Journal of Organisation & Human Behaviour
8 (2 & 3) 2019, 31-43
http://publishingindia.com/johb/

# ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL AND NATURE OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION IN TURNOVER INTENTIONS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

**Ritu Raj*, Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari**, Pramod Kumar Rai*****

**Abstract** *The study examined the turnover intentions of senior secondary school teachers in terms of the nature of school organization and psychological capital. Employing a correlational design, 118 males (M = 45.86, SD = 10.71) and 120 females (M = 43.24, SD = 9.79) were recruited using a convenience sampling method. The findings evinced that types of school showed its significant main effects for efficacy and turnover intentions, whereas gender exhibited its significant main effects for resilience and optimism. Tukey test showed that central school teachers achieved higher mean scores on efficacy and resilience compared to the teachers of state and private schools. A significant negative correlation between the scores of resiliency and turnover intentions of the central school teachers was observed. Moreover, small positive and negative correlations were observed among the scores of efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism and psychological capital, and the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. The regression analysis showed that central school accounted for 7.90 variations in the score of turnover intention. Conversely, gender, state and private schools, efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism and psychological capital did not contribute significantly to the scores of the turnover intentions of the teachers. The findings may have significant implications for policymakers while framing the policies and service conditions for employees of organizations of any sort. Future directions for researchers have been discussed.*

**Keywords:** *Psychological Capital, Turnover Intentions, Types of School Organization, Central School, State-Owned School, Private School*

## INTRODUCTION

The wave of Positive Psychology initiated by Seligman (1998) had significantly impacted the paradigms of thinking of all branches of Psychology. It was Luthans (2002) who is credited with introducing Positive Psychology to the field of organizational behaviour that culminated into the development of a new paradigm of positive organizational behaviour. The study and use of positive psychological strengths and capacities as well as their measurement, development and management for enhancing workplace performance represent positive organizational behaviour (Luthans, 2002). This newly adopted paradigm led to introduce many constructs that successfully explained many aspects of human behaviours in organizational settings. One such construct was psychological capital that constitutes the core concept in the field of organizational behaviours. Psychological capital has been conceived as positive psychological development of individuals (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009). In essence, psychological capital includes self-efficacy, hope, optimism, subjective well-being and emotional intelligence (Lutahns & Youssef, 2004). Bandura (2012) has argued that self-efficacy reflects one's confidence about one's ability involving motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action to carryout successfully a task in a given situation. It has been argued that the individuals with high degree of self-efficacy have five important characteristics namely, setting of high goals for themselves

* Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Madhya Pradesh, India. Email: ricky.rtrj@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Madhya Pradesh, India. Email: gyaneshpsychology@gmail.com

*** Professor & Head, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Doctor Harisingh Gour Vishwavidyalaya, Madhya Pradesh, India. Email: prof.pkrai@gmail.com

and choosing difficult tasks, embracing and flourishing on the challenge, self-motivation, accomplishment of goals and perseverance in the face of adversity (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Self-efficacy has been shown positive links with job performance and satisfaction (Stajkovic & Luthans, 2003), and negative correlation with job stress (Matsui & Onglatco, 1992) and turnover intentions (Harris & Cameron, 2005).

Optimism refers to maintaining the goal and adjusting to achieve the goal. Likewise, hope denotes the attribution style that involves positive belief of present and future successes. It reflects an affirmative motivational state that is derived from a sense of successful goal-directed energy and planning to meet goals (Snyder, 2000). Hope has evinced its close association with generating unconventional strategies to meet goals in the face of obstacles (Youssef & Luthans, 2011), job performance (Adams, Snyder, Rand, King, Sigmon, & Pulvers, 2003), financial performance (Adams et al., 2003) and retention (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Resilience denotes the ability to overcome adversities and difficulties and entails the ability to bounce back to attain success in the face of problems and adversity (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). It also refers to a set of evaluating criteria of effectiveness and differentiates between individuals who recover following adversity. Moreover, resilience reflects protective resources that minimize the individual and environment risk factors relevant for positive future outcomes (Masten & Reed, 2002). Resilience comprises of cognitive skill, disposition, a positive life orientation, spirituality, a sense of wittiness, emotional stability and initiative (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007).

On the other hand, turnover refers to the proportion of employees who quit the job during a given period of time (Price & Price, 1977). It also refers to the replacement of workers in the labour market between organizations, jobs and occupations (Abassi & Hollman, 2000). Turnover intentions have both advantages and disadvantages. For example, it allows underperforming employees getting replaced with more creative, dynamic and adaptive ones. The disadvantages of turnover may include cost of recruitment, training, decreased productivity and morale (Abassi & Hollman, 2000). Age, gender, education level, marital status, length of working, individual ability and responsibility constitute the chief causes underlying employees' turnover (Huang, Lin, & Chuang, 2006). Job stress, lowered commitment and job dissatisfaction are some of the organizational factors that have also been related with turnover intentions (Firth, Mellor, Moore, & Loquet, 2004). Moreover, the feeling of helplessness, locus of control (Firth et al., 2004), economic reasons (Mano-Negrin & Tzafrir, 2004), attributes of labour market (Idson & Feaster, 1990), job satisfaction (Trevor, 2001), role ambiguity (Muchinsky & Howes, 2019), irrelevant peers expectations, improper performance evaluation and job pressures are some other factors that are linked with turnover intentions of employees. The nature of organization and tasks also significantly impact turnover intentions (Chang, Chiu, & Liu, 2017).

## Rationale of the Study

A perusal of the previous studies evinced that the study of psychological capital and turnover intentions are very significant to understand the functioning and performance of the employees and the organizations themselves. The study of these constructs may reflect equal significance in school setting especially where there is sufficient lack of such efforts. Teachers are the main force and a key factor behind successful academic success of the students. A thorough appreciation of emotional states, thinking, job commitments and retentions of teachers may be very important to understand their performance. The teachers with strong turnover intentions may create an acute dearth and increased workload for existing staff that, in turn, may affect the academic outcomes of the students. These constructs are even more important in this era when teachers are facing a host of challenges in the form of ever changing educational environment causing stresses. It has been reported that more contented teachers carry out their roles more efficiently than the opposite (Hean & Garrett, 2001). Moreover, it has been suggested that improvement in well-being of teachers is significant for the employees, the organizations and other stake holders (Taris & Schreurs, 2009). The uniqueness of structure, standards and culture of school organizations certainly has a long-lasting impact on the teachers, students, parents and the whole society.

The current status of research evinced lack of theoretical and empirical shreds of evidence, especially in developing countries like India pertaining to these constructs that may contribute to understanding the dynamics of academic performance. In addition, the factors associated with the study of school organizations are diverse and fragmented as well as there is a large discrepancy in the methodology to study these constructs. As the positive organizational climates differ a lot in school settings due to the dissimilarities in their benefits, nature of management, social status, flexibility, security attached to the services, salary and perks in central, state and private-run schools, it would constitute a significant contribution to study the links between psychological capital and turnover intentions of school teachers. It has been reported that negative climate in school organizations may strengthen turnover intentions among teachers (Cheng, 2013; Katz, Greenberg, Jennings, & Klein, 2016).

Moreover, there is lack of studies of turnover behaviours in relation to psychological capital in Indian setting. There has been little consistency among researchers regarding their

findings. Many benefits have been associated with these constructs. For example, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been reported to be negatively correlated with turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). The psychological capital significant lowers stress and reduces turnover intentions among employees (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009). Some previous researchers have reported negative links between psychological capital and turnover intentions in non-school organizational settings (Gupta & Singh, 2014; Singh & Khan, 2014). The study involving psychological capital will constitute an important contribution as it has been reported to be linked with turnover, job satisfaction, commitment, burnout and work-life balance (Cheng, 2013; Singh & Khan, 2014). In this background, the present study attempts to underscore the role of types of school organizations and psychological capital in regulating turnover intentions of the male and female secondary teachers affiliated with the central, state and private organizations.

## OBJECTIVES

The following were the major goals of the present study:

- To study the main and interaction effects of gender and types of school organization on psychological capital and turnover intentions of the secondary teachers;
- To understand the nature and the extent of correlation between psychological capital and turnover intentions of the central, provincial school and private secondary school teachers; and
- To assess the predictive strengths of gender, types of school and psychological capital for turnover intentions of the secondary school teachers.

## HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses have been formulated for the present study:

- Gender and types of school organization will show significant main effects on the various dimensions of psychological capital and turnover intentions of the secondary school teachers.
- The psychological capital and its components will show a negative correlation with the scores of turnover intentions of the secondary school teachers.
- Gender, types of school organization and psychological capital will contribute significantly to the scores of turnover intentions of the secondary school teachers.

## METHODS AND PROCEDURE

### Participants

A convenience sampling method was used to recruit the participants in the study. Data were collected from 238 teachers, working in various Central School, Provincial Government School, and Private School of Gwalior city in Madhya Pradesh, India during 2017. Initially, 300 participants with an equal number of males and females were recruited for the study. After screening the outliers, the data of only 118 males (M = 45.86, SD = 10.71) and 120 females (M = 43.24, SD = 9.80) were used for the final analysis. All the relevant demographic information were collected through a questionnaire that included age, gender, education, income, marital status, tenure, working hours, subject of teaching, the location of posting (urban/rural), health, etc. The details of some of the biographic characteristics of the participants have been displayed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Biographic Details of Teachers Affiliated with Central (*N* = 81), Provincial (*N* = 83) and Private (*N* = 74) School Organizations**

| Sr. No. | Types of School | Gender | Domicile | Age | | Mean Experience (in Years) | Mean Income/ Month (in Thousand Rupees) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Mean | SD | | |
| 1. | Central | Male | Rural | 31.83 | 4.58 | 5.67 | 4.17 |
| | | | Urban | 44.85 | 11.01 | 19.06 | 10.55 |
| | | Female | Rural | 36.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 5.00 |
| | | | Urban | 38.54 | 9.95 | 11.86 | 10.02 |
| 2. | Provincial school | Male | Rural | 33.40 | 3.58 | 2.00 | 5.40 |
| | | | Urban | 49.84 | 10.50 | 23.65 | 10.51 |
| | | Female | Rural | 33.33 | 5.77 | 9.00 | 5.00 |
| | | | Urban | 43.31 | 8.82 | 15.53 | 8.97 |
| 3. | Private | Male | Rural | 53.00 | 0.00 | 32.00 | 3.00 |
| | | | Urban | 47.89 | 8.41 | 18.43 | 2.50 |
| | | Female | Rural | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | | | Urban | 48.55 | 7.99 | 21.48 | 2.97 |

## Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

A set of inclusion and exclusion criteria was adopted to choose the participants. All the teachers who were in service from at least 1 year or more as a confirmed employee of the institute were allowed to take part in the study. Guest teachers, ad hoc teachers, temporary teachers and demonstrators were excluded from this study.

## Psychometric Tools

All the scales employed in the present study were first translated by three researchers from English to Hindi followed by a back translation from Hindi to English. In addition, their face validity was ascertained by the competent researchers of the field according to the basic constructs before the final decision to use these tools was taken. The researchers had gone through the various constructs and validated each item of the scales. Following psychometric tools were employed to collect data:

### Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ)

Psychological capital of the teacher participants was measured with the help of a 24 items psychological capital questionnaire (PCQ) developed by Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007). It has 24 items on which employees have to rate themselves on the scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The aggregate of scores measures individuals' psychological capital on the main four components: viz., hope, efficacy, resiliency and optimism. The reliability coefficient of the psychological capital scale has evinced statistical significance (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

### Turnover Intentions Scale (TIS-6)

A six-item turnover intention scale (Roodt, 2004) was used to measure turnover intentions of the teachers. This scale is based on semantic differential technique of Osgood (1964). Each item has a five-point scale that ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) on which the teachers were instructed to specify their feelings. The first author has procured the written permission from its developer before the start of its use for data collection. The Chronback Alpha of the turnover intention scale has been reported to be 0.80 (Bothma & Roodt, 2013).

## Procedure

The data of the study were collected after completing the initial preparations, formal permissions, acceptance and procurement of written consent from the participants. The data were collected individually by establishing rapport with each participant. The participants were debriefed about the basic objectives of the study. The data of the study were arranged for statistical analyses as per the objectives of the study.

## Plan of Data Analyses

The data of the study were analysed in two phases as per the objectives of the study. The mean, standard deviation (SD), Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the coefficient of correlation were computed for preliminary analysis. To ascertain the relative predictive strengths of gender, types of school organization and psychological capital for turnover intentions of teachers, the hierarchical regression analysis was carried out. The data analysis was carried out with the help of SPSS 25v.

# RESULTS

The data were analysed in two phases: preliminary analysis and hierarchical regression analysis. The details of the same have been given below:

## Preliminary Analyses

The mean, SDs, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and coefficient of correlations were computed of the scores of psychological capital and its components efficacy, hope resilience and optimism and turnover intentions of the male and female teachers belonging to the central, state and private schools.

## Main and Interaction Effects of Gender and Types of School on Psychological Capital and Turnover Intentions

Three types of secondary teachers were recruited namely, central school teachers, state government teachers and private school teachers. To understand the effect of gender and types of school on efficacy, hope, resilience, optimism, psychological capital and turnover intentions, analysis of variance was conducted.

**Table 2: Summary of A 2 × 3 Factorial ANOVA for Efficacy**

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of School (A) | 45.50 | 2 | 22.75 | 3.97 | .020* |
| Gender (B) | 3.62 | 1 | 3.62 | 0.63 | .427 |
| AXB | 12.75 | 2 | 6.37 | 1.11 | .330 |
| Error | 1328.53 | 232 | 5.73 | | |
| Total | 1390.40 | 237 | | | |

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 2 shows statistically significant main effects of types of school (F (2, 232), = 3.97, $p$ = .02) for efficacy whereas the main effect of gender as well as the interaction effect of types of school × gender for the same was not significant. To underscore the differences in the mean scores of the teachers of the three types of schools, post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests was used that showed a higher mean efficacy score of central teachers compared to the teachers of state and private schools at .013 level while other combinations were not significant (see Table 3).

**Table 3: Summary of Post-Hoc Tukey's HSD Tests**

| Types of School (I) | Types of School (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | SE | *p* | 95% CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Central School | State School | –1.06* | .374 | .013 | –1.95 | –.18 |
| | Private School | –.55 | .385 | .326 | –1.46 | .36 |
| State School | Central School | 1.06* | .374 | .013 | .18 | 1.95 |
| | Private School | .51 | .383 | .374 | –.39 | 1.42 |
| Private School | Central School | .55 | .385 | .326 | –.36 | 1.46 |
| | State School | –.51 | .383 | .374 | –1.42 | .39 |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

To explain the effect of gender and types of school on hope, analysis of variance was conducted the results of which evinced no significant main effects of types of schools (F (2, 232), = 0.28, $p$ = .756) and gender (F (1, 232), = 1.46, $p$ = .229) as well as no interaction effect of types of school × gender (F (2, 232), = 1.66, $p$ = .192) on hope.

**Table 4: Summary of A 2 × 3 Factorial ANOVA for Resilience**

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of School (A) | 15.20 | 2 | 7.60 | 1.08 | .341 |
| Gender (B) | 35.55 | 1 | 35.55 | 5.06 | .025* |
| AXB | 8.04 | 2 | 4.02 | 0.57 | .566 |
| Error | 1631.50 | 232 | 7.03 | | |
| Total | 1690.29 | 237 | | | |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

Table 4 shows statistically significant main effects of gender for resilience (F (1, 232), = 5.06, $p$ = .025), whereas the main effect of types of school as well as the interaction effect of types of school × gender for resilience were not significant. To underscore the differences in the mean scores of the resilience for the teachers of three types of schools, post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests showed that none of the combinations differed significantly.

**Table 5: Summary of A 2 × 3 Factorial ANOVA for Optimism**

| Source of Variation | SS | Df | MS | F | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of School (A) | 9.65 | 2 | 4.83 | 1.39 | .252 |
| Gender (B) | 78.61 | 1 | 78.61 | 22.57 | .000** |
| AXB | 14.07 | 2 | 7.03 | 2.02 | .135 |
| Error | 808.07 | 232 | 3.48 | | |
| Total | 910.40 | 237 | | | |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

Table 5 shows statistically significant main effects of gender for optimism (F (1, 232), = 22.57, $p$ = .000), whereas the main effect of types of school as well as the interaction effect of types of school × gender for optimism were not significant. The results of post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests showed that none of the combinations of mean scores of types of the school differed significantly for optimism.

To understand the effect of gender and types of school on psychological capital, analysis of variance has been conducted the results of which evinced no significant main effects of types of schools (F (2, 232), = 0.47, $p$ = .623) and gender (F (1, 232), = 0.07, $p$ = .786) as well as no interaction effect of types of school × gender (F (2, 232), = 0.72, $p$ = .490) on psychological capital.

**Table 6: Summary of A 2 × 3 Factorial ANOVA for Turnover Intention**

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Type of School (A) | 81.40 | 2 | 40.70 | 3.56 | .030* |
| Gender (B) | 0.69 | 1 | 0.69 | 0.06 | .806 |
| AXB | 54.32 | 2 | 27.16 | 2.37 | .095 |
| Error | 2655.79 | 232 | 11.45 | | |
| Total | 2792.21 | 237 | | | |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

To understand the main and interaction effect of gender and types of school on turnover intentions, the analysis of variance has been conducted the results of which have been presented in Table 6. The F-values presented in Table 6 show statistically significant main effects of types of school (F (2, 232), = 3.56, $p$ = .03), whereas the main effect of gender, as well as the interaction effect of types of school × gender, was not significant for turnover intentions.

To explicate the differences in the mean scores of the teachers of the three types of schools, post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests were applied that showed significantly higher mean score on turnover intention measure of central teachers compared to the teachers of state and private schools at .021 level while the other combinations were not significant (see Table 7).

**Table 7: Summary of Post-Hoc Tukey's HSD Tests**

| Types of School (I) | Types of School (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | SE | *p* | 95% CI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Central School | State School | 1.42* | .528 | .021 | .18 | 2.67 |
| | Private School | 1.16 | .544 | .085 | –.12 | 2.45 |
| State School | Central School | –1.42* | .528 | .021 | –2.67 | –.18 |
| | Private School | –.26 | .541 | .881 | –1.54 | 1.02 |
| Private School | Central School | –1.16 | .544 | .085 | –2.45 | .12 |
| | State School | .26 | .541 | .881 | –1.02 | 1.54 |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

## Correlations Among Psychological Capital and Its Dimensions and Turnover Intentions of the Teachers of Central, State and Private Schools

The coefficients of correlation have been computed among the scores of psychological capital and its components efficacy, hope resilience and optimism and turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. The results have been displayed in Table 8.

**Table 8: Coefficients of Correlations Among the Scores of Psychological Capital and its Components Efficacy, Hope Resilience and Optimism and Turnover Intentions of the Central (*N* = 81), State (*N* = 83) and Private (*N* = 74) School Teachers**

| S. No. | Predictors | Criterion | Central School | | State school | | Private school | | Overall | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | r | p | r | p | r | p | r | p |
| 1. | Efficacy | Turnover Intentions | –.050 | .657 | .017 | .879 | –.069 | .559 | –.070 | .284 |
| 2. | Hope | Turnover Intentions | –.096 | .393 | .008 | .945 | –.033 | .781 | –.045 | .487 |
| 3. | Resiliency | Turnover Intentions | –.270* | .015 | .041 | .711 | –.066 | .575 | –.094 | .147 |
| 4. | Optimism | Turnover Intentions | –.144 | .199 | .142 | .199 | –.038 | .751 | –.048 | .465 |
| 5. | PsyCap | Turnover Intentions | –.178 | .111 | .053 | .633 | –.051 | .664 | –.082 | .206 |

*$p$ < .05. **$p$ < .01.

The results showed that there was a negative correlation between the scores of resiliency and turnover intentions of the central school teachers ($r$ = –.270, $p$ = .015). Small positive and negative correlations were observed among the scores of efficacy and the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. Similar trends were also recorded among the scores of hope and the scores of turnover intentions of the teachers of three types of school. Moreover, the scores of resiliency and the scores of turnover intentions also exhibited small positive and negative correlations for the teachers of the three categories. Optimism again showed the similar trends its association with the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. Lastly, this pattern in the correlations was again observed among the scores of psychological capital and the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers (see Table 6).

## Hierarchical Regression Analysis

The hierarchical regressions were computed assuming gender, psychological capital and school types as the predictors and turnover intention as the criterion. As there were three categories of school type (categorical variable), i.e., central, state and private, dummy variables were created to make the comparisons possible for their predictive strengths. Table 9 depicts the predictive strengths of gender, central school type (leaving the state and private schools as dummy) and psychological capital for turnover intentions. The results showed that gender ($R^2$ = .000, F (1, 236) = 000, $p$ = .996) did not contribute significantly to turnover intention. Conversely, central school predicted significant variance of 3.20% ($R^2$ = .032, F (1, 235) = 7.819, $p$ = .006). Efficacy ($R^2$ = .034, F (1, 234) = .410, $p$ = .523), hope ($R^2$ = .035, F (1, 233) = .170, $p$ = .680), resilience ($R^2$ = .044, F (1, 232) = 2.242, $p$ = .136), optimism ($R^2$ = .044, F (1, 231) = .149, $p$ = .700) and psychological capital ($R^2$ = .047, F (1, 230) = .726, $p$ = .395) did not contribute significantly to the turnover intentions of the teachers (see Table 9).

**Table 9: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Turnover Intentions of the Participants ($N = 238$)**

| Variables | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | | Model 6 | | | Model 7 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β |
| Gender | -.002 | .447 | .000 | -.028 | .441 | -.004 | -.016 | .442 | -.002 | -.038 | .445 | -.006 | -.120 | .448 | -.018 | -.058 | .477 | -.008 | -.072 | .477 | -.011 |
| CS | | | | 1.300 | .465 | .179 | 1.251 | .472 | .173 | 1.262 | .473 | .174 | 1.335 | .475 | .184 | 1.342 | .476 | .185 | 1.305 | .478 | .180 |
| Efficacy | | | | | | | -.059 | .092 | -.042 | -.041 | .103 | -.029 | -.021 | .104 | -.015 | -.008 | .109 | -.006 | -.464 | .546 | -.327 |
| Hope | | | | | | | | | | -.032 | .078 | -.030 | .019 | .085 | .018 | .030 | .090 | .028 | -.483 | .609 | -.445 |
| Resilience | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.144 | .096 | -.112 | -.146 | .097 | -.113 | -.615 | .559 | -.477 |
| Optimism | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.054 | .139 | -.031 | -.590 | .645 | -.335 |
| PsyCap | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .483 | .567 | 1.079 |
| $R^2$ | .000 | | | .032 | | | .034 | | | .035 | | | .044 | | | .044 | | | .047 | | |
| $F$ for change in $R^2$ | .000 | | | 7.819** | | | .410 | | | .170 | | | 2.242 | | | .149 | | | .726 | | |

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

**Table 10: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Turnover Intentions of the Participants ($N = 238$)**

| Variables | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | | Model 6 | | | Model 7 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β |
| Gender | -.002 | .447 | .000 | -.104 | .448 | -.015 | -.084 | .449 | -.012 | -.101 | . .453 | -.015 | -.195 | .456 | -.028 | -.165 | .487 | -.024 | -.186 | .487 | -.027 |
| SS | | | | -.880 | .470 | -.122 | -.819 | .477 | -.114 | -.824 | .478 | -.114 | -.934 | .482 | -.130 | -.930 | .484 | -.129 | -.935 | .484 | -.130 |
| Efficacy | | | | | | | -.073 | .093 | -.051 | -.059 | .104 | -.041 | -.038 | .104 | -.026 | -.032 | .109 | -.022 | -.629 | .546 | -.443 |
| Hope | | | | | | | | | | -.025 | .079 | -.023 | .027 | .086 | .025 | .033 | .091 | .030 | -.642 | .611 | -.592 |
| Resilience | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.145 | .098 | -.113 | -.146 | .098 | -.113 | -.764 | .562 | -.593 |
| Optimism | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.025 | .141 | -.014 | -.731 | .648 | -.415 |
| PsyCap | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .635 | .569 | 1.418 |
| $R^2$ | .000[a] | | | .015 | | | .017 | | | .018 | | | .027 | | | .027 | | | .032 | | |
| $F$ for change in $R^2$ | .000 | | | 3.510 | | | .608 | | | .099 | | | 2.211 | | | .033 | | | 1.245 | | |

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

**Table 11: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Turnover Intentions of the Participants ($N = 238$)**

| Variables | Model 1 | | | Model 2 | | | Model 3 | | | Model 4 | | | Model 5 | | | Model 6 | | | Model 7 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β | B | SEB | β | B | SE B | β | B | SE B | β |
| Gender | -.002 | .447 | .000 | .040 | .449 | .006 | .058 | .450 | .008 | .043 | .453 | .006 | -.021 | .457 | -.003 | .041 | .488 | .006 | .016 | .488 | .002 |
| PS | | | | -.447 | .485 | -.060 | -.448 | .485 | -.060 | .006 | . 486 | -.061 | -.423 | .487 | -.057 | -.439 | .490 | -.059 | -.388 | .492 | -.052 |
| Efficacy | | | | | | | -.099 | .092 | -.070 | -.087 | .103 | -.061 | -.073 | .103 | -.052 | -.061 | .109 | -.043 | -.604 | .553 | -.426 |
| Hope | | | | | | | | | | -.022 | .079 | -.021 | .018 | .086 | .017 | .029 | .091 | .027 | -.584 | .619 | -.539 |
| Resilience | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.112 | .097 | -.087 | -.113 | .098 | -.088 | -.675 | .569 | -.524 |
| Optimism | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -.052 | .142 | -.030 | -.692 | .654 | -.393 |
| PsyCap | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .577 | .576 | 1.288 |
| $R^2$ | .000 | | | .004 | | | -.008 | | | .009 | | | .014 | | | .015 | | | .019 | | |
| $F$ for change in $R^2$ | .000 | | | .849 | | | 1.149 | | | .079 | | | 1.320 | | | .134 | | | 1.004 | | |

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 10 depicts the predictive strengths of gender, private school type (leaving the central and state schools as a dummy) and psychological capital for turnover intentions. The results showed that gender ($R^2$ = .000, F (1, 236) = 000, $p$ = .996), state school ($R^2$ = .015, F (1, 235) = 3.510, $p$ = .062), efficacy ($R^2$ = .017, F (1, 234) = .608, $p$ = .436), hope ($R^2$ = .018, F (1, 233) = .099, $p$ = .753), resilience ($R^2$ = .027, F (1, 232) = 2.211, $p$ = .138), optimism ($R^2$ = .027, F (1, 231) = .033, $p$ = .857) and psychological capital ($R^2$ = .032, F (1, 230) = 1.245, $p$ = .266) did not contribute significantly to the turnover intentions of the teachers (see Table 10).

Table 11 depicts the predictive strengths of gender, state school type (leaving the central and private schools as dummy) and psychological capital for turnover intentions. The results showed that gender ($R^2$ = .000, F (1, 236) = 000, $p$ = .996), private school ($R^2$ = .004, F (1, 235) = .849, $p$ = .358), efficacy ($R^2$ = -.008, F (1, 234) = 1.149, $p$ = .285), hope ($R^2$ = .009, F (1, 233) = .079, $p$ = .778), resilience ($R^2$ = .014, F (1, 232) = 1.320, $p$ = .252), optimism ($R^2$ = .015, F (1, 231) = .134, $p$ = .714) and psychological capital ($R^2$ = .019, F (1, 230) = 1.004, $p$ = .317) did not contribute significantly to the turnover intentions of the teachers (see Table 11).

## DISCUSSION

The findings of the study exhibited a significant role of gender, psychological capital and types of school organizations in shaping the nature and extent of turnover intentions. The findings showed that the types of school showed its significant main effects for efficacy and turnover intentions whereas gender exhibited its significant main effects for resilience and optimism. Tukey test showed that central school teachers significantly achieved higher mean scores on efficacy and resilience compared to the teachers of state and private schools. Moreover, the findings showed that there was a negative correlation between the scores of resiliency and turnover intentions of the central school teachers ($r$ = –.270, $p$ = .015). Likewise, small positive and negative correlations were observed among the scores of efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism and psychological capital and the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. The regression analysis showed that central school accounted for 7.90 variations in the score of turnover intention. Conversely, gender, state and private schools, efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism and psychological capital did not contribute significantly to the scores of turnover intentions of teachers. These findings partially approved the hypotheses of the study formulated for this study.

The findings of the study may be explained in terms of the meaning extracted through the scrutiny of the items of each subscale that may be argued to work a valid ground to understand the nature of the association between psychological capital and turnover intentions. The measure of psychological capital used in this study comprises four components namely, efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism. Efficacy refers to the confidence in representing organizational challenges, ability to contribute for organizational strategy and confidence for meetings/presentations. Hope denotes creative ideas to solve problems, feeling of success, alternatives to achieve targets and successful achievement. Resilience involves self-motivation/direction towards work/task, coping in stressful situations and gain from previous experiences. Optimism carries a positive outlook and positivity towards the future. On the other hand, turnover intention refers to thinking of leaving the job, focus of satisfaction of personal needs, frustration with work-related goal, search for a new job to satisfy personal needs, acceptance of another job and non-continuance.

The findings showed that the male participants were more resilient while the females exhibited higher optimism. This may be due to familial and societal expectations that may have been working behind higher resilience of the males that involves self-motivation, coping in stressful situations and gain from previous experiences. In Indian society, the males are still expected to earn bread and butter for their family even in the face of increased female employment that is assumed as the supplementary income. On the other hand, the females in Indian society are expected to maintain a strong faith in the likelihood of future that may nurture productivity and vigour for the family members whom they are expected to look after. Thus, gender differences in the socialization and expectations of the males and females may be assumed to be the real causes behind their dissimilar scores in resilience and optimism.

The nature of school organization also proved to be a relevant factor to understand psychological capital and efficacy. It was observed that central school teachers achieved higher mean scores on efficacy and turnover intentions compared to the teachers of the state as well as private schools. This may be due to the fact that central school teachers possess higher educational qualifications with regular positions that may have promoted them to think for exploring better or higher positions in Universities and Degree Colleges. This fact might have led to show higher turnover intentions of the central school teachers compared to the teachers of state and private schools. In addition, their higher educational qualifications may also be assumed to work behind their higher achievement of efficacy compared to the other two comparison groups.

The findings also indicated negative correlations among the scores of resiliency, efficacy, hope, optimism and psychological capital and the scores of turnover intentions of central, state and private school teachers. This may be explained in terms of the contradictory features of the two constructs. Psychological capital reflects a

positive psychological state comprising self-efficacy, hope, optimism, subjective well-being and emotional intelligence (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009; Luthans, 2002). Moreover, psychological capital has been reported to nurture the performance and satisfaction of employees that may counteract turnover intentions. Psychological capital also comprises self-motivation and perseverance to face the adversity (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). These attributes of psychological capital may be assumed to show negative links with turnover intentions (Harris & Cameron, 2005). Efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience reflect adjustment, positive attribution style, abilities to generate alternative strategies, protective assets, positive outlook, spirituality, sense of humour, emotional stability and initiative (Masten & Reed, 2002; Youssef & Luthans, 2011). These positive attributes may be argued to work behind the low positive or negative correlations among the various dimensions of psychological capital and turnover intentions of the secondary school teachers of this study. Turnover intentions entails low productivity, low morale, reduced personal reputation, low creativity, flexibility and adaptability on the part of employees (Abassi & Hollman, 2000; Huang, Lin, & Chuang, 2006) that may be assumed to be closely linked negatively with the psychological capital of the participants in the present study.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings showed an important role of gender, psychological capital and types of school organizations to explicate turnover intentions. The main effects of types of school were significant for efficacy and turnover intentions. Conversely, gender showed its significant main effects for resilience and optimism. The central school teachers showed higher mean scores on efficacy and resilience compared to the teachers of both the schools. The negative correlations were observed among efficacy, hope, resiliency and optimism, and turnover intentions of the teachers. In addition, central school accounted for significant variance in turnover intention with no significant contributions by gender, state and private types of schools as well as efficacy, hope, resiliency, optimism and psychological capital to the criterion measure.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The findings of the study have practical implication in the formulations of educational and social policies for retaining employees with professional competencies, but at the same time have turn out intentions. Better work conditions with facilities for professional growth and academic recognition strategies may be devised, if we know turnover intentions. However, different strategies for persons with intrinsic motivation are to be devised like providing opportunities for their other creative pursuits. While planning for new schemes of educational and social enhancement, the positive psychological construct may be useful to check the ill consequences of turnover. Many experiments are being done in the field of education, their structures and conditions of service to face new challenges by central and state governments in India where private participation is to be increased. It would be pertinent for policymakers to consider these issues to retain good employees in organizations of any sort.

## DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCHERS

The findings of the study exhibited a significant role of gender, nature of school organization and psychological capital to underscore turnover intentions of secondary teachers. The study of the positive psychological constructs is in its initial stage. It is suggested that the inclusion of positive constructs such as forgiveness, positive self-concept, compassion, morality, emotional intelligence, organizational culture (Raj, Tiwari, & Rai, 2019a) and interdependent happiness (Raj, Tiwari, & Rai, 2019b) may help future researchers to develop a deeper understanding of the relationship of psychological capital and turnover intentions of employees. The use of qualitative methods will help unearth the depth of comprehension of these constructs. The findings of the present study may also be verified on the samples of other types of organizations.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the cooperation and support extended by the experts who helped in analysing the data and preparing the manuscript.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

Abbasi, S. M., & Hollman, K. W. (2000). Turnover: The real bottom line. *Public Personnel Management*, *29*(3), 333–342. doi: 10.1177/009102600002900303

Adams, V. H., Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., King, E. A., Sigmon, D. R., & Pulvers, K. M. (2002). Hope in the workplace. In R. Giacolone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. New York: Sharpe.

Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, *48*(5), 677–693. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20294

Bandura, A. (2012). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bothma, C. F., & Roodt, G. (2013). The validation of the turnover intention scale. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, *11*(1), 507−519. doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v11i1.507

Chang, C. P., Chiu, L. Y., & Liu, J. (2017). A study on the relationship between well-being and turnover intentions among rural school teachers: School organizational climate as a moderating variable. *Creative Education*, *8*(4), 523–538. doi: 10.4236/ce.2017.84041

Cheng, W. C. (2013). *A study on the correlations among personality traits, organizational commitment, and turnover intention of junior high school teachers in Kao Hsiung city* (Master thesis). Pingtung, Taiwan: Department of Education, National University of Pingtung.

Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., & Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *19*(2), 170–187. doi: 10.1108/02683940410526127

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, *26*(3), 463–488. doi: 10.1177/014920630002600305

Gupta, V., & Singh, S. (2014). Psychological capital as a mediator of the relationship between leadership and creative performance behaviors: Empirical evidence from the Indian R&D sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *25*(10), 1373–1394. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2013.870311

Harris, G. E., & Cameron, J. E. (2005). Multiple dimensions of organizational identification and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions and psychological well-being. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/ Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, *37*(3), 159–169. doi: 10.1037/h0087253

Hean, S., & Garrett, R. (2001). Sources of job satisfaction in science secondary school teachers in Chile. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *31*(3), 363–379. doi: 10.1080/03057920120098491

Huang, I. C., Lin, H. C., & Chuang, C. H. (2006). Constructing factors related to worker retention. *International Journal of Manpower*, *27*(5), 491–508. doi: 10.1108/01437720610683976

Idson, T. L., & Feaster, D. J. (1990). A selectivity model of employer-size wage differentials. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *8*(1, Part 1), 99–122. doi: 10.1086/298238

Katz, D. A., Greenberg, M. T., Jennings, P. A., & Klein, L. C. (2016). Associations between the awakening responses of salivary α-amylase and cortisol with self-report indicators of health and well-being among educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *54*, 98–106. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.012

Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *16*(1), 57–72. doi: 10.5465/ame.2002.6640181

Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management. *Organizational Dynamics*, *33*(2), 143–160. doi: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.003

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(3), 541–572. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mano-Negrin, R., & Tzafrir, S. S. (2004). Job search modes and turnover. *Career Development International*, *9*(5), 442–458. doi: 10.1108/13620430410550727

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. J. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Oxford University Press Oxford. U. K.

Matsui, T., & Onglatco, M.-L. (1992). Career self-efficacy as a moderator of the relation between occupational stress and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *41*(1), 79–88. doi: 10.1016/0001-8791(92)90040-7

Muchinsky, P. M., & Howes, S. (2019). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Summerfield, NC: Hypergraphic Press, Inc.

Price, J. L., & Price, J. L. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames Io: The Iowa State University Press.

Raj, R., Tiwari, G. K., & Rai, P. K. (2019a). Assessing the predictive strengths of school organizations and organizational cultures in interdependent happiness of the secondary school teachers. *IAHRW International Journal of Social Sciences Review, 7*(6), 1093-1101.

Raj, R., Tiwari, G. K., & Rai, P. K. (2019b). Gender and nature of school organizations predict interdependent happiness of teachers. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature, 7*(6), 363-378.

Roodt (2004). *Turnover intentions* (Unpublished document). Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). Building human strength: Psychologys forgotten mission. *APA Monitor*, *29*(1), 12–18. doi: 10.1037/e529932010-003

Singh, N., & Khan, I. (2014). Psychological capital and happiness among government and private bank

employees - A comparative investigation. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, *3*(2), 336–338. doi: 10.15373/2249555x/feb2013/115

Snyder, C. R. (2000). *Handbook of hope*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (2003). Behavioral management and task performance in organizations: Conceptual background, meta-analysis, and test of alternative models. *Personnel Psychology*, *56*(1), 155–194. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00147.x

Taris, T. W., & Schreurs, P. J. (2009). Well-being and organizational performance: An organizational-level test of the happy-productive worker hypothesis. *Work & Stress*, *23*(2), 120–136. doi: 10.1080/02678370903072555

Trevor, C. O. (2001). Interactions among actual ease-of-movement determinants and job satisfaction in the prediction of voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(4), 621-638. doi: 10.5465/3069407

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2011). Positive psychological capital in the workplace: Where we are and where we need to go. In K. M. Sheldon, T. B. Kashdan & M. F. Steger (Eds.), *Designing Positive Psychology: Taking Stock and Moving Forward.* New York: Oxford University Press.