

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYEE MOBILITY: FACTORS AFFECTING KNOWLEDGE CONTINUITY

L. Linhartová, H. Urbancová

Received: November 14, 2011

Abstract

LINHARTOVÁ, L., URBANCOVÁ, H.: *Results of analysis of employee mobility: factors affecting knowledge continuity*. Acta univ. agric. et silvic. Mendel. Brun., 2012, LX, No. 4, pp. 235–244

One of the tools to eliminate the loss of knowledge of qualified staff that holds knowledge critical for the given organisation is the application of the knowledge continuity conception which focuses in particular on the transfer of knowledge from the leaving employee to his/her successor. The objective of the article is to analyse use of employee mobility information in organisations and apply its results on knowledge continuity ensuring. The article has been processed based on the analysis of secondary sources, outcome synthesis and the evaluation of results of a questionnaire surveys. Knowledge continuity ensuring as an internal force can, together with the right employees, help the organisation to adapt more quickly to external conditions that the organisation practically cannot control. The advantages of knowledge continuity applying and its impact on employee mobility are mentioned as well. Summary, mobility is not usually managed in referred organisations and effort to objectively solve negative employee mobility have only minimum of referred managers. Thus, intervention to the system of mobility management is suggested together with greater emphasis of top management to already existing practices, which are very often ignored by line managers.

mobility, manager, knowledge, knowledge continuity, management, factor

A shift to a knowledge society and the growing requirements for competitiveness multiply the pressure placed on the human factor in every organisation. In the entrepreneurial sector, more than anywhere else, the level of dependence of organisations on their employees has been growing (Wong, 2009). The labour market is adapting to these new needs and is instigating labour mobility, lifelong education and permanent knowledge enhancement. Labour mobility has become a natural phenomenon (Kachaňáková, Stachová, 2011). Newcomers contribute to dynamics and development preservation since they bring new ideas, knowledge and new perspectives. Recruits are either qualified and offer sufficient knowledge and experience already when hired or gain qualifications during their work for the organisation. Organisations, however, often have to deal with the leaving of employees in whom they invested money (Prevot, 2008; Cabrera *et al.*, 2006). The leaving of qualified employees means a serious blow for organisations, in particular small

ones, such as lost profit, costs associated with the leaving of former and hiring of new employees, team destabilization, increased workload for the remaining staff, loss of business contacts and delays in project implementation and development. One of the tools to eliminate the loss of knowledge of qualified staff that holds knowledge critical for the given organisation is the application of the knowledge continuity conception which focuses in particular on the transfer of knowledge from the leaving employee to his/her successor (Stam, 2009; Eucker, 2007; Beazley *et al.*, 2002).

The objective of the article is to analyse use of employee mobility information in organisations and its impact of knowledge continuity ensuring. The aim of the article is not to detect all causes of employee mobility, but to identify the main areas that make employees decide to leave organisations, to compare them and to define their common denominator. A partial aim of the article is to turn owners' and managers' attention to the causes of

employee dissatisfaction, the elimination of which could help stabilize their personnel, preserve their knowledge and enhance the overall competitiveness of the organisation. The advantages of knowledge continuity applying and its impact on employee mobility are mentioned as well.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

First part of the article deals with theoretical approaches to the issues of employee mobility and knowledge continuity ensuring in organisations while the second part analyses the findings of surveys carried out in the Czech Republic. The article has been processed based on the analysis of secondary sources, outcome synthesis and the evaluation of results of a questionnaire surveys.

Based on literature review determinants of reasons of employee mobility were deducted and main factors constructed. In two successive surveys 29 determinants¹ were used to describe 7 main factors causing employee mobility². Those factors are remuneration, certainty, relationships, recognition, communication, culture and expectations. The factors were confirmed by the method of induction based on the results of the surveys. For reasons of provable clear understanding, the factors were structured as general, analogically to the survey carried out by Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann (2003), John, Naumann and Soto (2008) and Benet-Martinez and John (1998). The conclusiveness of the outcomes was supported by aggregation; by adding individual tested items the superordinate item and the whole were supported³. The conclusiveness of factors and their determinants was tested by means of a association analysis at the significance level of 0.01. The outcomes indicate a direct and strong dependence between employee dissatisfaction with the identified factors and the decision to leave their work position. The factors were therefore used for further analyses.

The surveys focused on employees were filled by 100 respondents who left their jobs last year. Employees were surveyed to found hidden reasons to leave the organisation. The method used for data collection in the first survey was CAWI (computer-assisted web interviewing). The second, control questionnaire was based on the CATI method (computer-assisted telephone interviewing). The selection of a representative sample of employee population across sectors was carried out by a random selection of telephone numbers, which incorporates the advantages of multilevel random selection (Disman, 2008). The sample was selected solely for the purposes of the survey and included employees or managers in the age category from

20 to 55 who left their job in the course of the past twelve months. The surveys were based on the study of literature, documents and other related surveys carried out by the following authors: Branham (2005), Hackman, Oldham (1980), Meyer, Allen (1991), Reiß (2008) and Katcher and Snyder (2007). In the second survey a semantic differential was applied that permitted the identification of nuances in respondents' attitudes through the questionnaire. Respondents' reactions to target statements and their attitudes to the given matter were restricted by offering a set of several statements (Hayes, 1998).

The outcomes of the surveys do not include focus on sex of the respondent, because χ^2 test indicated that there is no dependence between sex and reasons to leave the organisation. As well as χ^2 test did not indicate any dependence between sexes of respondent, also sector does not affect causes of employee mobility.

One additional research focused on managers took a part of the whole study to compare views of both parts of work process. The third questioning (both qualitative and quantitative) focused on managers used the same topics as it was described for the first and second survey. Special attention was paid to use of information about employee mobility, knowledge of reasons, why employees leave and if organisation takes care about costing of employee mobility and wishes to keep trained employees. Questions were open and managers could speak about the theme. The respondents were found across sectors to create representative sample.

The analysis was carried out using the Microsoft Excel 2007 and SPSS programmes. The conclusiveness of the outputs and relationships obtained were supported by the tools of descriptive statistics, the analysis of dispersion, parametric tests and association (correlation), regression, determination and factor analyses were used to review the outcomes.

The data for the evaluation of relationships between potential threats of organisations from the loss of knowledge and identification variables has been gathered through a quantitative survey, i.e. a questionnaire survey, in which 167 higher and middle management managers from various organisations took part; the branch in which the organisations operate has not been taken into account in 2010.

The survey was focused on managers:

- Who were part of managerial units (liable for the running of the organisation or group performance) that were to focus, on an increasing scale, on sharing, transferring and preserving of knowledge of employees who were about to retire or leave

1 Statements used by the respondents to characterize the main reasons to leave.

2 Factors were verified by statistical analyses (association, determination, factor analysis).

3 Individual items of the construct sustaining final factors were tested separately and their reliability was added up in the whole.

to join a competitor (responsible for knowledge transfer in the organisation).

- Working with knowledge base and with the aim to enhance it.
- Who themselves were knowledge employees with critical knowledge or monitored employees with such critical knowledge.

The data have been processed by means of absolute and relative frequencies using the LimeSurvey application and the Excel 2007 programme. Testing is done by Pearson Chi-Square test in association table and contingency table. The power of dependence is determined by the correlation coefficient and Cramer's coefficient. Presented results can be generalized on selected sample.

Theoretical background

Bělohlávek (2008), Jenkins (2009) and Ramlall (2004) describe the causes of employee mobility as disharmony with internal motivation. If a need at a higher level of Maslow's pyramid of needs is not satisfied, an individual aims at satisfying a need at a lower hierarchical level. The most common case is that an employee's unfulfilled expectation in the area of self-development translates into the development of relationship needs (Bělohlávek, 2008; Mikuláščík, 2007). Should these be unsatisfactory as well, an employee leaves his/her job (unless conditions can be changed).

According to a study executed by Hackman and Oldham (1980) that concentrated on employees of educational institutions and scientists, six major factors determining employee mobility have been identified. These factors include the level of compensation and benefits, promotion and development, meaningfulness of work, a superior's style of management, relationships with colleagues and work safety. Pass (2005) in Anderson (2009) mentions the 3R system (Recognition, Respect, Relationships) as the main reason for employee satisfaction. Anderson (2009), Branham (2005) and Katcher and Snyder (2007) extend it by remuneration, suitable culture at the workplace, security (and safety) of work. Ramlall (2004) has divided motivational factors leading to employee satisfaction in their work position into satisfying basic motivational needs according to Maslow (1943), i.e. equal treatment,

fulfilment of expectations and workplace concept. The outcome of the studies was a low correlation between dissatisfaction at the workplace leading to employee mobility and the level of compensation. On the contrary, organisations were recommended to concentrate on the improvement of employee qualifications, enhancement of competences and clear specification of the meaning of the content of the given position.

The leaving of a job can be considered the extreme case of a stressful situation and an employee's long-term frustration. Kolman (2003) and Linhart (2003) mention the following possible organisational causes and consequences of stress (see Tab. I):

Employee mobility is an extreme case of dissatisfaction – demotivation that is characterised by one (or a combination) of the above-mentioned causes. If the basic working conditions expected by an employee are not met, the employee becomes frustrated (Armstrong, 2009; Deiblová, 2005; Kocianová, 2010; Bělohlávek, 2008). The gathered motivational energy remains unused.

Employee mobility or intercompany mobility means the transition of employees between the organisation and its surroundings, i.e. other organisations and institutions. It can have both positive and negative impacts. The negative ones include, for example, failing to use the acquired qualification or work experience of the leaving employee, the occurrence of undesirable characteristics and attitudes of employees within the organisation, the worsening of the relation to work and poor work morale. On the contrary, some of the positive aspects are: new ideas and thoughts brought by new employees, stagnation avoidance, hiring a more suitable employee (with better knowledge, more experience), personnel planning optimisation and rationalization, development and succession planning (Stýblo, 1993).

Employee mobility is considered to be one of the key problems that organisations face. This is particularly the case if high quality employees who have worked for the company for many years or efficient and loyal people with critical knowledge for the organisation are to leave.

Employee mobility may also represent an advantage for the company. For example if a less productive employee is replaced by someone more productive, or if the position of an employee who is about to retire is taken by "young blood". A certain

I: *Organisational causes and consequences of stress*

Causes	Consequences
The employee and the work are not "a good fit"	Bad working relationships
Overloading	Dissatisfaction
Conflicting roles	Poor performance
Ambiguous role	Employee mobility
Insufficient resources	Changing of jobs
Management style	"Lover-like" motivation

Source: Kolman (2003), Linhart (2003)

level of mobility may decrease personnel costs of the organisation.

For employers it is very important to check the number of employees leaving the organisation and see what effect this has on the organisation. Naturally all that depends on the size the organisation, its location and special teams of employees who can help design the general strategy of resources (Hutchinson, Purcell, 2003; Stýblo, 1993).

If a qualified employee leaves, another organisation acquires a new knowledge employee who can become its competitive advantage. The loss of knowledge represents a threat for the former organisation, which increases the importance of knowledge continuity.

RESULTS

This chapter describes findings from the primary surveys regarding usage of information regarding

employee mobility in organisations in consequence with knowledge continuity ensuring. Results of statistical tests and analyses are presented below.

Analysis of usage of information regarding employee mobility in organisations

Results of a survey focused on use of information, rate, time series, reasons and consequences of mobility in organisations are stated in Tab. II. It is clear that reference sample of organisations do not work with leaving interviews and possibilities, which are hidden in the monitoring of employee mobility.

Links and deeper understanding of facts which characterised use and work with employee mobility rate in referred organisations shows Tab. III. The table shows association coefficients between selected statements (the statements are the same as in Tab. II). Bold are highlighted straight dependencies

II: *Monitoring of employee mobility in organisations*

Workflow	Yes (%)	No (%)
Use of leaving interviews	45	55
Retention of results of leaving interviews	55	45
Leaving interview initiated by supervisor	68	32
Costing of employee mobility	65	35
Use of employee mobility rate	45	55
Use of time series of employee mobility	29	71
Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments	26	74
Comparison of managers/departments	10	90
Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility	26	74
Monitoring of costs and incomes per employee	45	55
Unexpected leaves of employees are common	45	55
Discussion upon comments of leaving employees	97	3
Effort to maintain trained employees	71	29
Average	48	52

Source: author's survey

III: *Association table of organisational work with employee mobility*

	INTE	RESU	SUPE	CALC	RAT	TIM	INDI	COM	USER	COS	UNE	DISC	MAIN
INTER	1,000	0,563	0,072	-0,004	0,218	0,419	0,502	0,141	0,354	-0,433	0,218	0,166	0,152
RESUL	0,563	1,000	0,206	0,140	0,303	0,295	0,387	0,078	0,239	-0,218	0,303	0,201	0,134
SUPER	0,072	0,206	1,000	-0,223	-0,067	-0,167	-0,224	-0,241	-0,224	-0,067	-0,067	-0,126	0,015
CALC	-0,004	0,140	-0,223	1,000	0,402	0,326	0,283	0,243	0,437	-0,140	0,267	-0,135	-0,177
RATE	0,218	0,303	-0,067	0,402	1,000	0,705	0,650	0,361	0,650	-0,303	0,349	-0,201	-0,134
TIME	0,419	0,295	-0,167	0,326	0,705	1,000	0,760	0,512	0,760	-0,295	0,276	-0,285	0,253
INDIV	0,502	0,387	-0,224	0,283	0,650	0,760	1,000	0,555	0,663	-0,239	0,354	0,108	0,215
COMP	0,141	0,078	-0,241	0,243	0,361	0,512	0,555	1,000	0,555	-0,078	-0,078	0,060	0,209
USER	0,354	0,239	-0,224	0,437	0,650	0,760	0,663	0,555	1,000	-0,239	0,057	0,108	0,377
COST	-0,433	-0,218	-0,067	-0,140	-0,303	-0,295	-0,239	-0,078	-0,239	1,000	-0,172	0,166	0,009
UNEXP	0,218	0,303	-0,067	0,267	0,349	0,276	0,354	-0,078	0,057	-0,172	1,000	-0,201	-0,276
DISCU	0,166	0,201	-0,126	-0,135	-0,201	-0,285	0,108	0,060	0,108	0,166	-0,201	1,000	0,285
MAINT	0,152	0,134	0,015	-0,177	-0,134	0,253	0,215	0,209	0,377	0,009	-0,276	0,285	1,000

Source: author's survey

of variables with the strength of dependence weak till moderate and the whole highlighted field indicates strong or very strong dependence (relation between variables).

Moderately strong dependence (0.563) was found between use of leaving interviews and retention of its results. This dependence was predicted. If organisation use leaving interviews, it is appropriate to analyse them. It can be stated that dependence would be in ideal case equal to 1, but as showed in analysis of replies of referred sample of managers, leaving interviews are usually just formal issue and results are not consequently applied which in the end lower dependence of both attributes. Further analyses revealed moderate strong dependence between use of leaving interviews and use of time series (0.419) and individual evaluation of employee mobility rate for managers/departments (0.502). This dependence was also predicted because it is appropriate to use together with leaving interview information also other analyse of the problem.

Weak correlation together with leaving interview was found in Use of employee mobility rate (0.218), Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.354) and surprisingly in Common unexpected leaves of employees (0.218). First two weak correlations follow the trend of use of leaving interviews, striking is the fact that those organisations, who deeply work with leaving interviews experience unexpected leave of employees. It is possible that referred organisations started to use deeper analyses of leaving interviews to eliminate such phenomena and regarding to the weak correlation this effort is successful.

Retention of results of leaving interview correlates only (weak correlation) with statement, that Leaving interview is initiated by supervisor (0.206). This relationship could indicate formal assumptions leading to the predication that supervisors follow the regulation about necessity to undertake the leaving interview and to save and preserve its results. Regarding to the weak correlation it is possible to say that this shows only formal matter with no further use. Weak correlation was found also between Retention of results of leaving interview and deeper analyses of its results, such as Use of employee mobility rate (0.303), Use of time series of employee mobility (0.295) and Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers or departments (0.387). Statement that leaving interviews are saved also correlates with Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.239), but dependence is weaker than the one connected to leaving interviews (0.354). Other weak correlation was found together with Unexpected leaves of employees (0.303). The reason can be similar as it was with Analyse of leaving interviews. On the other hand, dependence is stronger, which indicates an organisational rule to apply those leaving interviews due to the high rate of employee mobility. Still there are no such results of monitoring mobility and using results to eliminate negative employee mobility rate. Organisations

that save results of leaving interviews, also discuss subordinate's comments. This correlation is weak indeed (0.201). The dependence between discussing of leaving employee comments was found only together with Retention of results of leaving interviews, no other organisational practices are associated to listening to comments. This prove randomness of this support by managers. It approved also survey focused on employees, which in more than two thirds stated that nobody listen to them (Linhartová, 2011).

As there are no correlations between factors of discussion of comments, also almost independent statement is that leaving interview is initiated by supervisor. Weak correlation was found only together with Retention of results of leaving interview (0.206), as mentioned above. This fact shows analogy to solving employees comments because both statements can be consider as random and have no meaning to organisation because results are not subject of further analyses and results were not used. It is just a formality. Fully independent is also statement Monitoring of costs and incomes per employee. This organisational activity does not correlate to any other analysed practices. Organisations do not consider monitoring of costs and incomes per employee as important despite advantages, that comes with it and which can help to solve or manage problematic mobility rate (it can help with the decision whether to keep an effective employees or to get rid of unproductive ones). Resulted independence is supported by the statement of employees, who stated unfair treatment, favouring of some employees and formation of nepotism (in 40%) in previous survey (Linhartová, 2011).

Organisations which work with costing of employee mobility very often also use mobility rate (0.402) and Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (moderate dependence 0.437). Weak till moderate dependence between costing of employee mobility was found with Use of time series of employee mobility (0.326), Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments (0.283), Comparison of managers/departments (0.243) and also with Unexpected leaves of employees (0.267). We may say that organisations calculating with mobility costs also deeply analyse rates and reasons of employee mobility in order to eliminate that negative phenomenon.

Use of employee mobility rate strongly correlates with Use of time series of employee mobility (0.705), Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments (0.650) and Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.650). Weak correlation was found with Comparison of managers/departments (0.361) and Unexpected leaves of employees (0.349). Strong correlation indicates interdependence of mentioned organisational activities. Organisations that decided to work deeply with data gathered from leaving interviews almost always use another possibilities

how to use results and ups downs of employee mobility related to managers or departments to lower negative impacts of employee mobility. Firstly by decreasing disaffection with sub-areas to minimize costs and higher efficiency.

Likewise, managers that use time series also use individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments (strong correlation 0.760) and Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.760). Moderate dependence was found with Comparison of managers/departments (0.512). Weak correlation was found between Use of time series of employee mobility and Unexpected leaves of employees (0.276) and also Effort to maintain trained employees (0.253). Relation between efforts to maintain trained employees is also between Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments (0.215), Comparison of managers/departments (0.209), Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.377) and Discussion upon comments of leaving employees (0.285). From those relations it is clear that primary goal of organisations that work deeply with employee mobility analysis, solve problems and compare results and ups downs for each part of the organisation is to retain employees.

Moderate and strong dependence was found between Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments (0.555) and Use of results and ups downs of employee mobility (0.663). Such dependence supports strong intercorrelation between deeper analyses and impacts of employee mobility. Together with Individual evaluation of mobility rate for managers/departments correlates also Unexpected leaves of employees (0.354), thus it is possible to conclude the effort to eliminate negative rate of employee mobility. Last dependence revealed by association analysis was found between Individual evaluation of mobility rate and Use of results (strong correlation, 0.555). It also support other results of the analysis, that knowledge of mobility rate in organisations leads to deeper analysis of its causes and consequences. Such knowledge may lower negative employee mobility rate, improve overall situation in the organisation (culture, relationships etc.) and help to ensure knowledge continuity.

DISCUSSION

Knowledge generation is determined by both internal and external factors. With respect to the fact that the article deals with the transfer of knowledge from the leaving employee to his/her successor (i.e. the transfer of knowledge in relation to personnel changes), for knowledge continuity ensuring which concerns the organisation and its internal environment it is the internal factors that play the main role. It is possible to say that the traditional development of an organisation (achieving competitiveness) is primarily ensured by internal forces rather than external ones. However, knowledge continuity ensuring as an internal force

can, together with the right employees, help the organisation to adapt more quickly to external conditions that the organisation practically cannot control. Knowledge continuity ensuring is thus part of an organisation's adaptation to external conditions.

Internal factors can be divided into two categories – individual level and organisational level factors. Individual level factors are associated with a particular employee (e.g. skills to transfer and receive knowledge, positive experience with knowledge sharing, etc.) while factors at the organisational level are determined by the organisation (organisational structure, management style, culture, etc.).

For organisations it is important to improve motivation and its strategy and to build organisational culture and climate that support knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing should become a key performance indicator (Key Performance Indicator – specific, reviewable and definable for each position) in the remuneration system of the organisation in the given period (formal performance review leading to pay rise, promotion, assignment to a different position, sometimes loss of the position and employment contract termination). Employees who well present the results of their work in organisations, for example, at conferences, who take part in seminars and training both at home and abroad, etc. and thus represent the company should be compensated for that. Compensation should be given not only to the employee who transfers knowledge (the leaving employee), but also the one who is willing to accept it (the successor). Knowledge assessment by the 360-degree method (possible also online) should be obligatory and should cover all employees.

These conclusions are also supported by the survey carried out by Kim and Lee (2006) who say that remuneration systems influence knowledge sharing. In their surveys, Smith and Mckeen (2003) as well as Zhang *et al.* (2006) state that the existence of this remuneration system (bonuses, knowledge-oriented publicity, etc.) strengthens employees' motivation to share knowledge.

It is possible to say that a knowledge-oriented remuneration system may determine the flow of knowledge and make this knowledge accessible within the organisation. The use of a motivation-based system will motivate employees to develop new knowledge, share the existing knowledge with colleagues and successors and stimulate the willingness to help new employees to become familiar with their job more quickly. It is necessary to mention that some employees are not motivated by money, but by the possibility of promotion and building their image, which is confirmed by the conclusions of the quantitative survey. The system of remuneration also has a positive impact on knowledge quality. Remuneration should be varied, of both a tangible and intangible nature, and

should be used efficiently to improve the quality of knowledge.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of practical use of employee mobility rates in organisations revealed overview of structure and relations between organisational practices used to monitor employee disaffection which leads to employee mobility. Relations between monitored practices in organisations give us four possible approaches to employee mobility. Firstly, managers are monitoring employee mobility only formally, to follow internal organisational rules. They interview employees as requested, save the results, but nobody use them or analyse them and it does not affect consequential mobility rate. Secondly, managers' attitude is characterized by deeper analysis of results of leaving interviews, address comments, time series analyses and solving of attitudes of single managers or departments in order to eliminate negative mobility rate that was already found in organisation. Thirdly, group of organisations profiled from those, that are trying to avoid negative mobility rate by deep knowledge get from leaving interviews and employees' comments and impulses, following time series and other analyses and tests to apply the results. Fourthly, group of organisations (which is relatively large – in average 52% of all referred organisations) do not use leaving interviews or any other analyse of employee mobility at all. Summary, mobility is not usually managed in referred organisations and effort to solve negative employee mobility rate objectively have only minimum of referred managers. Thus, intervention to the system of mobility management is suggested together with greater emphasis of top management to already existing practices that are very often ignored by line managers.

Ensuring the continuity of managers' knowledge creates a powerful advantage for organisations, managers themselves and their employees. This can be summarised by the following basic characteristics:

- It reduces mobility and its financial consequences.
 - It reduces employees' stress, improves their morale and increases the loyalty of employees towards their organisation. Current employees do not have to substitute those who left and do their work. The reason is that a newcomer can use the knowledge profile of the employee who resigned straight away. The process of learning is faster, less demanding and less stressful.
 - It speeds up the initial training of new employees by directing them to learning tracks and becoming productive in a shorter period of time.
 - It increases creativity, innovation, continuous progress and organisational learning, i.e. everything that is dependent on knowledge about the past.
 - It improves decision-making and reduces the errors of newcomers because they have the necessary critical operational knowledge at their disposal from the first day in their new position.
 - It preserves knowledge networks that would otherwise be lost with the leaving of former employees. These networks are essential for superior performance and it is difficult and time-consuming to re-develop them for new employees.
 - It prevents knowledge accumulation by one person.
 - It helps preserve an organisation's memory; knowledge remains in the organisation and turns into its asset.
 - It contributes to the preservation of basic organisational values, competencies and maintaining of the organisation's goals.
- Managers at all levels of management have to realise that the time and costs associated with the training of new knowledge employees (who actively educate themselves) are much higher than the investments in the support of knowledge sharing and transfer among current employees. If knowledge continuity is ensured, the organisation will not lose its knowledge when an employee with critical knowledge leaves, as it has been transferred to another employee.

SUMMARY

Organisations can lower mobility of employees, establish long-term relationships with them and foster their loyalty by identifying and addressing the key factors that cause staff disaffection and mobility. This article examines the behaviour inside organisations that leads to mobility and identifies solutions that mitigate disaffection and foster employee retention. The aim of the article is to analyse, based on the outcomes of primary surveys, the impact of causal factors of employee mobility on knowledge continuity ensuring in organisations. Employee mobility is considered to be one of the permanent problems that managers in all organisations have to deal with. This is particularly the case if high quality employees who have worked for the company for many years or efficient and loyal people with critical knowledge for the organisation are to leave. However, if suitable conditions are developed and knowledge continuity applied, mobility does not necessarily lead to the loss of knowledge carried by knowledge employees. The data evaluated has been obtained based on primary surveys among employees and managers employed by organisations in the Czech Republic. Knowledge continuity ensuring helps to combat the negative consequences of employee mobility. Analysis of practical use of employee mobility rates in organisations revealed overview of structure and relations

between organisational practices used to monitor employee satisfaction and disaffection which leads to mobility. If knowledge continuity is ensured, the organisation will not lose its knowledge when an employee with critical knowledge leaves, as it has been transferred to another employee. One of the conclusions of the article is that the main reason for mobility is not only the negative feelings of employees, but may lie in managers and their passive approach or incorrectly targeted activity. This statement is supported by association analysis, which identified at the significance level of 0.01 four possible approaches to employee mobility management. The largest group of referred organisations (52%) does not use leaving interviews or any other monitoring of employee mobility at all.

Acknowledgement

This contribution is a follow-up to the project of University – wide internal grant agency (CIGA), number 20121001 – Business continuity management contributing to higher performance in organisations.

REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, V., 2009: *Research Methods in Human Resource Management*. 2. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel Development. ISBN 978-184398-227-2.
- ARMSTRONG, M., 2009: *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. London: Kogan Page, ISBN 978-0-7494-5242-1.
- BEAZLEY, H., BOENISCH, J., HARDEN, D., 2002: *Continuity Management: Preserving Corporate Knowledge and Productivity When Employees Leave*. Wiley, September. ISBN 978-0-471-21906-4.
- BENET-MARTINEZ, V., JOHN, O. P., 1998: Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 75, 729–750, ISSN 0022-3514.
- BĚLOHLÁVEK, F., 2008: *How to lead and motivate people* (in Czech). 1st ed., Brno, Czech Republic, Computer Press, ISBN 978-80-251-2235-8.
- BRANHAM, L., 2005: *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave*. New York: AMACOM. ISBN 0-8144-0851-6.
- BRANHAM, L., 2000: *Keeping the people who keep you in business: 24 Ways to Hang on to Your Most Valuable Talent*. 1. USA: AMACOM, ISBN 9780814405970.
- CABRERA, A., COLLINS, W., SALGADO, J. S., 2006: Determinant sof Individual Engagement in Knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 254–264, ISSN 1466-4399.
- DEIBLOVÁ, M., 2005: *Motivation as management tool* (in Czech). 1st ed., Prague, Czech Republic, Linde. ISBN 80-902105-8-9.
- DISMAN, M., 2008: *How to create sociological knowledge*. (in Czech) Praha: Karolinum. ISBN 978-80-246-0139-7.
- EUCKER, T., 2007: *Understanding the impact of tacit knowledge loss*. Knowledge Management Review, Vol. 10, Issue 3, pp. 30–39, ISSN 1369-7633.
- GOSLING, S. D., RENTFROW, P. J., SWANN, W. B., 2003: A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 37, pp. 504–528, ISSN 0092-6566.
- HACKMAN, J. R., OLDFHAM, G. R., 1980: Work redesign and motivation. *Professional Psychology*, Vol. 11(3), pp. 445–455. ISSN 0033-0175.
- HAYES, N., 1998: *Basic social psychology*. (in Czech) Praha: Portál. ISBN 80-7178-198-3.
- HUTCHINSON, S., PURCELL, J., 2003: *Bringing policies to life: the vital role of front line managers in people management*. London, CIPD, ISBN 1843980533.
- JENKINS, A. K., 2009: Keeping the talent: understanding the needs of engineering and scientists in the defense acquisition workforce. *Defense AR Journal*, pp. 164–170, ISSN 1553-6408.
- JOHN, O. P., NAUMANN, L. P., SOTO, C. J., 2008: *Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues*. Handbook of personality: Theory and research, pp. 114–158, ISBN 978-1-59385-836-0.
- KACHAŇÁKOVÁ, A., STACHOVÁ, K., 2011: The level of education and development of employees in organisations operating in Slovakia. *Scientia Agriculturae Bohemica*, Vol. 2. ISSN 1211-3174.
- KATCHER, B. L., SYNDER, A., 2007: *30 reasons employees hate their managers*. New York, USA, AMACOM, 2007. ISBN 978-08144-1764-5.
- KIM, S., LEE, H., 2006: The Impact of Organizational Context and Information Technology on Employee Knowledge-Sharing Capabilities. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66, Issue 3, ISSN 0033-3352.
- KOCIANOVÁ, R., 2010: *Personal work and methods* (in Czech). Praha: Grada. ISBN 978-80-247-2497-3.
- KOLMAN, L., 2003: *Chapters from psychology for economical studies* (in Czech). Praha: Credit. ISBN 80-213-0968-7.
- LINHART, Z., 2003: *Prognostics and planning* (in Czech). Praha: Credit. ISBN 80-213-1067-7.
- LINHARTOVÁ, L., 2011: Employee mobility – organisational causes (in Czech). *Scientia et Societas*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 108–123, ISSN 1801-7118.
- MASLOW, A., 1943: A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 370–396, ISSN 0033-295X.
- MEYER, J. P., ALLEN N. J., 1991: A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment.

- Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, 61–89, ISSN 1748-8583.
- MIKULÁŠTÍK, M., 2007: *Psychology for managers* (in Czech). Praha: Grada Publishing. ISBN 978-80-247-1349-6.
- PASS, S., 2005: What's the best way to secure high-performance working and best practice? *People Management Magazine* [online]. [cit. 2010-11-03]. Available at: <http://www.peoplemanagement.co.uk/pm/articles/2005/09/ontheline.htm>.
- PREVOT, F., 2008: Interfirm Knowledge Transfer Methods. The Icfai University, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 6, No. 5, ISSN 1367-3270.
- RAMLALL, S. J., 2004: A Review of Employee Motivation Theories and their Implications for Employee Retention within Organisations. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, Vol. 5(1), pp. 52–63, ISSN 1540-1200.
- REIB, CH., 2010: Fluktuation. [online]. 2. 1. 2008 [cit. 2010-03-30]. Available at: <http://www.personaler-online.de/typo3/nc/personalthemen/suche-in-artikeln/detailansicht/artikel/fluktuation.html>.
- SMITH, H., MCKEEN, J., 2003: Knowledge Management in Organizations: The State of Current Practice. In: Holsapple, C. W., *Handbook on Knowledge Management, Knowledge Directions Springer-Verlag*, Vol. 2, ISSN 0219-3116.
- STAM, CH., 2009: Knowledge and the Ageing Employee: A Research Agenda. *European Conference on Intellectual Capital*, Haarlem, The Netherlands, ISBN 978-1-906629-0.
- STÝBLO, J., 1993: *Human resource management* (in Czech). Praha: Grada Publishing, ISBN 80-85424-92-4.
- ZHANG, J., FAERMAN, S. R., CRESSWELL, A. M., 2006: The Effect of Organizational Technological Factors and the Nature of Knowledge on Knowledge Sharing. *Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, ISBN 978-0-7695-4282-9.
- WONG, N. W., 2009: *Journal of Business Continuity & Emergency Planning*, Henry Stewart Publications Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 62–68, ISSN 1749-9216.

Address

Ing. Lucie Linhartová, Ph.D., Katedra managementu, Vysoká škola ekonomie a managementu, Nárožní 2 600/9a, 158 00 Praha 5 - Stodůlky, Česká republika, Ing. Hana Urbancová, Ph.D., Katedra řízení, Česká zemědělská univerzita, Kamýcká 129, 165 21 Praha 6 - Suchbátka, Česká republika, e-mail: lucie.linhartova@vsem.cz, urbancova@pef.czu.cz

