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Abstract

The question of employee turnover has come to gain greater attention especially in this 21st century where organizations all over the world, in various industries, have faced this problem at some stages of their evolution (Zahra et al 2013). Hitherto, organizational studies suggest that intentions to leave are important for organizations and researchers because once people have actually implemented the behavior to quit; there is little likelihood of gaining access to them to understand their prior situation (Juhdi et al 2011). A turnover intention is a mental decision prevailing between an individual’s approach with reference to a job whether to continue or leave the job (Jacobs and Rooodt, 2007). In other words, it represents conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organization (Tett and Meyer, 1993). Ongori (2007) contended that the meaning of turnover intention is the plan to leave an organization, and this appears to be the immediate antecedent to actually quitting. Turnover intention is a psychological variable of the tendency to leave that is closely related to turnover (Janseen, 1999). Mobley (1982) describes employee turnover as the cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization. Several researchers have pointed out that turnover intention is commonly endorsed in the literature as a predictor of turnover. The changes occurred in the theory of management has also significantly affected the attitude of organizations to their workers. The management paradigm, which until the mid of 20th century was under the influence of the “classical organization theory”, considered organizations as “closed-mechanical” systems and its workers as mere elements composing them. This approach tended to see them as parts of a machine rather than socio-psychological beings. Any lack of productivity or mistake of a worker was repaired by simply removing this worker and bringing a new one in his place. In this approach workers had no importance as “individuals” at all and their contribution to the organization was limited strictly to their job description. This attitude of the management reflected on the workers, causing that these were not trying to become more useful for the organization. When found a better job they used to quit their organizations to new one and to stay there until they find even better.
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INTRODUCTION:

Organizational commitment has a long history, and has been the subject of a great deal of research and empirical attention both as a consequence and an antecedent of other work-related variables of interest. It has also an important place in the study of organizational behavior and evolved as a wide range of ‘types’ (e.g. engagement, attachment, commitment, involvement) within a wide spectrum of foci (e.g. work, job, career, profession/ occupation, organization, union), while studies on commitment varied between the categories of behavioral, attitudinal and motivational within three broad research streams through sociological, industrial/organizational psychology and health psychology (Roodt, 2004a). It has been studied in the public, private, and non-profit sector, and more recently internationally. Organizations implement various policies to overcome the commitment problem. In essence of this effort, more duty-bound, more hardworking for the organizational goals and more consistent with the organization position of the individuals with higher organizational commitment. Organizational commitment goes beyond the classical concept of commitment. It implies a more active commitment. Employees are willing to give their personal contribution to the well-being of the organization. Therefore, the organizational commitment reflects not only on their expressions and statements but also appears in their acts and deeds (Mow day, Steers and Porter, 1979: 226).
Organizational commitment is a feeling of dedication, willingness to go the extra mile, and an intention to stay with the organization for a long period of time (Meyer & Allen, 1988; 1991). It means loyalty and intention to stay with the organization. Organizational commitment refers to an employee’s willingness to exert extra effort within the organization (Bateman & Strasser, 1984). It is the factor that promotes the attachment of the individual to the organization. Organizational commitment is the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization (Mowday, 1998).

**Turnover and Turnover intention**

Turnover models have been extensively studied, and scholars have provided strong support for the proposition that behavioral intentions (intention to leave) are the most immediate determinant of actual turnover (Igharia and Greenhaus, 1992). A turnover intention is a mental decision prevailing between an individual’s approach with reference to a job whether to continue or leave the job (Jacobs and Roodt, 2007). In other words, it represents conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organization (Tett and Meyer, 1993). Relevant to this study, management and psychology fields have explored turnover and turnover intention (as dependent variables) in association with organizational commitment i.e. affective, continuance and normative commitment (Sturman ET al2006).

Employee turnover is a generic term that refers to movement employees from one work organization to another (Allen, 2008; Choi, Musibau, Khalil & Ebi, 2012). Several researchers have pointed out that turnover intention is commonly endorsed in the literature as a predictor of turnover (Abrams, Ando, & Hinkle, 1998; Lee & Mow day, 1987; Michaels & Spector, 1982, Mobley 1982).

Turnover intentions are the thoughts of the employees regarding voluntary leaving the organization (Whitman, 1999). The intention to quit is probably the most important immediate antecedent of turnover decisions. Turnover intention is used instead of actual turnover because in general the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) suggests that behavioral is a good predictor of actual behavior. In fact, researchers have found intent to leave or stay as the strongest predictor of actual turnover (Hendrix, Robbins, & Summers, 1999, Lee & Liu, 2007).

Accordingly, considering the literatures on the area and the purpose of this research, the researcher has found taking a conceptual frame work developed by Wu, X. and Polsaram, P, in 2011 very appropriate and will be used for this research with some modification.

![Organizational Commitment Diagram](image)

**Figure 1: The conceptual Proposed Research Model of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. Source: Wu, X. and Polsaram, P. (2011). Factors Influencing Employee turnover Intention: The case of Retail Industry in Bangkok, Thailand.**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Objective of the study**

**General Objective**

The purpose of this research is to investigate the effect of organizational commitment on employees turnover intention particularly with reference to Administrative staff (employees) working at Hawassa University.

**Specific Objectives**

For this purpose, the researcher addresses the following specific objectives.

1. To assess the perception of employee towards the three dimensions organizational commitment (AC, CC & NC) & turnover intention among Administrative staff of the university.
2. To evaluate the level of organizational commitment and turnover intentions among Administrative staff in the university.
3. To analyze (investigate) the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions among Administrative staff.
4. To show the effect of organizational commitment (affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment) on turnover intention among Administrative staff of the university.

**Research Design**

This study adopted a descriptive survey research design and Cross-sectional study type. This is so because this method enabled the researchers to carefully analyze the sampled population with a view to inferring the relationship and the effect of the dimension of organizational commitment on turnover intentions among administrative staff at Hawassa University.

**Research Approach**

The quantitative research approach was selected for this study. This research approach was selected mainly due to the need to address the research questions already determined. Deductions about relations between variables are made, without direct intervention, from the associated variation of independent and dependent variables.

### 3.1. Sampling technique and sample size

In order to draw sample size (respondents) from total population the study utilized probability sampling techniques viz. stratified random sampling technique. By using the Formula for determining the sample size developed by Krejcie & Morgan (1970) the size of the sample was 346 respondents that was extracted from the population. The Population was categorized based on the campus they are working at Hawassa University. i.e. The administrative staff was divided into six strata (campus). The affiliated campuses are located at three different places namely, Hawassa, Wondogenet and Awada. Hawassa hosts four campuses – Main campus (MC), Awassa College of Agriculture(ACA), Hawassa College of Medicine and Health’s Sciences(HCMHS) and Institute of Technology (IOT) and the other two campuses are College of Forestry and Natural Resources (WCFNR) located at Wondogenet and Awada campus near Yirgalem.

**Formula for determining the sample size according to Krejcie & Morgan (1970) is as follows;**

\[ S = \frac{X^2 \cdot NP (1-P)}{d^2(N-1)} + X^2 \cdot P (1-P) \]

- **S** = required sample size
- **X²** = the table value of Chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level.
- **N** = the total population
- **P** = the population proportion (assumed to be 0.5 since this would provide the maximum sample size).
- **d** = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (0.05).

**Source:** Krejcie & Morgan, 1970

In order to ensure the representativeness of each stratum, the number of sample was allotted proportionally to the size of population in each stratum using the formula by C.R Kothari (2004).

\[ n_i = n \cdot P_i \quad \text{where,} \]

- **n** represents the total sample size,
- **Pi** represents the proportion of population included in stratum i,
- **ni** the number samples selected from population in each stratum (campus).

Hence, the sample was drawn from all campuses at Hawassa University. Moreover, the sample size in different strata (campus) is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total Population (Pi)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample size (ni)</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Awada</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IOT</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WCFNR</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources and method of data collection
In this study, both primary and secondary sources of data were used. Primary data was collected by using questionnaire and it was selected because it has and advantages of low cost, saving in time, respondents have adequate time to give well thought answers. Questionnaires are very convenient for collecting factual data and are usually easy to analysis.

3.2. Method of Data Analysis
After the necessary data from both primary and secondary sources were collected, it was properly organized and presented in the form of inferential statistics. Data was analyzed using SPSS Version 20 where descriptive and inferential results were obtained to draw conclusions for the study. Likewise, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between organizational commitment forms (affective, continuance and normative commitment) and Turnover Intention. Interpretation of correlation results (0-1), followed Cohen (1988) guideline in that r = 0.1 to 0.29 (small correlation), r = 0.30 to 0.49 (medium correlation) and r = 0.50 to 1.0 (large correlation). Moreover, regression analysis was done to investigate the effect of affective, continuance and normative commitment on employees’ turnover intention.

Table 4.2.1 The mean value and one sample t-test Analysis of Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements/propositions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with the university.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>1.30840</td>
<td>.0723</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.19878</td>
<td>.056 [4, .3411]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy discussing about my university with people outside it.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.443</td>
<td>1.32543</td>
<td>.0733</td>
<td>6.050</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.44343</td>
<td>.299 [2, .5876]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really feel as if this university problem is my own.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.969</td>
<td>1.20543</td>
<td>.0666</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.96942</td>
<td>.838 [3, 1.100]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This university has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>1.22552</td>
<td>.0677</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.81346</td>
<td>.680 [1, .9468]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a part of the family in this University.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>1.28898</td>
<td>.0712</td>
<td>9.224</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.65749</td>
<td>.517 [3, .7977]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in this University with good grace.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.507</td>
<td>1.27714</td>
<td>.0706</td>
<td>7.188</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.50765</td>
<td>.368 [7, .6466]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am proud to work for this University.

The first dimension of organizational commitment model is affective commitment, which represents an emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organization and goals (Mowday et al., 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1993; O'Reilly & Chatman). Moreover, Dunham, Grube, and Castaneda (1994) states that employees with affective commitment are ready to make sacrifices for the sake of their organization and won’t envisage leaving it.

Based on the above theory from the literature review, the above table 4.2.1 presents the mean scores, standard deviations and t-value scores of respondents’ responses for their level of commitment with respect to their affective commitment dimension of organizational commitment while working in the university. Respondents, to whom the questionnaire was administered, were asked to rate their level of agreement with the seven major elements of affective commitment dimension. Accordingly, the respondents have answered the questions and returned the questionnaire back. As one can easily see and understand from the above table, the issue that deals about if the employees really feel as if the university problem is their own has got the highest score (mean score of 3.9694 and SD of 1.20543) as compared to other elements included in this dimension. This score shows that the respondents have agreed as the mean score for the statement is in between the range of 3.41-4.20 (Best, 1977).

The respondents also have agreed when they are questioned whether the university has a great deal of personal meaning to them (mean score of 3.8135 and SD of 1.22552), if they enjoy discussing about their university with people outside it (with mean score of 3.4434 and SD of 1.32543), if they feel like a part of the family in the university with mean score 3.6575 and SD of 1.28898), if they work in the university with good grace and if they are proud to work for the university (with mean score of 3.7951 and SD of 1.26694) respectively.

However, employees are neutral as the (mean score is in between 2.61-3.4) if they would be very happy to spend the rest of their career with the university because their mean scores is 3.198 and SD of 1.3084 (Best, 1977). This implies that most respondents response fall in the agree domain for affective commitment except for the first statement/ propositions. This shows that employees have emotional attachment and identification with university.

**Table 4.2.2 The mean value and one sample t-test Analysis of Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements/propositions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.152</td>
<td>1.29221</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.15291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my university now.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2.972</td>
<td>1.35975</td>
<td>.0751</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>-.02752</td>
<td>.1755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Result 2016
Quitting this university/organization will put me in a difficult financial position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements/propositions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.(2tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. If I find better job, I will quit this University right away.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>1.34874</td>
<td>.0745</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.30275</td>
<td>-.4495 to -.1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Even if I quit this University without finding another job, I won’t have any problem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.685</td>
<td>1.33448</td>
<td>.0738</td>
<td>4.268</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.31498</td>
<td>-.4602 to -.1698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Result 2016

According to Table 4.2.2 the one sample t-test (test value=2.61-3.40) result value shows neutral: the mean value of the statement it would be very hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to is at mean score 3.1529 and SD=1.29221 with P-value of .033 which is found to be significant at (t=2.140) <0.5 level; too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my university now with mean score 2.9725 and SD=1.35975 with P-value of .715 which is found to be insignificant at (t=.366) >0.5 level, Quitting this university will put me in a difficult financial position with mean score2.6972 and1.34874, and even if I quit this university without finding another job, I won’t have any problem with mean score 2.6850 and 1.33448 fall into the neutral domain with most of the respondents, while the statement with if I find better job, I will quit this University right away with a mean score 3.8196 and SD=1.31340 falls under agree domain (Best, 1977).

As what is presented in the literature part, continuance commitment is the willingness to remain in an organization because of the investment that the employee has with “nontransferable” investments. Nontransferable investments include things such as retirement, relationships with other employees, or things that are special to the organization. It is regarded as an instrumental attachment to the organization, where the individual's association with the organization is based on an assessment of economic benefits gained (Beck &Wilson, 2000).

Continuance commitment is an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization and they stated it is calculative in nature because of the individual's perception or weighing of costs and risks associated with leaving the current organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997). From the above discussion the result of the analysis shows that the majority of the responses are neutral regarding their continuous commitment. Among others employees continuous commitment is related with cost benefit that an organization offers hence anything that can increase employee’s financial benefit/gain can increase their continuous commitment. Hence implement incentives strategy and other motivational tools, better payment comparable with labour market, promotion opportunity, implement a system that enable to recognize, praise and reward employees good performance and others.

Table 4.2.3 The mean value and one sample t-test Analysis of Normative Commitment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Source: Survey Result 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>As one can see from the above table, the respondents are disagree when they are asked I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her university/org with the mean score 2.3425 and SD=1.49400, and neutral which inclined to disagree for the statement. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my university with the mean score 2.7859 and SD=1.44958; and the respondents are in agree domain with the statements. Jumping from organization/university to organization/university does not seem at all unethical to me with the mean score 3.6972 and SD=1.33961; one of the major reasons I continue to work in this university is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of obligation to remain at a mean score 3.6330 and SD=1.31060; and I owe a lot to this university at a mean score 3.8257 and SD=1.17105. On the other hand, the one sample T-test results of the question respondents are asked for I won’t quit this university even if I find better job, are disagree at a mean score 2.1988 and SD=1.29425. From the above discussion it can be understood that the administrative employees working in the university are inclined to neutral with regards to normative commitment. So it needs to foster factors that can win employees moral obligation to stay in the university like providing opportunity for education and training through scholarship, foster team spirit among employees and management, facilitate good working environment and the like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>to me. Source: Survey Result 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to me.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the major reasons I continue to work in this university is that I</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of obligation to</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got another offer for a better job anywhere I would not feel it was right</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to leave my university.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe a lot to this University.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I won’t quit this university even if I find better job.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.2.4 The mean value and one sample t-test Analysis of Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements/propositions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean DiffERENCE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think about quitting my job across my mind.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.1346</td>
<td>1.3924</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.07700</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.13456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often search for better job opportunities.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4.0765</td>
<td>1.1284</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06240</td>
<td>17.251</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.07645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about starting my own business leaving this university.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.6208</td>
<td>1.2929</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.07150</td>
<td>8.682</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.62080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to look for a new job within the next 12 months.</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.4159</td>
<td>1.4005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07745</td>
<td>5.370</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.41590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Result 2016

From the above table, looking at the score of descriptive statistics, it is possible to understand that administrative staffs in Hawassa University are indifferent or neutral when they are asked if they think about quitting their job across their mind at a mean score 3.1346 and SD=1.39244 with P-value of .082 which is found to be insignificant at (t=1.747) >0.5 level; and respondents are at agree domain with the rest as the mean score is above 3.61 (Best, 1977) for the statement I often search for better job opportunities at a mean score 4.0765 and SD=1.12840, I think about starting my own business leaving this university at a mean score 3.6208 and SD=1.29295, and I plan to look for a new job within the next 12 months at a mean score 3.4159 and SD=1.40052.

So from the analysis one can understand that the majority administrative employee response lies an agree domain for the turnover intention questionnaires.

### Table 4.2.5 Level of employees Perception on general organizational commitment and Turnover intention Using One-Sample Test Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable dimension</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.2575</td>
<td>.62729</td>
<td>.03469</td>
<td>7.423</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.25748</td>
<td>.1892-.3257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.5619</td>
<td>.96059</td>
<td>.05312</td>
<td>10.578</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.56193</td>
<td>.4574-.6664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Result 2016

Table 4.2.6 above depicts results about the perception of respondents on organizational commitment and turnover intention.

As we can see from the above table, turnover intention has got the higher rank with a mean score of
The turnover intention variable mean scores is in between the range of 3.41-4.20 (Best, 1977), and it can be said that respondents have agreed with the statements about turnover intention questionnaires. And according to Best, respondents have come to be ‘indifferent or neutral’ with the organizational commitment variables with a mean score 3.2575.

Therefore, one can say that, respondents have an intention to leave the university as their response lies in agree domain. The result from the above table, at the same time, shows that there is some kind of doubt or neutral with the employees with regards to organizational commitment.

Therefore, one can say that, respondents have an intention to leave the university as their response lies in agree domain. And, according to Best, respondents have come to be ‘indifferent or neutral’ with the organizational commitment variables with a mean score 3.2575.

So, the study has hinted on the need to develop employees’ organizational commitment as it was found to influence turnover intention. As organizational commitment level was only moderate or neutral, there is a need for the university to seek ways to increase organizational commitment among its employees. This is important as employees who are less committed may likely route their commitment in other directions and tend to seek job opportunities elsewhere.

**Conclusion**

The aim of this study was to examine the level and effect of organizational commitment on employees’ turnover intention in the case Hawassa University administrative staff. It also assesses the perception of employee towards organizational commitment and turnover intention. Moreover it addresses the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. It also attempted to measure whether the administrative staff (employee) in the university differ in their feeling of organizational commitment and turnover intention with respect to their gender, age, educational status, years of stay in the university, salary level and marital status. To achieve this objective, questionnaires were used to collect data from administrative employees at Hawassa university. After the necessary data were collected from employees at the university, the researcher has analyzed and interpreted them in chapter four. Based on the analyzed and interpreted data in chapter four, the following conclusions are drawn as follows. The result of the research shows that respondents have an intention to leave the university as their response lies in agree domain. And, at the same time even though it looks the respondents have affective commitment to the university; employees ‘continuous and normative commitment is in questionable in particular; and organizational commitment in general. It also shows that correlation coefficient results indicated insignificant and small negative correlation between affective commitment and turnover intention; whereas significant and positive correlation with Continuous commitment and turnover intention; and small and positive correlation between normative commitment and turnover intention. The result of regression analysis also shows that affective commitment negatively or inversely predicts turnover intention while continuance commitment showed statistically significant and positive relationship with turnover intention. However, normative commitment showed statistically insignificant positive relationship with turnover intention. The result of organizational commitment and turnover intention with respect to demographic characteristics (age, gender, service year, educational qualification, and marital status) is analyzed and the result shows that there is there is no significance difference on the perception of organizational commitment and turnover intention with regards to gender i.e., male and Female. With regards to age group there is no significant difference among age groups in terms of organizational commitment which falls on neutral except with the age group 60 years & above which lies on agree domain; and has no difference with regards to turnover intention which inclined to agree domain. The result of independent sample t test shows that employees with educational status of Grade 10 & below, and PhD holder have higher Organizational commitment and indifferent for turnover intention for grade 10 & below. It is also possible to understand employees with service year 31 and above are at agree domain for organizational commitment and turnover intention questionnaires; similarly employees with less than one year service have more intention to leave the university when compares to the other. The result of the analysis also shows that the majority of the respondents are indifferent or neutral towards organizational commitment with the reference to their salary level except for the salary level 582-1000 ETB which falls under agree domain. Moreover
regarding marital status there is considerable difference for divorced and widowed employees with regards to organizational commitment and turnover intention.

**Recommendations**

The result of the research shows that respondents inclined to intention to leave the university as their response lies in agree domain. And, at the same time even though it looks the respondents have affective commitment to the university; continuous commitment is somewhat in questionable or neutral. Moreover normative commitment was not statistically significant at (Beta =0.106, p>0.05). And this makes some kind of doubt or neutral with the administrative employees with regards to organizational commitment in general. So, the study has implied the need to develop employees’ organizational commitment as it was found to influence turnover intention. As organizational commitment level was only neutral, there is a need for the university to seek ways to increase organizational commitment among its employees. This is important as employees who are less committed may likely route their commitment in other directions and tend to seek job opportunities elsewhere.

Thus, it is suggested that the university develops human resource strategies that enhance (strengthen) employees’ continuous commitment. Among others employee’s continuous commitment is related with cost benefit that an organization offers so that attention should be given to anything that can increase employees financial benefit/gain and reduce their cost. Hence implement incentives strategy and other motivational tools, better payment comparable with labour market, promotion opportunity, implement a system that enable to recognize, praise and reward employees good performance and others. Moreover as normative commitment is related with employees’ moral obligation the university should give attention to invest on employees as valuable resources with the purpose of winning their moral obligation to stay. Finally, implementing the above recommendations helps to strengthen employees’ continuous commitment and normative commitment in particular; and organizational commitment in general to minimize intention to leave.
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