

How Supervisors and Engaging Work Retain Generation Z: Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment as Parallel Mediators of Turnover Intention in Indian Multinational Corporations

Ranjan Mishra¹, Dr. Moon Moon Lahiri²

¹Research Scholar, Faculty of Management & Commerce, Poornima University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

²Associate Professor, Faculty of Management & Commerce, Poornima University, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

Abstract

Purpose: Purpose: Although supervisor support and job involvement are known as retention resources, the influence on the intention to leave of Gen Z employees is not fully understood. This study aims to understand how job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment act as mediators between the construct of job involvement, supervisor support and coworker support in predicting the turnover intention of Gen Z employees in multinational corporations (MNCs) in India and draws a framework for retention based on the findings..

Design/methodology/approach: Two surveys were carried out. Study 1 was a small-scale study of mediation models in 189 young workers. Study 2, which involved a validated questionnaire of 446 Gen Z workers for six different sectors and six metropolises, was analyzed by confirmatory factor analysis and an integrated latent structural model with 11 antecedents and control variables; indirect effects were tested using Monte Carlo confidence intervals (20,000 draws) and bootstrapped intervals (bias corrected).

Findings: Supervisor support was the best predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.358$) in Study 2, and job involvement was the best predictor of affective commitment ($\beta = 0.392$) in Study 2. Mediators both decreased turnover intention (satisfaction $\beta = -0.275$; commitment $\beta = -0.321$). The effect of job involvement on job satisfaction was completely mediated by supervisor support and the effect of job involvement on commitment was completely mediated by job satisfaction, with 89 per cent of the total effect of job involvement going through these two mediators. There was no statistically significant indirect effect of coworker support. The partial mediation seen in Study 1 was the outcome of modelling mediators and all antecedents simultaneously. Research limitations/implications: This study has a cross sectional, self reported design which reduces the ability for causal statements; longitudinal and multi-source designs are recommended.

Research limitations/implications: The cross-sectional, self-reported design limits causal inference; longitudinal and multi-source designs are recommended.

Practical implications: To keep Gen Z employees, MNCs should improve the coaching and recognition skills of their supervisors, and enhance job involvement to organisational attachment. A three-pillar retention structure, that includes measurable indicators, is proposed.

Originality/value: The study is one of the first studies to test satisfaction and commitment as parallel mediators of Gen Z employees in MNCs in India using an integrated latent model and provides a first attempt to operationalize the mechanism into an evidence-based retention framework.

Keywords: Generation Z; turnover intention; supervisor support; job involvement; job satisfaction; affective commitment; mediation; multinational corporations; India

1. Introduction

Every year, many young graduates are recruited by the multinational corporations (MNCs) in India but many of them quit the service after two or three years. In India, overall employee turnovers are 16.2 per cent, with three-quarters of them being voluntary and Gen Z (born in 1997 or subsequent) employees remaining in their jobs for a mean of 1.1 years for the first five years on the job (Debnath, 2025; Sharma, 2026). For MNCs investing a lot in the training of their early career professionals, retaining them has thus become a strategic problem. Leadership

and social support along with the nature of the work are found to be the most significant retention factors across research conducted on Gen Z retention factors (Wei & Yazid, 2026), while Indian studies highlight the importance of supportive supervisors and meaningful work (Mutsuddi & Sinha, 2023, Gosavi et al., 2025, Bisht et al., 2026). There is less information on how these resources decrease the intent to leave. In the attitudinal models of turnover, job conditions will affect job change intentions primarily through the mechanisms of job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Mobley, 1977; Tett & Meyer, 1993); organisational support theory suggests that job conditions will affect job change intentions primarily through the mechanisms of organisational attachment and organisational retention, mediated by supervisors as agents of the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2002). But, hardly any studies look at satisfaction and commitment as parallel mediators and even fewer studies do so while controlling for other factors that might affect turnover. Few studies have examined Gen Z employees in Indian MNCs. This paper attempts to fill these lacunae. It makes two inquiries. First, what are the attitudinal mechanisms through which job involvement and supervisor support and coworkers support reduce the turnover intention of the Gen Z employees in Indian MNCs? Second, what sort of retention structure emerges from these mechanisms? The study combines a preliminary survey of 189 young employees (Study 1) which was used to identify areas of weakness in measurement and design, with a screened main survey of 446 younger Gen Z employees from MNCs (Study 2), analysed using an integrated latent structural model and resampling-based tests of indirect effects. The direct effects of the antecedents for Study 2 are reported in a companion paper. The paper makes three contributions. It demonstrates that, in the case of Gen Z employees, job involvement and supervisor support have no direct effect on the intention to leave, rather they do so indirect through the intermediate mechanism of attitudes, while job involvement directly affects affective commitment mainly. It demonstrates how conclusions regarding mediation change if simple mediation models are replaced by an integrated model with parallel mediators. And it puts forward a retention system, coupled with measurable metrics, that can be tested within local contexts by MNCs.

2. Theory and Hypotheses

2.1 Attitudes as the mechanism of withdrawal

Causal models of turnover add organisational commitment as a second intervening attitude, and Mobley's (1977) withdrawal model begins with job satisfaction before moving to a set of job withdrawal cognitions that leads to job withdrawal intentions. Job satisfaction is "a pleasurable or positive emotional state that is caused by the appraisal of one's job" (Locke, 1976) while affective commitment is defined as an emotional bond with and identification with the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). They are related but separable; satisfaction is about the job and commitment is about the employer; and separate from the effects of satisfaction, meta-analytic path analyses indicate that each has a unique relationship to turnover intention (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Affective commitment is a type of commitment that is most negatively related to turnover intention (Meyer et al., 2002). These attitudes are two of the strongest predictors of intention to leave and actual leaving (Griffeth et al., 2000; Rubenstein et al., 2018).

H1: Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention.

H2: Organisational commitment is negatively related to turnover intention.

2.2 Supervisor support and job satisfaction

Organisational Support Theory suggests that the worker's perception of the importance of his or her contribution to the organisation and his or her feeling of care is mirrored in the worker's attitude and loyalty to the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The most obvious source of such treatment is from supervisors: their recognition, support and feedback sets the tone for employees' experiences at work, and their support is extended to the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Supervisor support is more strongly related to work attitudes than coworker support (Ng & Sorensen, 2008). Gen Z workers want regular feedback and supportive managers (Schroth, 2019) and a lack of managerial support can jeopardize the loyalty of young Indian workers (Bisht et al., 2026). In the South Asian context, job satisfaction and affective commitment mediate between trust in supervisor and quit intentions (Pathardikar et al., 2025).

H3: Supervisor support is positively related to job satisfaction.

H4: Job satisfaction mediates the negative relationship between supervisor support and turnover intention.

2.3 Job involvement, satisfaction and commitment

Job involvement refers to the extent to which a person psychologically identifies with the job he is in (Kanungo, 1982). Job involvement is linked to job satisfaction and organisational commitment and is highly valued by involved employees, who see work as central to their self-image and experience it as satisfying (Brown, 1996). However, an employee who is highly committed to Analytics can bring that commitment to another employer: Therefore, involvement should influence turnover intention primarily as it translates to satisfaction with the current job, and most importantly, attachment to the organisation.

H5: Job involvement is positively related to job satisfaction.

H6: Job involvement is positively related to organisational commitment.

H7: Job satisfaction mediates the negative relationship between job involvement and turnover intention.

H8: Organisational commitment mediates the negative relationship between job involvement and turnover intention.

2.4 Coworker support and commitment

Coworker support includes instrumental support (help from fellow workers) and emotional support (feeling a sense of belonging to the work group and, in turn, the organisation) (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). Within the field of IT specialists, coworker support contributes to the decrease in the turnover intention, while supportive/difficult coworkers contribute to the decrease in perceived support and affective commitment (Kmieciak, 2022; To & Yu, 2024).

H9: Coworker support is positively related to organisational commitment.

H10: Organisational commitment mediates the negative relationship between coworker support and turnover intention.

3. Study 1: Preliminary Survey

3.1 Method

Study 1 was a preliminary study that was sent online via LinkedIn, e-mail, social media and referrals to young employees in India. Of the 280 questionnaires completed, 189 were dropped because they were incomplete and inconsistent. The vast majority were aged between 20 and 29 years (89.4 per cent), 57.1 per cent were male and 40.7 per cent female, 63.5 per cent had university degrees in STEM subjects and half (50.3 per cent) worked for less than one year. Items adapted from the job involvement scale developed by Kanungo (1982) were used to assess job motivation, a 15-item facet scale was used to measure job satisfaction, 15 items were used for organisational commitment, and three items for intention to quit ($\alpha = 0.958$). Four simple mediation models were estimated, one for each of the proposed indirect paths, and indirect effects were tested using delta-method z statistics.

3.2 Results

Table 1 reports the results. All 4 indirect effects were significant. Job satisfaction fully mediated the effects of job motivation and supervisor support, and direct effects remained significant, while organisational commitment fully

mediated the effects of job motivation and coworker support. The job motivation via commitment was the greatest indirect effect (86.0 per cent).

Table 1. Study 1: simple mediation models (N = 189)

Path	a	b	Indirect	Direct (c')	Total (c)	Mediated	Type
Job motivation → JS → ITQ	0.372	-0.574	-0.213***	-0.208*	-0.421	50.6%	Partial
Supervisor support → JS → ITQ	0.502	-0.379	-0.190**	-0.388***	-0.578	32.9%	Partial
Job motivation → OC → ITQ	0.634	-0.572	-0.362***	-0.059	-0.421	86.0%	Full
Coworker support → OC → ITQ	0.389	-0.554	-0.215***	-0.133	-0.348	61.8%	Full

Note: Unstandardised estimates. JS = job satisfaction; OC = organisational commitment; ITQ = intention to quit.

* $p < .05$; **p < .01**; * $p < .001$. Delta-method tests; proportion mediated = indirect ÷ total.

3.3 Limitations and design implications

There were significant limitations of Study 1. The survey did not ask respondents about year of birth or employer so 10.6 per cent (20) were aged 30 and over, and five per cent (5) were self-employed. There were several commitment items that reiterated intentions to stay, which may overestimate the commitment–intention path, and pay, security and supervision were very similar on the satisfaction scale. In other mediation models, there was only one antecedent and one mediator, and the same mediator appeared in both models, so the estimates did not control for other antecedents or the second mediator; the delta-method test assumes a normally distributed indirect effect, which is not often the case (Preacher & Selig, 2012). Additionally, a Monte Carlo power analysis indicated that the sample size of 189 had only 0.47 power to detect a small-to-medium indirect effect, whereas 450 had 0.84 power (Schoemann et al., 2017). Study 2 was set up to rectify each of these drawbacks.

4. Study 2: Main Survey

4.1 Sample and procedure

The target population was full-time Gen Z employees (born in 1997 or later and at least 18 years old) of MNCs in India with at least three months' tenure. The multi-stage, non-probability sample included six MNC hubs—Bengaluru, Delhi-NCR, Mumbai, Pune, Hyderabad and Chennai; and six sector groups (IT and IT-enabled services; banking, financial services and insurance; consulting and professional services; FMCG and retail; manufacturing and engineering; pharmaceuticals and healthcare). Respondents were recruited via HR, learning and development contacts, LinkedIn, Alumni networks and there was a soft quota of at least 35 per cent of women per sector monitored on a weekly basis. The screening questions confirmed birth year, full time MNC employment and tenure. A total of 450 questionnaires were completed, all of which had passed two attention checks and met the inclusion criteria, with four questionnaires excluded due to straight-lining, leaving 446 valid responses. Mean age was 24.5 years (SD 2.3); 55.8 per cent were males and 40.4 per cent females; 65.0 per cent were at entry or associate level; 42.2 per cent had been in their jobs less than one year; and 52.2 per cent worked in hybrid positions. The biggest sector group comprised IT and IT-enabled services (36.1 per cent) with between 12.8 and 23.5 per cent of respondents coming from these sectors in each city.

4.2 Measures

The five-point scale was used for all the scales. Sixteen items were used, adapted from others' research and split into four categories based on the research scale items they referred to. Job involvement was measured with Kanungo's (1982) ten-item scale; supervisor support was measured with the four items adapted from Eisenberger et al. (2002); coworker support was measured with the four items adapted from Caplan et al. (1975); job

satisfaction was measured with the three-item global scale used by Cammann et al. (1979) and which did not restate the intention to stay; organisational commitment was measured with the eight-item affective commitment scale used by Allen and Meyer (1990); and turnover intention was measured with the six-item TIS-6 (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The model further controlled for eight other antecedents assessed in the larger study (using established scales) and included gender, age, tenure, work arrangement and sector as controls; to estimate the mediating paths net of other influences.

4.3 Analysis

The analyses were conducted using R, lavaan and semTools (Rosseel, 2012; Jorgensen et al., 2022). A 14 factor confirmatory factor analysis was estimated using robust maximum likelihood estimation followed by the estimation of a latent structural model where job satisfaction was predicted by job involvement and supervisor support, organisational commitment by job involvement and coworker support, and turnover intention by all of the preceding, including the two mediators, job satisfaction and organisational commitment, as well as the residuals of the two mediators, which were allowed to correlate. Indirect effects were tested using Monte Carlo confidence intervals of the model parameters (Preacher & Selig, 2012) and reproduced in a composite score model using bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap intervals of 5,000 resamples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). The classification of mediation was based on Zhao et al. (2010) who classified mediation as indirect-only (full) in the case of a significant indirect effect only, and complementary (partial) in the case of a significant direct effect only.

4.4 Measurement model

The measurement model fitted the data very well: scaled $\chi^2 = 3,130.39$, $df = 2,834$, robust CFI = 0.984, TLI = 0.983, RMSEA = 0.015 and SRMR = 0.034. All 78 loadings were significant (0.661 to 0.832). Reliability and convergent validity of the constructs measured in this paper are reported in Table 2, with values for α ranging from 0.803 to 0.930 and AVE ranging from 0.506 to 0.646 in all 14 constructs. The two mediators were significantly correlated, but not identical ($r_{lat} = .684$, below the square roots of the AVEs, .804 and .750, respectively, and ratio of HTMT = 0.679, well below .85, recommended by Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015). Common method variance was not likely to be an issue: Harman's first factor accounted for 18.5 per cent of the variance; the one-factor model fit poorly ($\Delta\chi^2 = 8,609.97$, $df = 91$, $p < .001$) and the highest full collinearity VIF was 2.26 (Kock, 2015)..

Table 2. Study 2: descriptive statistics, reliability and correlations of the focal constructs (N = 446)

Construct	M	SD	α	AVE	1	2	3	4	5
1 Job involvement	3.42	0.76	.930	.575					
2 Supervisor support	3.44	0.76	.830	.553	.30				
3 Coworker support	3.71	0.75	.840	.569	.26	.36			
4 Job satisfaction	3.45	0.84	.844	.646	.21	.42	.36		
5 Organisational commitment	3.17	0.75	.911	.563	.38	.38	.25	.60	
6 Turnover intention	3.17	0.81	.903	.611	-.25	-.31	-.30	-.57	-.55

Note: Correlations among composite scores; $|r| \geq .16$ significant at $p < .001$.

4.5 Structural model and hypothesis tests

The structural model was a good fit with the data, accounting for 17.6 per cent of the variance for job satisfaction, 17.8 per cent of the variance for organisational commitment and 47.9 per cent of the variance for turnover intention (scaled $\chi^2 = 4,141.70$, $df = 3,622$, robust CFI = 0.972, TLI = 0.970, RMSEA = 0.018, and SRMR = 0.058). The

small R^2 for the mediators is to be expected as only two were specified for each mediator according to the hypotheses. The pathways to and from mediators are reported on Table 3. Table 3. Study 2: paths to and from the mediators

Table 3. Study 2: paths to and from the mediators

Hypothesis	Path	β	SE	z	p	Result
H1	Job satisfaction $\rightarrow$ turnover intention	-0.275	0.067	-4.10	< .001	Supported
H2	Organisational commitment $\rightarrow$ turnover intention	-0.321	0.064	-5.03	< .001	Supported
H3	Supervisor support $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction	0.358	0.047	7.62	< .001	Supported
H5	Job involvement $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction	0.129	0.055	2.35	.019	Supported
H6	Job involvement $\rightarrow$ organisational commitment	0.392	0.048	8.13	< .001	Supported
H9	Coworker support $\rightarrow$ organisational commitment	0.079	0.045	1.76	.079	Not supported
	Job involvement $\rightarrow$ turnover intention (direct)	-0.021	0.050	-0.42	.673	
	Supervisor support $\rightarrow$ turnover intention (direct)	0.002	0.072	0.02	.982	
	Coworker support $\rightarrow$ turnover intention (direct)	-0.061	0.050	-1.22	.221	

Note: Standardised coefficients (MLM). The model also includes eight further antecedents and five control variables; residual correlation of the mediators $\psi = 0.61$, $p < .001$.

Mediators have a smaller effect on turnover intention, with organisational commitment ($\beta = -0.321$) showing a slightly higher significance compared to job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.275$), thus supporting H1 and H2. Supervisor support was the most significant antecedent of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.358$), supporting H3 and job involvement had a smaller positive impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.129$), supporting H5. With regards to organisational commitment, job involvement was found to have a strong positive relationship ($\beta = 0.392$) with organisational commitment, thus supporting H6, while coworker support was found to have a positive relationship ($\beta = 0.079$, $p = .079$) but that was not statistically significant, failing to support H9. There was no direct significant impact of the three antecedents on turnover intention.

The indirect effects are presented in Table 4. Job satisfaction mediated the effects of job involvement ($B = -0.049$; 95% CI -0.105 to -0.007) and supervisor support ($B = -0.136$; 95% CI -0.219 to -0.065), supporting H7 and H4. The largest indirect effect in the model was from job involvement to organisational commitment through mediating the role of OCBs ($B = -0.175$; 95% CI -0.270 to -0.092), which provided support for H8. H10 was not supported by the indirect effect of coworker support through commitment ($B = -0.035$; 95% CI -0.076 to 0.004). The direct effect outcomes of job involvement and supervisor support were not significant, which means that all supported mediations were indirect-only (full) type. Job involvement had a significant total effect on turnover intention ($\beta = -0.182$, $p < .001$), which was mediated by the two mediating variables, commitment (roughly two-thirds) and satisfaction (about one-fifth).

Table 4. Study 2: indirect effects on turnover intention

Hypothesis	Path	B	β	95% Monte Carlo CI	95% BCa bootstrap CI	Type	Result
H7	JI $\rightarrow$ JS $\rightarrow$ TI	-0.049	-0.036	[-0.105, -0.007]	[-0.069, -0.012]	Full	Supported
H4	SS $\rightarrow$ JS $\rightarrow$ TI	-0.136	-0.098	[-0.219, -0.065]	[-0.099, -0.029]	Full	Supported
H8	JI $\rightarrow$ OC $\rightarrow$ TI	-0.175	-0.126	[-0.270, -0.092]	[-0.171, -0.072]	Full	Supported
H10	CS $\rightarrow$ OC $\rightarrow$ TI	-0.035	-0.025	[-0.076, 0.004]	[-0.034, 0.016]	None	Not supported

Note: JI = job involvement; SS = supervisor support; CS = coworker support; JS = job satisfaction; OC = organisational commitment; TI = turnover intention. B and β from the latent model; Monte Carlo CIs from 20,000 draws. Bootstrap CIs from the composite-score model (5,000 resamples), whose point estimates are smaller because measurement error is not removed.

4.6 Comparison of Study 1 and Study 2

Mediation conclusions in three cases were similar in both studies but differed in nature. In Study 1, the third mediator (satisfaction) mediated partially, whereas in Study 2, the direct effects were not observed and the mediation was full when both mediators and all antecedents were modeled together. Study 2 was not a replication of the coworker support pathway which seemed to be fully mediated in Study 1. The differences are consistent with those that would be expected when a screened sample, non-overlapping scales, an integrated model and resampling based tests are used to replace simple models based on an unscreened sample.

5. Discussion

5.1 Supervisors as the central route to satisfaction

Supervisor support was consistently shown as the most significant antecedent to job satisfaction, and as the only antecedent to turnover intention to eliminate it. Supportive supervisors might then hold onto Gen Z workers without creating a separate conative relationship, but through creating a satisfactory work experience. This is consistent with organisational support theory, as supervisors act as an agent of the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2002, Kurtessis et al., 2017), with the evidence from the meta-analysis showing that supervisor support had a stronger association with attitudes than coworker support (Ng & Sorensen, 2008), and with the Indian evidence on supervisor support and intention to stay (Mutsuddi & Sinha, 2023), and abusive supervision and intention to quit (Pradhan et al., 2020). It is also consistent with the Gen Z literature that highlights leadership and support as the two most consistent factors that make retention more likely (Wei & Yazid, 2026).

5.2 Involvement becomes loyalty only through attachment

The total effect of job involvement on turnover intention was statistically significant, but there was no direct effect; approximately two-thirds of the effect of job involvement was mediated by organisational commitment and approximately one-fifth through satisfaction. The fact that an employee participates in his or her employment does not mean that he or she is bound to the employer. It helps to lower the desire to move on to other jobs when turned into pleasure with the present one and particularly into attachment to the organisation. For this sample, the current job satisfaction ($M = 3.45$) was higher than their commitment to the organisation ($M = 3.17$); this indicated that there was potential not realised: MNCs held on to involved employees when they became the arena where they could be involved, recognised and rewarded. The result helps substantiate the separation of job involvement from organizational commitment (Brown, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

5.3 Why coworker support did not matter

The most positive aspect of work was the coworkers' support ($M = 3.71$), which was correlated with commitment ($r = .25$) and turnover intention ($r = -.30$), but did not have either a direct or indirect effect on the integrated model. It seems to have a similar relationship with commitment as job involvement and supervisor support do (Kmieciak, 2022), but aligns with the less significant attitudinal role of coworker support reported by Ng and Sorensen (2008). A ceiling effect is also possible: a high proportion of employees may feel supported by colleagues and there may be little difference between the employees who stay and the ones who leave in terms of peer support. Peer relationships can act as belongings condition instead of being a retention lever.

5.4 Theoretical implications

The results contribute to theory in three ways. First, they demonstrate that the effects of job-focused motivation and supervisory support on turnover intention are completely mediated by attitudes, which validates attitudinal theories of turnover (such as Mobley, 1977; and Tett & Meyer, 1993), and implies that the direct effect of job-focused motivation and supervisory support on turnover intention may be the result of an omitted mediator. Second, they empirically illustrate that there are two parallel processes in the workplace, job satisfaction and affective commitment, which have different antecedents: supervisors work primarily through job satisfaction, and involvement primarily through affective commitment. Third, the split between the two studies reveals the potential for wrongly attributing the mediation to the partial rather than full type in simple, single-mediator models, and the possibility that such effects do not remain significant if a test for integrated mediation is applied.

5.5 A retention framework for Gen Z in Indian MNCs

The results were translated into a framework of retention, based upon the mechanism the data revealed. The attitudinal mechanism is its central point, which is the practices that increase job satisfaction and affective commitment. It's supported by three pillars. The developmental pillar clarifies promotion criteria and career paths, and makes involvement in the organization into a sense of loyalty through meaningful work; the relational pillar focuses on developing supervisors' coaching, recognition and feedback skills; and the well-being and role pillar focuses on stress and conflicting demands and directly impacts turnover intention (as reported in the companion paper). Valued benefits, job security, and adequate resources are fundamental, but not unique, features of the base. By using a diagnostic layer of pulse surveys and stay interviews, MNCs can track the attitudes that have an impact. Table 5 provides the following association of each lever to practices and indicators.

Table 5. Gen Z retention framework: levers, practices and indicators

Pillar	Lever (evidence)	HR practices	Indicators
Developmental	Job involvement → commitment (H8)	Meaningful assignments; line of sight to company purpose; recognition of contributions; involvement in decisions	Job involvement; affective commitment
Developmental	Promotional opportunities	Transparent promotion criteria; visible career paths and internal job marketplace; six-monthly career conversations	Promotion-fairness perceptions; internal mobility; time to first promotion
Relational	Supervisor support → satisfaction (H3, H4)	Train first-line managers in coaching, recognition and feedback; monthly one-to-ones; team satisfaction and retention in manager scorecards	Supervisor support score; satisfaction by team; regretted attrition by manager
Relational	Coworker support (supporting condition)	Buddy schemes; cohort-based onboarding; team rituals in hybrid settings	Belonging scores; 90-day new-hire attrition

Pillar	Lever (evidence)	HR practices	Indicators
Well-being and role	Negative affectivity; role conflict	Employee assistance programmes; single point of priority-setting; workload reviews	Well-being indices; role-conflict score
Foundation	Pay, benefits, security, resources	Market-benchmarked pay; benefits Gen Z values; clear communication about job continuity; adequate tools	Pay competitiveness; benefits satisfaction
Diagnostic	Satisfaction, commitment, intention	Quarterly pulse surveys; stay interviews for high-risk groups	Share with high turnover intention; regretted attrition

5.6 Practical implications

As job satisfaction is primarily linked to supervisors of the young, the following measures are recommended: Make recognition, feedback and development discussions a core part of supervisors' job expectations; train first line managers for coaching; and ease the administrative burden on supervisors that prevents them from engaging in such conversations. Leaders need to create a link between employees' work and the purpose of the organisation, publicly recognise their contribution and include young employees in decisions that impact on their work to ensure involvement. Lastly, the effects of most workplace resources (satisfaction and commitment) change before resignations take place and therefore HR teams should monitor them on a regular basis via short pulse surveys and take action based on the results.

5.7 Limitations and future research

Both studies were cross-sectional, meaning it is difficult to draw inferences about directionality of the relationships; for instance, it is possible that satisfaction leads to turnover intention, or that turnover intention leads to satisfaction. But all the measures were self-reported, with some indications from procedures and some statistical checks that common method variance is not a serious problem. Study 2 was based on a non-probability sampling of the six selected sectors and six metro hubs and Study 1 was not limited to Gen Z or MNC employees so findings are exploratory. The result is an intention to turn over, not the actual turnover. Longitudinal designs linking attitudes to actual exit should be applied to future studies: supervisor ratings and HR records to minimise the single-source bias, comparisons of Gen Z with Millennials in the same organisations, and field experiments to test interventions such as supervisor training.

6. Conclusion

Indian MNCs Gen Z employees remain in the company if their jobs are fulfilling them and they feel connected to their companies. There are no direct links between the intention to leave and the attitudes measured by supervisors; and the direct link between the intention to leave and the level of involvement in the job is zero: both attitudes are the mediators of the other. The message for MNCs is that they need to build the skills and abilities of their first-line managers, ensure young workers feel attached to their job and evaluate satisfaction and commitment as key predictors of retention.

References

- [1] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18.
- [2] Bisht, S. S., Dhaundiyal, C., Lakhera, A., & Uniyal, M. (2026). Learning to stay or choosing to leave: Workplace environment and retention of Gen Z employees in Indian five-star hotels. *Enterprise Development and Microfinance*, 36(3s), 77–88.

- [3] Bothma, C. F. C., & Roodt, G. (2013). The validation of the turnover intention scale. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(1), Article 507.
- [4] Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120(2), 235–255.
- [5] Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire [Unpublished manuscript]. University of Michigan.
- [6] Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V., & Pinneau, S. R. (1975). Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (NIOSH).
- [7] Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082–1103.
- [8] Debnath, P. (2025, September 9). Gen Zs' job tenure falls to 1.1 years; 37 per cent Indian Gen Zs plan to switch within a year, says survey. *Outlook Money*.
- [9] Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- [10] Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565–573.
- [11] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
- [12] Gosavi, J., Misra, P., & Goidani, M. N. (2025). Retaining Generation Z in India – A work values based HR perspective. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(4), 2722–2731.
- [13] 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.
- [14] Hayes, A. F. (2022). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- [15] Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135.
- [16] Jorgensen, T. D., Pornprasertmanit, S., Schoemann, A. M., & Rosseel, Y. (2022). *semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling* (R package version 0.5-6).
- [17] Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 341–349.
- [18] Kmiecik, R. (2022). Co-worker support, voluntary turnover intention and knowledge withholding among IT specialists: The mediating role of affective organizational commitment. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 17(3), 375–391.
- [19] Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration*, 11(4), 1–10.
- [20] Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854–1884.

- [21] Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.
- [22] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- [23] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52.
- [24] Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237–240.
- [25] Mutsuddi, I., & Sinha, C. (2023). Role of supervisor, co-worker support, social network and group cohesiveness on employee intention to stay. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 33(3), 299–325.
- [26] Ng, T. W. H., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group & Organization Management*, 33(3), 243–268.
- [27] Pathardikar, A. D., Mishra, P. K., Sahu, S., & Srivastava, A. (2025). Superior-subordinate trust affecting quit intentions: Mediation of job satisfaction and affective commitment. *South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management*, 12(1), 129–152.
- [28] Pradhan, S., Srivastava, A., & Jena, L. K. (2020). Abusive supervision and intention to quit: Exploring multi-mediational approaches. *Personnel Review*, 49(6), 1269–1286.
- [29] Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879–891.
- [30] Preacher, K. J., & Selig, J. P. (2012). Advantages of Monte Carlo confidence intervals for indirect effects. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 6(2), 77–98.
- [31] Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24(3), 543–565.
- [32] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
- [33] Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36.
- [34] Rubenstein, A. L., Eberly, M. B., Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (2018). Surveying the forest: A meta-analysis, moderator investigation, and future-oriented discussion of the antecedents of voluntary employee turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(1), 23–65.
- [35] Schoemann, A. M., Boulton, A. J., & Short, S. D. (2017). Determining power and sample size for simple and complex mediation models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(4), 379–386.
- [36] Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review*, 61(3), 5–18.
- [37] Sharma, M. (2026, March 2). What attrition at 16.2%, lowest in 5 years, signals for India Inc in 2026. *Business Today*.
- [38] Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2002). Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: New procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, 7(4), 422–445.
- [39] Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259–293.

- [40] To, W. M., & Yu, B. T. (2024). Impact of difficult coworkers on employees' turnover intention: The mediating roles of perceived organizational support and affective commitment. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 16(4), 797–815.
- [41] Wei, J., & Yazid, Z. (2026). Factors influencing the retention of Generation Z: A systematic review. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 9(9), Article 2026444.
- [42] Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 197–206.