fit of the model. The above indices comprehensively indicate that the overall model is fit and suitable, and no further modifications are required. Therefore, the estimation of the model can be made conveniently.

3.3. Estimation model

Before delving into the hypothesis acceptance/rejection part of the study, it is implied to discuss the model estimations for the study. The structural equation model (SEM) has been estimated by taking all the variables together. Figure 2 shows the results of the estimation model. Where for COM, the standardized regression weights were between 0.84 (COM2) and 1.05 (COM3). The square loadings were between 0.31 and 0.61. In the case of TI, the standardized regression weights were between 1.00 (TI1) and 1.32 (TI2). The square loadings were between 0.25 and 0.59, respectively. For OS, the standardized regression weights were between 1.00 (OS1) and 1.21 (OS2). Its square loadings were between 0.25 and 0.41, respectively. While in the case of PM, the standardized regression weights were between 1.00 (PM4) and 1.35 (PM5). The square loadings were between 0.41 and 0.48, respectively.

3.4. Hypotheses testing

The rule of thumb to proceed is that CR (critical ratio) must be greater than 1.96 (CR > 1.96), and the probability value must be less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) (Byrne, 2010). Table 4 shows the estimation values and other essential statistics required for hypothesis testing.

Table 4. Regression weights of estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM ↔ Ti</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>5.130</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM ↔ OS</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>7.542</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM ↔ PM</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>4.835</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti ↔ OS</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>6.406</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti ↔ PM</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS ↔ PM</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>5.478</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results for $H_1$ indicate that a good compensation package (COM) negatively relates with turnover intentions (TI) with $t$-value = 5.130, which is greater than the table value where $t = 5.130 > 1.967$, and probability value ($p$-value) of 0.000 < 0.05. It infers that a good compensation will lead to reducing turnover intentions. Notably, all three variables of study except for turnover intentions are coded reverse to make the interpretation more convenient and easy to understand.

Figure 2. Standardized estimates for the model
The more supportive an organization and its personnel management policies are toward employees, the less tendency of leaving the organization and negate turnover intentions. However, once the compensation is related to personnel management, it becomes difficult to notice this strong relationship. But results are quite obviously in favor of $H_3$. Here it can be noticed that $t$-value is 4.835, which is higher than the table value ($t = 4.835 > 1.967$) and probability value ($p$-value) is $0.000 < 0.05$. The results for $H_4$ depict a similar trend of earlier constructs: $t = 6.406 > 1.967$, and probability value ($p$-value) is $0.000 < 0.05$. This indicates that turnover intentions can be negated with a high amount of organizational support. The more supportive an organization and its policy to employees, the less tendency of leaving the organization or turnover will be found among employees. $H_5$ is to test the impact of personnel management policies on employee turnover intentions. These results emphasize the need for fair and transparent personnel management policies, which will negate turnover intentions. The results found that $t$-value is greater than the table value $= 4.098$, where $t = 4.098 > 1.967$, and probability value ($p$-value) is $0.000 < 0.05$. Therefore, this hypothesis can be easily accepted.

$H_6$ is set to know the relationship between personnel management and organizational support. The results indicate that $t$-value is greater than the table value $= 5.478$, where $t = 5.478 > 1.967$, and probability value ($p$-value) is $0.000 < 0.05$. The positive relationship between organizational support and personnel management is obvious and evident from the literature. In fact, organizational support is considered as the offshoot of good personnel management practices and policies. Therefore, it is quite evident from the discussion and the results reported in Table 4 that all the hypotheses stated in the study can be accepted.

4. DISCUSSION

The present study revealed different positive aspects of continuance employment with the organization as it identified diverse factors which negate turnover intentions. To achieve research objectives, different hypotheses were formulated. The result clearly states that compensation plays a vital role in the continuation of current employment. Where, a good compensation package (COM) negatively relates with the turnover intention (TI) with a $t$-value $= 5.130$, which is greater than the table value. Henceforth, good compensation packages embedded employees and decreased turnover intentions. In line with Rathakrishnan et al. (2016), the results show that low compensation increases turnover intentions. It was further explained that lectures compare their salaries with the same kind of institutions in the same positions; in the case of mismatch, they consider leaving this job. In a similar manner, Amporful et al. (2018) also found that if university lectures are fairly treated in terms of their salary and promotion, they are encouraged to work better for an organization.

The results indicate a positive relationship between compensation package and organizational support. It is shown that compensation and organizational support are positively correlated with each other ($t$-value $= 7.542$, which is greater than the table value). Choi (2006) also concluded that better compensation and a better work environment encourage the continuance of employment with the current organization and negate turnover intentions. The findings indicate a relationship between personnel management and compensation, but it is not as strong as organizational support. The study explained that when employees are getting organizational support in the form of better learning opportunities, better work environment, understanding employee contribution, and encouraging them to improve their abilities, these factors highly influence academicians to stay with current institutions and decrease their turnover intentions. Better personnel management policies negate turnover intentions. The study also suggests that academicians working in private business schools want organizational support and the implication of personnel management.

Thus, the study empirically tested the applicability of three theories, namely organizational support theory, equity theory, and social exchange theory, to negate turnover intentions. Finally, it provided empirical evidence in their support. The results align with Rathakrishnan et al. (2016), who also
validated equity theory and social exchange theory and found significant relations of compensation satisfaction with turnover intention. This paper strongly supports equity theory as hypotheses testing results indicate that academicians working in private business schools expect higher or equal compensation from the same type of institutions, and adequate compensation negates turnover intentions. The study also supports organizational support theory and social exchange theory as reasonable compensation and organizational support also negate the turnover intention, compensation and organizational support are also positively associated with each other.

CONCLUSION

The objectives were to investigate the factors that can cause turnover intentions of academicians. Specifically, the study was conducted to test the relationship between compensation satisfaction, organizational support, personal management, and turnover intentions. The hypotheses were tested using the structural equation modeling (SEM) approach. The results clearly state that compensation satisfaction is negatively associated with turnover intentions, which means once employees feel satisfied with the compensation package, that leads to a continuance of employment. These findings are in contrast to previous studies which reported that once academicians are compensated fairly, they are encouraged to stay with their current organization, thus they are unlikely to leave the current job. On the other hand, other variables such as organizational support and personal management also have a negative relationship with turnover intentions. This result clearly implies that academicians are looking to be more committed towards their organization once they get organizational support and with the implications of personnel management policies. Thus, it is confirmed that organizational support and personnel management affect the desire of academicians to stay with their current organization. Therefore, managers should design better compensation packages as per current industry trends to bind academicians with the organization and avoid unwanted turnover consequences. On the other hand, they should make policies to enhance learning opportunities and employee participation and encourage them to work towards organizational goals to gain a competitive advantage.
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