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Abstract
The Goal of this thesis was to gain an understanding of why people decided to leave an ICT subcontracting and consultancy company. The study was conducted by analyzing roughly 300 employment ending interview transcripts written by an employee supervisor as notes for the company HR department. Later in the theory creation process also company annual reports were used to gain statistical information on employees, such as their background education and length of career.

The research is qualitative in nature and the research method used was grounded theory. The chosen research approach is relativist and constructivist, meaning that the goal is to understand the subjective truth of the employee. The reason for this is to gain theory with explanatory power from the field with mixed and sometimes even contradictory results.

The transitory theory built on top of empirical data during early phase of analysis directed research towards trust discussion in an organizational setting. At the same time, contemporary career discussion was examined to find further explanations to solve contradictions in the theory created by the data alone. In the end, it was found that faith in career fulfillment was the crucial component for the employees to leave the company. Scientifically faith creates, I would argue, a long yearned bridge between trust and career discussions. Faith works inside the career context where it determines if the employee will leave a company or not. If the employee does not have faith that his envisioned career can be fulfilled in the current organization he most likely makes the decision to leave.

As a qualitative study this thesis cannot be generalized into the wider population, but can be generalized into the current career and trust discussions. It supplements both of them with an insight of why people decide to change work places.
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1. INTRODUCTION

During the time of Enlightenment Descartes started Cartesian revolution and changed the way we understand the world. He separated the body, mind and God from each other. Mind and person became separate entities with subjective free will and not only the object of God’s divine will. This thesis aims to do no less. One can see it as a Cartesian revolution of how organizations should relate to their employees. Like Descartes liberated the mind and body from God, this thesis will finalize the liberation of the employee and the career from the organization.

Organizational studies are still too concerned with the employee in an organizational context. The employee, as oxymoronic as it might sound, needs to be seen as a separate subjective entity inside the organization. In the current organization discussion employees are mainly seen as objects of organizational activities, not as acting subjects with their own free will. Interactional justice speaks about how the organization should approach employees with the decisions that have been made. Transactional leadership speaks about the exchange of resources and transformational leadership is all about inspiring and motivating the employees. These are just simple examples, but in both cases the employee is only an object and the actor is either the supervisor or the organization itself. No one is really asking what the employee wants. At the same time the focus in the studies has been the quantitative relationships and correlations between different organizational actions and the intention to leave, while no one has really bothered to ask why the employee decides to leave in the first place. A Layman’s saying is that getting fired is equal to going through a divorce. If there is even a shred of truth behind this saying then I think it safe to say no one is changing the employer “just because”, even if it is from their own free will. There are always clear reasons behind decisions to leave, albeit those reasons might not be clear to a 3rd party observer.

In this thesis I will dive into the subjective experience of why some employees decided to leave the company. The main finding will be the role of faith in the decision to leave. This faith has no religious meaning but it works inside a career context. It refers to the hopes and dreams that an employee feels towards the fulfillment of his or her envisioned career. Faith will also combine the current career and trust discussions by creating a bridge between these two. In the career context, as
we will see, faith acts as a crucial component in the decision to leave. If the employee believes the company can provide or further his envisioned career, it will strengthen his faith towards the envisioned career and he will stay, if not, the roads will separate.

1.1 Importance of topic
The current trust discussion in an organizational setting approaches an employee’s intention to leave or the employee retention without taking account of what we know about how employees see careers or even how companies themselves see careers. This gives employees a role only as the object of organizational actions taken by companies. The employees are not actually heard in the discussion. Careers have been targets of scientific studies for a long time. The earliest ones are from the time before the Second World War (Hughes 1937). Since then a lot has changed. The current discussion sees two opposite ends in a career continuum: a traditional organization focused career (e.g. Super 1957; Wilensky 1961) and a contemporary individual focused boundaryless career (DeFillippi and Arthur 1994; Hall 1996). The latter has been the focus of recent discussion as the western world is heading more and more towards individualism and self-concern (Singer, 1997; Wolfe, 1998). This means that people are taking bigger responsibility for their own life, including careers. The shift in how people see their own life is bound to have an effect on an employee –employer relationship. This makes careers an important topic especially in the fields that require high employee expertise.

Trust as a phenomenon has been a topic of study for decades. To organizational studies it was brought by McAllister (1995), who made the first conceptualization of interpersonal trust in the organizational context. In the same year as McAllister’s study, Mayer et al. (1995) published their integrative model of organizational trust. These, interpersonal and organizational trust, can also be seen as the two main approaches of trust research in organizational studies. Later on trust has been identified to be an important factor in creating positive behavior within organizations. It has been connected to cooperative behavior (Zalabak et al., 2000), organizational citizenship behavior (Van Dyne et al., 2000), commitment (Aryee et al., 2002), effective communication (Zalabak et al., 2000), turnover (Davis et al.
2002) and loyalty (Costigan et al., 1998). The fact that trust has a strong relationship with so many positive behaviors in organizations makes it an important research topic.

1.2 Purpose of this study and research question

This study started by receiving almost 300 employment ending interview transcripts written by an employee supervisor from a company HR department. My initial goal was simply to read them through in order to take notes of the stories in the transcripts. Of course I had some precognitions of what I would find. There was a big customer of the company that had hit a serious downturn. That might reflect somehow in the documents. When the earliest transcripts were written we were heading deeper to global recession. Could that be somehow seen from the transcripts? I knew that the company had invested in leadership training during the last few years. They had, for example, their own leadership academy that all supervisors participated. Maybe this new academy would reflect positively in the documents? Of course the fact that the material was from employment ending discussions narrowed down the topic to be somehow related to the ending of employment. Other than that, I just let the empirical material lead me wherever it wanted to take me.

At a quite early phase in my note-taking I started boxing my findings to things that were somehow related to the company, the supervisors and the employee himself. It was clear that these were the three pillars this thesis would lie on. What the connection between these three would be would still be a mystery for some time. At times I had a feeling that the transcripts would pull jokes on me. In one case someone who had already recommended the company to his friends spoke highly about everything decided to leave. If you are willing to recommend the company to your friends and there is nothing wrong with it then why leave? The mystery started to reveal itself to me once I noted that most of the time people expressed some kind of mistrust towards the company, the supervisors and the employee himself. This pushed me deeper inside the subjective experience of the employees. I needed to start thinking like the employees who had decided to leave. By changing my point of view from the organization to the employee I understood that there were two kinds of
“trusts” at work. There was the trust that one can cognitively reason and the trust that works only based on gut feeling. The latter one I ended up calling “faith” in this thesis and it would be in the center of the theory created. From that point on, the goal of this research was to gain understanding of why people decide to leave a company and what the role of faith is in this. The research question is:

RQ: How can trust be understood from the employee's perspective and what it's effect on the decision to leave the company?

1.3 Research approach
The aim of this study is to gain an understanding of what goes on inside employee heads when they leave a company. The study was done by analyzing “employment ending interview” transcripts of a Finland-based international subcontracting and consultancy company. To gain an understanding of people’s behavior we need to understand their subjective truth. Ontologically the study takes a relativist stand and epistemologically the approach is constructivism and social constructivism. Young and Collin (2004) define and differentiate these two so that in constructivism individuals create and give meaning to the surrounding world through cognitive processes and in social constructivism cognitive processes are replaced with social interaction. For a person observing his or her surroundings, the natural world is only something that is referred from socially defined reality (Hammersley 1992). In companies this means employees create their world everyday in their work through social actions. They discuss with each other, participate in company info sessions together, read public announcements together etc. Through this information sharing they create a subjective and a shared view of the world.

As the goal of this study is to gain an understanding of people’s behavior, the research is qualitative in nature. As the material is interview transcripts written by the interviewer, I think the best way to approach the subjective is through grounded theory research. In grounded theory research the theory emerges from the empirical data, not from previous scientific discussions (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Of course, the emergent theory needs to be reflected against the current knowledge on the topic, but it should not be the starting point.
The literature base I ended up using in this study draws from discussions about trust in leadership as well as trust in impersonal organization context. At the same time it is necessary to acknowledge the individual goals and aims of the employees. To gain this understanding career literature needs to be studied. Figure 1 illustrates the literature base used in this thesis. The trust discussion will mostly be based on the findings of Mayer (1995) and McAllister (1995). Both of them study trust in a sociological context. Faith will be approached from the same sociological direction. Career, in this thesis, is seen from the employee point of view, making it highly subjective and psychological in nature.

![Figure 1: Literature base used in this thesis.](image)

1.4 Outline

The study starts with introducing grounded theory as a research methodology in chapter 2. I will build justification for why it was chosen. The chapter also contains a short description of different grounded theory approaches and contains reasoning on why one of those was chosen to be used in this thesis.

After the research methodology has been selected and justified the description of the data analysis starts in chapter three. This order is somewhat different than in more traditional qualitative research methods where the theoretical and literature analysis of the study is usually done at the beginning of research. In this chapter I will do the initial analysis of the transcripts and try to identify a core category to explain a
phenomenon that can be found in the interviews. Once this core category has been identified I will proceed to literature analysis.

Chapter four contains literature review of the thesis. It has two main parts: career and trust. This gives an understanding of how employees of today see their career and how trust is defined in an organizational context, what the antecedents for trust are and possible trust outcomes are. In the end of chapter four I will summarize the literature analysis and draw some initial conclusions for the theory creation.

In chapter five I will start re-building the theory based on the literature review and data analysis. First I must define the theoretical framework for this thesis and define the terminology used. I will also introduce new data to be used in theory creation to build theory with better explanatory power. Once all this is done, I will introduce the new theory containing faith as a separate entity from trust and explain how it is the crucial component in the decision to leave company.

The final part is the discussion where I will introduce the scientific and managerial implications this thesis has. The concluding chapter also contains some new research ideas for those who would be interested to gain further knowledge about the phenomenon.
2. METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains the introduction and justification of the chosen research methodology: grounded theory. First we will briefly go through the history of grounded theory research: why the theory was developed, in what type of studies it has been used and what the main characteristics of the method are. Then I will introduce three different grounded theory methods: classic grounded theory, qualitative data analysis and constructivist grounded theory. When the reader is familiar with these I will make justifications for why this thesis uses grounded theory methodology and why one of the three approaches was taken.

2.1 Grounded theory in research

Grounded theory was developed in the 1960’s by two sociologists, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, when they were conducting research on terminally ill patients. Based on the research method used they wrote a book *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Glaser & Strauss 1967). During that period, social sciences were going through a strong quantitative period and qualitative research was seen as impressionistic, anecdotal, unsystematic and biased (Charmaz 2006). To fight this positivist dominance qualitative research wanted to develop systemic guidelines for their research. The Goal of Glaser and Strauss was to find a way to generate theory from the real world instead of multiple generations of theories built on top of each other. They wanted to combine the richness of qualitative tradition and the logic and systematic analysis of quantitative tradition (Walker & Myrick 2006).

While there are numerous different variants from grounded theory, Fernandez (2012) identifies four main models: the feminist grounded theory, classic grounded theory, qualitative data analysis of Strauss and Corbin and constructivist grounded theory of Charmaz. According to her, these are the main grounded theory methodologies used in academic research. Feminist grounded theory is not considered in this thesis as the topic under study is not gender specific.
2.1.1 Grounded theory in practice

Creswell (1998) has listed the following twelve assumptions that are commonly shared by those using grounded theory in research:

- The aim of grounded theory research is to generate or discover a theory.
- The researcher has to set aside theoretical ideas to allow a “substantive” theory to emerge.
- Theory focuses on how individuals interact in relation to the phenomenon under study.
- Theory asserts a plausible relation between concepts and sets of concepts.
- Theory is derived from data acquired through fieldwork, interviews, observations, and documents.
- Data analysis is systematic and begins as soon as data become available.
- Data analysis proceeds through identifying categories and connecting them.
- Further data collection (or sampling) is based on emerging concepts.
- These concepts are developed through constant comparison with additional data.
- Data collection can stop when new conceptualizations emerge.
- Data analysis proceeds from “open coding” (identifying categories, properties, and dimensions) through “axial coding” (examining conditions, strategies, and consequences) to selective coding around an emerging story line.
- The resulting theory can be reported in a narrative framework or as a set of propositions.

Egan (2002) lists five steps to outline the process of grounded theory research:

1. Initiating research.
2. Data selection.
3. Initiation and ongoing data collection.
4. Data analysis.
5. Concluding the research.

During the first step, initial research, the researcher selects a suitable area of inquiry and the site suitable for study. The ways of describing this area of study can be
phenomenon, location or context. Literature is usually postponed for later steps in the research to maintain theoretical sensitivity (Egan 2002).

The second step includes identifying potential data sources regarding the chosen research question. A more detailed plan for data selection cannot be done before the emergence of the theory (Egan 2002).

At the beginning of the third step, data collection has a very broad approach. Once the concepts and categories start to emerge from the data, data collection focuses on a specific area. This step is closely connected to data analysis and is continued until a certain level of saturation is reached in the theory. (Egan 2002).

The fourth step is data analysis. During data analysis categories and concepts are being integrated to emerge a theory from the data. This step can be divided into multiple sub steps, but it is more or less up to the researcher and the topic under study how these steps are practically implemented. Figure 2 shows all nine sub steps of data analysis (Egan 2002).

The final step in the grounded theory research process is “concluding the research”. This is reached when data saturation has been reached, meaning that data collection does not add any more elaboration or clarification for the phenomenon under study. At this point, documentation of the emergent theory becomes the sole focus of the researcher (Egan 2002).
2.1.2 Classic grounded theory

Classic grounded theory (CGT) has its foundations in the original works of Glaser and Strauss (1965, 1967). While it does not focus on describing the research process in as much detail as qualitative data analysis (QDA), it still has four steps of how to evaluate the grounding of a grounded theory:

- **Fit** – does the theory fit the substantive area in which it will be used?
- **Understandability** – will non-professionals concerned with the substantive area understand the theory?
- **Generalizability** – does the theory apply to a wide range of situations in the substantive area?
- **Control** – does the theory allow the user some control over the “structure and process of daily situations as they change through time”? (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)

Regarding empirical data analysis and coding, CGT uses substantive and theoretical coding. The work starts with substantive coding where the researcher goes through the data fracturing and analyzing it. This process, also known as open coding, is used
to find a core category and related concepts. After a core category has been found selective coding, in which concepts are saturated, starts. Theoretical coding happens as the final stage to conceptualize how relevant codes form a hypothesis to be integrated into the theory (Holton 2007). During the coding process the researcher makes coding comparison on three levels:

1. Case by case searching for new concepts.
2. Concepts to more cases for further theoretical clarification and saturation of concepts.
3. Concepts to concept to find theoretical integration and through theoretical coding. (Holton 2007)

For a CGT researcher “all is data”. This means that the researcher should compare data on as many dimensions as possible. This includes, for example, news-paper articles, questionnaire results, historical documents and even cultural statements. The Goal is to create an abstraction of the phenomenon, not a description (Glaser 2007). A major difference between QDA and CGT is the use of literature. In CGT literature is used as additional data after the researcher has already created the theory (Heath & Cowley 2004) whereas in QDA the researcher is not expected to operate as a “blank slate” (Goulding 1999). Usually reflection is the final stage. In this phase the researcher asks himself, “what is my own stand on the matter?”, “how can it influence my work and how should I take it into account in the study?” (Deady 2011)

2.1.3 Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data analysis puts more emphasis on deduction and verification than CGT (Health & Cowley 2004). CGT, as described by Glaser (1978), is seen as an inductive-deductive mix. In practice this difference can mean that QDA directs the researcher away from the data and into following existing research and knowledge. This reduces the effectiveness of the research (Heath & Cowley 2004).

QDA, also known as Straussian grounded theory, describes eleven procedures to be followed in the creation of a theory:

1. Data collection and analysis are interrelated processes.
2. Concepts are the basic units of analysis.
3. Categories must be developed and related.
4. Sampling in grounded theory proceeds on theoretical grounds.
5. Analysis makes use of constant comparisons.
6. Patterns and variations must be accounted for.
7. Process must be built into theory.
8. Writing theoretical memos is an integral part of doing grounded theory.
9. Hypotheses about relationships among categories are developed and verified as much as possible during the research process.
10. A grounded theorist need not work alone.
11. Broader structural conditions must be brought into the analysis; however microscopic in focus is the research (Corbin & Strauss 1990).

As it can be seen, the method is far more descriptive, structured and rigid than CGT. The difference in the use of literature can be seen in step four. In QDA, coding is done based on theoretical grounds, which is bound to create preconceived bias. As stated earlier, in CGT, literature is only used after the coding has already been done to avoid existing research from contaminating research under work. Goulding (1999) argues that knowledge is required to develop new theories and thus some early literature analysis is needed. The key is in finding the right balance between all aspects of data collection that allow the researcher to develop theories without bias.

This early use of literature also affects the coding process of QDA. In CGT, the process is inductive and the emergence comes directly from the used data (Glacer 2011). In QDA this is not taken as granted. While Strauss and Corbin (1990) also speak about open coding in early phases of the analysis, in their approach the coding is not only based on the findings from the data, but is also dependent on the researcher and his precognitions. They also introduce a new step in the coding process called axial coding. This happens after the open coding and is used to rearrange the data by making connections between different categories (Strauss & Corbin 1990).

2.1.4 Constructivist grounded theory

Constructivist theory is founded on the belief that concepts are constructed, not discovered, as Glaser (2002) sees them. A constructivist starting point for research is
specific questions posed about a specific area whereas in CGT the starting point is the desire to understand a specific area without preconceived questions (Hernandez & Andrews 2012). Also the use of literature in constructivist grounded theory is closer to QDA than to CGT. In constructivist grounded theory analysis starts with a literature review to learn what has been done in the field of interest (Hernandez & Andrews 2012). In the coding process, the constructivist theory uses three different codes: open, focused and theoretical. The meaning of the first two codes is similar to CGT, but the theoretical coding has a different meaning. In CGT theoretical coding is part of the selective process by which grounded theory is integrated. In the constructivist theory, it means merging of concepts to groups (Hernandez & Andrews 2012).

2.2 Why grounded theory for this research
Grounded theory is one of the most popular qualitative research methods. Originally it was developed for social sciences (Glaser & Strauss 1967) and as such it is well suited for studying working environments and employees. According to Birks and Mills (2011) grounded theory is very well suited when:

- Little is known about the area of study.
- The generation of theory with explanatory power is the desired outcome.
- An inherent process is imbedded in the research situation that is likely to be explicated by grounded theory methods.

Locke (2001) adds that grounded theory can be used to enliven mature theories.

Employee behavior is hardly a new research area. The problem is that the results of these studies are differing and sometimes even contradictory. Early Hawthorne studies were used to show that employee attitude affects their performance (Chiesa & Hobbs 2006). Later on Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) used statistical tools to prove that there was no correlation between job satisfaction and performance. Organ (1988) argued that the problem was in the too narrow definition of work performance. When behaviors usually not included in performance appraisals, such as organizational citizenship behaviors, are added the correlation is far better. In
2001, by reviewing over 300 studies, Judge *et al.* managed to improve the correlation significantly just by correcting measurement and sampling error. They also found that correlation goes higher when work complexity increases. Multiple studies have found that dissatisfied employees are more likely to quit than satisfied ones (e.g., Hulin *et al.* 1993; Kohler and Mathieu 1993). What hardly anyone challenges is that a high turnover of critical personnel is costly to a firm in terms of replacement but also in terms of shared values and continuity (Phillips 1990). Based on the study of Chessario and Legeault (2009) on the Canadian B2B ICT sector, it seems that HR activities are irrelevant regarding employee resigning decisions. To gain clarity on employee behavior and the process that leads to an employee resigning, we need a research method suitable for creating a theory with explanatory power from a topic that has mature, but mixed foundations.

It is a bit more uncommon to use grounded theory as a method when doing research on previously written transcripts. As mentioned earlier, concurrent data collection and analysis is one of the unique features of grounded theory. When relying only on transcripts, there is no way to go back to the original source to make clarifying questions. This concurrent data collection is especially important when using grounded theory in a social constructivism context. Charmaz (2002), one of the main advocates of constructivist grounded theory, gives a big role to the researcher in the process of obtaining data. In her approach the researcher and the participants jointly produce the data and the meaning which the researcher observes and defines. She even claims that the researcher should prefer a literary approach over purely scientific one in writing (Charmaz 2000). In her view, writing needs to be analytical, but still keep the experiences of the research subjects alive (Charmaz 2000). This creates contradiction between ontological and epistemological approaches of my study and how constructivist grounded theory is seen in the scientific literature. That being said, it is not completely uncommon to do grounded theory research without access to what could be described as the “original source”. In the field of management, at least Turner (1978) and Gephart (1993) have made disaster studies based on archives only. Orton (1997) has made grounded theory research on organizational processes based on archives of Ford library in Fuqua School of Business. The key for solving this contradiction is in the fact that research material is
not the employees themselves and their subjective truth as it is, but how it is described in the transcripts.

2.3 Grounded theory process in this thesis
Grounded theory method in this work mostly follows classic grounded theory methodology. The constructivist approach might also be suitable as my ontological stand is in relativist and epistemologically constructivist. Unfortunately I am unable to access the original source directly and that, in my opinion, severely hampers the applicability of the constructivist method. While QDA, with its clearly defined structure, also sounds tempting, I would rather try to delay my literature review as much as possible. Of course I have some precognitions on the reasons why people leave companies based on my previous studies and I also have a basic understanding of human psychology through courses I have participated, but as the field of study has so differing results I want to see what kind of a story the transcripts tell without strong bias. For that goal CGT seems the best alternative.
3. DATA ANALYSIS

This is the chapter where most of the data analysis is described. I will use some additional data later, but this will be the main part. The chapter starts with the introduction of the data. I will explain a bit of background information about the company, and describe where and when the interview transcripts were written.

Data analysis at this stage of the thesis work happened in three phases: first I familiarized myself with the data, then I started open coding to look for categories in the data and finally I did selective coding based on the categories. There is a separate sub-chapter on each of these coding phases. In the end of chapter three I will generate a theory based on the data and discuss some of the problems and inconsistencies it has.

3.1 Data collection

Raw data used in this thesis are roughly 300 employment ending interview transcripts from an ICT subcontracting and consultancy company operating in Finland as well as internationally. The interviews were held privately, one-on-one between the employee and his or her direct line supervisor. The Company HR processes instruct to use a pre-defined template in the discussion, but in the end, it is up to the supervisor how deeply and thoroughly he or she wants to conduct the interview, write the transcripts and report the findings. Even though the company operates internationally, the interviews used in this thesis are from the company Finnish sites. The transcript templates can be found from appendices one and two. It is important to note that the transcripts are not written literally based on some recordings of interview, but are more like notes that the supervisor makes during the interview. There are no recordings of the event. During the examination period the template provided by the HR department changed, but the main goals of the interview remained the same: how the employee experienced the tasks, colleagues, superiors and the working conditions. In the end there was also a question asking what the supervisor’s view was on the reason why a given employee decided to leave the company. This could make some comments look confusing as they were written in personal tense and others were written as 3rd person observations on the situation. Regardless of how the comments look like, the interview has always been conducted
in a similar fashion: the supervisor interviews the employee who is leaving the company and the supervisor is the one who writes the transcript notes based on the discussion.

The focus of the study is not the employees themselves, but what the transcripts tell. There is no way to go back to the original source to make further questions. The interviews were taken at a certain time and place and thus reflect the atmosphere of that time. We do not know if the employees were honest in what they said about their reasons. We do not know if the supervisor wrote down in the transcripts what supervisor thought the HR wanted to see or how much supervisors own precognitions affected the transcripts. Some of the transcripts were written in Finnish and some in English. In case of Finnish I have translated the comments I have used in this thesis to the best of my ability and have taken care not to add my own implications. In case the transcripts were in English, I have copied them as is with all the misspellings and typos they might contain. The only change I have done is to hide the names of the employees, supervisors and companies mentioned in the transcripts.

3.2 Coding

3.2.1 Familiarizing myself with data
In the familiarizing phase I made some open coding. My main focus was in setting up what I call search values. The codes created at this stage could be used later on to focus more on certain aspects if needed. For coding the transcripts I used the NVivo10 software. I made the following codes:

**Date**: Date was coded according to the year and the quarter when the employee had his or her last working day. This value gives me the possibility to see if there is a change in employee behavior as the time goes by. If I noticed sudden changes in the number of people resigning I could use date to look for news regarding the company or its customers that could provide insight into the sudden changes.

**Length of work history**: Length of the work history in two year terms. This may be important since if, for example, someone has worked in the company for several
years, he might have very different reasons for leaving compared to someone who has barely started his or her career. My precognition is that the first one is probably more emotionally attached to the company than the latter one.

**Position:** Position the employee held when he or she left the company. It is interesting to see how it affects. A layman could think that when troubled times come, the first ones to be terminated are the line managers and thus they would have the biggest incentive to find a new workplace. The Interview transcripts contain notes on positions ranging from trainees to business team leaders.

**Reason of termination:** On what grounds the employment was terminated. Possible values are: resigned, dismissal, end of fixed term contract or retired. It is bound to affect the way a person sees the company if he or she resigns himself or if he or she is terminated involuntarily.

**Site:** In what location the person was working before leaving the company. If some geographical locations had a significantly different number of employees resigning than others, I could use the information to search news of the company or its customers that would explain the behavior.

**Supervisor:** The Employee’s direct line supervisor. My assumption is that the line supervisor is the employees’ direct link towards the company and the personal relationship between the employee and his or her supervisor might have an effect on the reason why the person has left the company.

**Attitude towards colleagues:** The attitude was roughly estimated as “negative”, “neutral” or “positive”. My reasoning is that colleagues can be seen as a big factor in work satisfaction and thus affect the reason why a person wants to leave the company.

**Attitude towards company:** The attitude was roughly estimated as “negative”, “neutral” or “positive”. My precognition is that attitude towards the company surely affects why a person leaves.

**Attitude towards line supervisor:** The attitude was roughly estimated as “negative”, “neutral” or “positive”. As stated above, the supervisor is often the direct link between the employee and the company. The personal relationship between the
employee and his or her supervisor affects many things including how the employee sees the company. This is especially true when doing subcontracting work and the employee is sometimes working alone in the customer premises without the company colleagues.

**Attitude towards project supervisor:** The attitude was roughly estimated as “negative”, “neutral” or “positive”. A line supervisor is the direct link towards the company, but the project supervisor is the one the employee is usually in more contact with. This is also bound to have an effect on why people leave a company.

**Attitude towards work tasks:** The attitude was roughly estimated as “negative”, “neutral” or “positive”. How a person sees his everyday work tasks surely affects his reasons to leave a company. I assume this is especially true in a knowledge intensive field, where the motivation towards the work at hand is one of the key drivers in job satisfaction and personal career development.

3.2.2 Open coding
After familiarizing myself with the data I started the actual open coding. I started to pay more attention to the actual content in the transcripts. I decided to focus only on the transcripts of those people who had resigned. While the transcripts people who were dismissed could have also provided interesting information, I was more interested in people who had taken the initiative and actions. For many, leaving a company is a big decision that is not taken lightly. It implies that employee intention to leave has passed over some kind of a threshold. For that reason my premise is that the transcripts from these people will provide more practical and useful information. Focusing in resigned people narrowed down the number of used transcripts to 188. Besides, many of the transcripts from people who were dismissed contained very little, or as in some cases, no information at all. Particularly in cases where complete sites had been closed due to co-operative discussions there was very little information.

Many of the codes are not “the straw that broke the camel’s back” and made the person leave. These are just topics that the leavers saw as problems in the company at the moment of their departure. I made the following codes:
**Bad compensation:** This contains all the compensation employees receive for their work. Typically the transcripts described situations where an employee was not happy with his or her salary. In some cases there were not any references to the direction that the salary would have been bad, but that the employee received a better offer from another company. There were also hints that the compensation for some special tasks was not enough. People also seemed to be unhappy about incentives the company was using. In some cases people were discontented with the equipment, such as phones, the company gave to the employees. According to the transcripts, due to the harsh times, the company removed bonus vacation pay in one of the cooperative negotiations. This loss of already acquired benefits was a source of bitterness for many.

**Career advance:** Career advance was a common reason to change the company. This code was roughly separated in two elements: a better position and assumed better possibilities for career advance.

1. Better position
   a. Moving up in hierarchy
   b. More interesting position
   c. More challenging work

2. Assumed better possibilities

Better position was again divided into three groups. The first finding was that people changed a company because they moved upwards in the company hierarchy and got more responsibilities. The second finding was that the new position was not hierarchically better, but it was more interesting. The third reason was to search for more challenging work opportunities. The last element for leaving was assumed better career development possibilities. In these cases there was nothing in the transcript that would imply that the person leaving the company would actually get a better position; for example, the position in the new company would be roughly similar to the one they had in the current organization. They just assumed that by changing a company there were better possibilities for progress.

**Broken promises:** Some of the resigned employees had their promises broken by their supervisor or the top management. The Promises made by the supervisor were usually personal, such as getting to work with specific technology or into specific
The promises of the top management were usually not personal but affected the whole personnel. In some cases there was general dissatisfaction with how well promises were kept but no concrete examples given by the employees.

**Company values and practices not aligned:** Some resigned employees felt that the company had values, but that for some reason it did not live according to them. The company advertised riding on the crest of the wave even though the positions they offered to employees did not match that. Some also felt that the company values and visions were communicated, but not really put into practice. A special grudge was that the top management seemed to be more interested in their own benefits than making their part during difficult times.

**Competence development not working:** This includes comments regarding official training the company was giving as well as possibilities to develop competence through assignments. Some workers also disagreed how the employee trainings were seen in the company. The trainings were organized to give training, not because new skills were necessarily needed. The employees felt that the company was not really taking the initiative regarding skills that the possible customers were looking for and that the company was not really interested in keeping the employees’ know-how up to date.

**Competence not utilized enough:** Sometimes a transcript showed that an employee had been frustrated when he or she was not given possibility to contribute as much as he or she wanted towards the company.

**Confusing organization:** Some employees felt that the organization was confusing. They were not certain about what the responsibility areas were or why they were doing things that they were. This was not only seen from the personal point of view but also as a more holistic problem. The Employees saw that if confusing organizations would be fixed, it would give benefits for the whole company, implying citizenship behavior.

**Confusing working conditions:** Some cases confusion was not in the organization, but in the actual work people were doing daily. Under this code go things such as work practices, tools and communication regarding how daily work is done.
Decrease in overall feel of company: Sometimes the employees felt that the “feel of the company” had decreased, but did not or could not clarify it more.

Getting out of subcontracting work: A few of the employees wanted to get rid of the subcontracting work the company was doing. There were several reasons why people felt subcontracting might not be suitable for them. Some wanted to work towards creating something “own”. The subcontracting work was also seen as a source of confusion. Colleagues were constantly changing and, sometimes, the customers did not even know what they wanted. People who were leaving often saw subcontracting as a source of uncertainty. One knew that you were safe when working in a project, but at the same time you knew that if you were not in a customer project, you were at risk if the company started co-operative negotiations.

How people are seen in company: The leavers were also concerned how people were seen in the company. Many felt that during the last few years people had not been appreciated as much as before. Some of the resigned employees expressed concern that the company seems to be appreciating customers over their own employees. Keeping investors happy at the expense of the employees had also caused concerns.

Job circulation not working: Dysfunctional job circulation was something that many of the employees regarded as a problem. In some cases the work itself had been reasonable, but the grief was that there had not been any variety in it.

Lack of faith in company or strategy: Under this code I had several, connected phenomena listed. It contained the leavers’ comments about their mistrust towards the company, company top management and strategy. Some of the comments were quite general while some had more precise concerns regarding mistrust. Many leavers also felt that the biggest source of mistrust was the co-operative negotiation and the difficult overall situation in the business environment.

No company related reason for leaving: Sometimes the employee is going to change the company no matter what. These kinds of reasons include things such as moving back to home country, starting to study something completely new or a spouse getting a good position in another city.
No real possibility to international assignments: The company gives officially the impression that you have possibilities for international assignments; it might not be true in practice. The employees expected international assignments to be also monetarily profitable. In some cases assignments were promised, but when the employee should have left, it was not possible because of the employee’s ongoing project.

No visibility to issues outside everyday work: There was also frustration that employees didn’t have visibility of company related issues outside their own everyday work. This included issues such as what projects and customers other sites or business teams had, but also issues concerning own site. When employees are working in customer premises rather than in own premises, much of the important unofficial communication is missing. There were also concerns about the honesty of the communication.

Not connected to mother company: In subcontracting work when you are in the customer premises you easily end up feeling disconnected from the mother company.

Supervisor distant or constantly changing: Many of the leavers felt that their superior had been distant or that there had been too many of them to build a real connection. The employees usually understood that it was mostly due to the nature of the subcontracting work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bad compensation</td>
<td><em>The resent salary rise was not good enough.</em>&lt;br&gt;It feels like no matter how you do your job it doesn’t really have an effect on the salary or the incentives you are getting.&lt;br&gt;Work phones are old compared to the phones employees are developing for the customer.&lt;br&gt;...was bitter because of the bonus vacation pay was taken away in co-operative negotiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Career advance</td>
<td><em>Got better offer from [another company] regarding both position and salary that we couldn’t compete.</em>&lt;br&gt;One of the reasons may have been that he did not like the maintenance type of work that he often had to do.&lt;br&gt;Better technical challenges with new employer.&lt;br&gt;Strong drive for career development and understanding that there won’t be better positions available in Tampere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Broken promises</td>
<td><em>On all levels things are being promised, but not delivered.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>In Berlin, assignment is not at all that was promised. Was supposed to be leading our own persons, but now writing XML test scripts. Bouncing around to different project (ad hoc work). Coding is not first preference I work assignments.</em>&lt;br&gt;Just before co-operative negotiations employees were told that there won’t be any negotiations planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Company values and practices not aligned</td>
<td><em>Public image of the company is not aligned how the company operates in everyday work: nice speeches about values and visions do not automatically make people passionate, they need to be inspired more.</em>&lt;br&gt;Lot of mistrust towards top management, organizational changes, constant co-operative negotiations and cutting of benefits, but then top management gets better reward system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Competence development not working</td>
<td><em>Promised training, but was not realized. Dissatifier.</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Company seems to focus its training activities mostly quantitative approach where importance is only for conducting the training.</em>&lt;br&gt;Company should pay more attention to peoples skill development with a long range timeframe to prevent situations where people who have been with company for many years are fired because their skills no longer are requested by customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Competence not utilized enough</td>
<td><em>Tasks had not been so challenging as [employee] had expected. Not very much architecture type of “high level” design but lots of small scale bug fixing.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Confusing organization</td>
<td><em>In house processes have not been developing at all. There should be more focus on those as it would increase efficiency and thus save money.</em> Management tasks have been ok, but sometimes areas of responsibilities have been unclear (who is responsible and what, for example where goes the line between HR and group management?). As a group manager project supervising has been little bit mismatch. When you are approving hours from project that are completely strange to you (you are not part of the project or your group members are not working in the project).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Confusing working conditions</td>
<td><em>Amateur work, where environments and specifications are not in the level where they should be.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Decrease in overall feel of the company</td>
<td><em>2010 it was a great company, but that has changed so much, it is not so great anymore. Company is suffering, like competitors.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Getting out of subcontracting work</td>
<td><em>Getting out of subcontracting work: colleagues don’t change in every project, project customer really know what they want etc</em> [Employee] prefer working for companies making own products instead of company that provides SW development services as subcontracted work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The reason why [employee] started looking for new position was the result of beginning new co-operative negotiations and he was without customer project.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>How people are seen in the company</td>
<td><em>Sometimes you get the feeling that employees are just cutlets on a counter that you can just throw around.</em> Company does not have too much to say about project work and its content, problems. Pushing people too much to projects that they might not enjoy themselves.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Public listed company’s profit responsibility affects human resource management (eg. no leaves during Christmas time).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Open codes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Job circulation not working</td>
<td>Variability has been too little (4 years desktop SW development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing from project to project has been difficult due to customer needs. Task themselves have been ok, but there hasn’t been any development on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lack of faith in company or strategy</td>
<td>Constant and regular co-operation negotiations and hence conducted lay-offs have had a demoralizing effect and caused lots of discussion among employees about management’s understanding of business and its vision for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>According to [employee] company is lacking real vision (or vision is changing too often) and therefore any serious product development cannot be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>No company related reason for leaving</td>
<td>It was a family decision to move back to Germany. They are originally from Germany and they have their relatives living there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>No real possibility for international assignments.</td>
<td>Promised international assignment didn’t realize. It was said that would be first person to be offered, but when the situation came, it was impossible due to current customer project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointed in international assignments, you make less money than in home country assignments and you have to take care of majority of the practicalities by yourself (such as finding apartment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>No visibility things outside everyday work</td>
<td>Sometimes it was like working in the engine room of a ship without knowing where the ship is headed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication between sites should be improved. They are operating too independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When company is doing badly, things are not told as they are. Only how well we are doing in future. More honesty to motivation speeches!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Not connected to mother company</td>
<td>He has been sitting at the customer premises all the time so he has not had any colleague contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Supervisor distant or constantly changing</td>
<td>First supervisor was really crappy, but after that supervisors have been ok. Though must say that all supervisors have been bit distant due to customer work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superiors have been ok. Have had too many of them though. If counting correctly, four different superiors during three year period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Categories

3.3.1 Trust and faith

During my focused coding it became clear to me that the problems and challenges the employees were describing in the transcripts could be divided into three groups: 1) supervisors and top management 2) strategy and practices 3) employee’s own situation. Usually, there was more than one reason listed as the reason of leaving the company. The HR practices required the supervisor of the leaving employee to write his own interpretation on why the person left, but I usually found several items listed. From the transcripts it also became clear that the employees had been following the company development for some time. Very few of the transcripts describe a situation where an employee has just recently come to the company and then quickly decides to leave. Usually the employees had been working for at least a couple of years and they had quite strong opinions on what the problems were. They also had a clear vision what the future holds for them or to the company. I will call this strong view employees had “faith”. Faith always has an object. In this thesis the targets of faith are the company, the supervisors and the employees’ own view of future self. Through these three “faiths” the employee forms trust towards the company. Trust is also my core category.

The selection of the words faith and trust over “confidence”, a word with a similar meaning, is intentional. The term “faith” derives from the Latin word “fides” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2014), which means trust, faith, confidence, reliance, credence and belief but also trustworthiness, faithfulness, conscientiousness, credibility and honesty (Numen – The Latin Lexicon, 2014). This Latin etymology of the word grasps the spirit of what employees are searching for in workplaces during troubled times.

These three faith elements are not independent islands, but are connected and overlapping. For example, the lack of faith in strategy can be a result of an unconvincing strategy or just failure to communicate it. The end result, people leaving the company, is the same regardless of what the reason is.
3.3.2 Faith in supervisors

As said earlier, faith that the employees experience towards the supervisors is closely connected to faith they experience towards the company as a whole. This makes faith in supervisors a natural starting point for the trust analysis. The assumption is that supervisors and managers in general play a crucial part in how employees make sense of their work environment. They are the key drivers who can make or break employee attitude towards the company. Figure 3 visualizes faith in supervisor and my findings that affect the faith.

![Figure 3 Visualization of faith in supervisor](image)

**Distant supervisor:** To do their work as leaders and sense makers, supervisors and managers need to have a personal relationship to those who they are supposed to lead. As a B2B subcontracting company this is challenging at least for the immediate supervisors who should be the ones working with the employees daily. When it comes to the top management I think everyone agrees that they cannot be present at all sites all the time.

“Supervisors have usually been distant and customer "supervisor" has been closer as he is the one you are working with every day.”

“You could see [supervisor name] work as a supervisor only in monthly meetings. He should have dedicated more time to his group.”

It seems like the contact between many supervisors and their subordinates had often been on a purely professional basis, making the relationship emotionally distant even though it might have been physically close:
“Nothing to complain or to praise, but then again supervisors have been pretty distant.”

Of course the relationship between the supervisor and a subordinate is unique and in some cases there have been improvements. The employees also found that having a real supervisor actually mattered for them:

“No during the last year I’ve actually had a real supervisor! Before this it was five years and five different supervisors that you heard from once a year. Full time supervisor is a clear change for the better - more commitment to company.”

**Supervisor changing:** To make things difficult, the transcripts describe that the turnover among the supervisors has been high, making it difficult, if not impossible, to make personal attachment with the employees:

“The number of supervisors has been really high, which has created own challenges in the work.”

“The superiors have been ok. Have had too many of them though. If counting correctly, four different superiors during a three-year period.”

Not all the transcripts describe problems with the supervisors. Employees seem to understand that the supervisor work is difficult when you are located in a different place than your subordinate:

“The supervisor has changed several times during a short time period. All of them have been good; everything that has been agreed on has been done.”

**No clear goals and working methods:** These changing supervisors have not only disturbed the formation of personal connection with the employees, but also affected the goal targeting and even everyday work:

“There have been far too many organizational changes over his time (approx. four different supervisors) which has caused difficulties to line up with the targets and appreciated working methods.”

**How people are seen in company:** The distance of the supervisor was not the only concern coming from the transcripts. Former employees had also felt that there had been a clear change for the worse in relation to how people were seen in the company. They said that before the crisis employees were valued as human beings, but now that the business had taken a downturn, employees were seen more like resources to be utilized just to get money:
“Project work feels more meaningful than personnel leasing. It seems like the company had shifted into that direction since we were acquired by [the company].”

“The company does not have too much to say about project work and its content, problems. Pushing people too much to projects that they might not enjoy themselves.”

This kind of behavior is bound to raise doubts in the personnel’s minds. If we are only seen as resources, what will happen to us? Some even said people were seen as pieces of meat that were thrown to the counter:

“Sometimes you get the feeling that employees are just cutlets on a counter that you can just throw around.”

**Broken promises:** What I think is the biggest contributor in faith regarding the supervisor and the management is the question of whether one can trust their word. From the transcripts it was clear that there had been some issues regarding this. There were cases where the closest supervisor did not keep their promises and sometimes the employees reported that the supervisor just happened to forget things:

“Salary increase was already agreed on and communicated with the site manager, but it was later forgotten.”

Usually the employees did not go to much detail regarding things that were promised, but spoke about them on a general level:

“On all levels things are being promised, but not delivered.”

What was even more concerning was that some of these promises were given by the top management. They had also failed to keep their promises as was described in one transcript:

“Just before the co-operative negotiations the employees were told that there won’t be any negotiations planned.”

Even when the supervisor and managers were distant and you could not form a close personal relationship with them, you could still trust them professionally as seen from the earlier comments. But when supervisors cannot keep their word on really important matters, such as salary increases or companywide drastic actions, there is no hope of building faith or making the employees to trust their supervisors.
3.3.3 Faith in the strategy and company

From the transcripts it was clear that many of the employees were interested in the company strategy. It was also imminent that they had their own ideas on how good the strategy was. Figure 4 below clarifies what I found to affect the faith towards strategy and company.

**Figure 4** Visualization of faith in strategy and company

**Too dependent on one single customer:** One of the biggest concerns coming from the transcripts was employee concern of being too dependent on a single customer. The employee comments also imply that workers have been discussing this with each other for a long time:

“[Customer] dependency has been bothering for several years and now those risks are realizing. People have been talking about the issue for several years, but in practice no-one has done anything.”

**Feedback not appreciated:** At the same time, the company management has been communicating about changes in strategy, but the message has not had any real effect. To make things worse, it seems that the employees have given their own input on what the company should do, but the management does not seem to be listening:

“The top management doesn’t show at all in here. There could be any ”John Doe” running the company and it wouldn’t change a thing. The top management has been talking about ramping up non-[customer] work for several years but we haven’t seen any real change. In the end all the communication has been ignored.”
Mistrust towards communication: Communication was also seen as not as honest as the employees hoped for. It has been overly positive while failures are not communicated or explained at all:

“Constant changes over the last three years have not created trust to the future and keeps company as a very poor example as a communicator towards its employees. [Employee] mentioned that too often employees receive information which is overly positive and later nearly secretly turn out to be failed on some unknown reason which is never explained further.”

It is also clear from the comment that the top management, though they are communicating the new strategy, are not really present for the employees. This distance between the employees and the management is bound to put strain on the faith that employees have on the company’s chosen strategy. It is also clear that the employees were giving feedback on what should have been done to fix the situation, but the employees felt that their feedback had been ignored. What is even more problematic is that the employees felt that they could not trust that the top management was telling the truth about what was going on.

Management not active enough: From the transcripts it was also clear that the leavers questioned how well the company top management was fit to run the company during crisis.

“Reaction to crisis should have been more decisive.”

Overall the impression that forms from the employee comments regarding the top management actions during a crisis is that the management is distant, they do not listen to the employees and they seem not to be making enough to fix the situation.

No community feeling: My assumption is that another key element in creating faith, or the lack of it, towards a company strategy is how engaged people are in the company. The nature of the B2B subcontracting work is such that people are often sent to work in the customer premises without a continuous connection to the mother company. Working in the customer premises has made people feel as in example below:

“There has not however been a real work community feeling because the organization has been changing and everyone works in his own project.”
Even though this might also be listed under how people feel about their work, I see building of community feeling as a part of the strategy process. As said earlier, according to social constructivism, people create their world in social interaction with each other. When this interaction is missing, employees cannot help each other to build faith towards the company and the strategy. Their main social connections are people from other companies with whom they cannot speak about internal matters without breaking their NDA.

Another problem in building a community inside the company has been the method of how the company has grown. Growth of the company has been rapid through acquisitions. According to the transcripts the integration of people coming from other companies has not been successful:

“[Employee] thinks that the people from the old company in Oulu are still a little bit of their own group. He thinks that it fair to ask are those people still not fully integrated to company.”

“…bit insider feeling. Old [acquired company] people have managed to get hold of all the key positions and thus have blocked others outside. They have been doing a good job, but it still gives bad insider taste.”

Again this might not be directly linked to strategy, but the forming of insider groups and suspicion of cronyism is bound to increase mistrust towards leadership, strategy and the company as a whole among the employees.

3.3.4 Faith in oneself
As the analysis is done from employment ending transcripts, they describe expectations of personal future that is linked with the company future. People were leaving the company as they were afraid of being unemployed. My interpretation is that they decided to take action rather than to wait until the situation develops to the point where action is taken by the employer. As seen in figure 5, there were clearly four different elements.
I think “faith in oneself” works in a different way than “faith in company” or “faith in supervisors”. In the last two cases the object of faith is external so you have a clear object at which your faith is aimed. With faith in oneself, the object of faith is internal. This “faith in oneself” describes that the future will work out for you. To have faith does not mean having faith to complete some specific task but, rather, more generally having confidence in own future. A concrete example of what I mean by this and what I found from the transcripts would be that when people are working in a knowledge intensive field, it is imperative to keep their personal expertise up to date. If employees feel that their competence does not develop as well as they thought, they have to find some other company where it is possible:

“The company should pay more attention to people’s skill development with a long range timeframe to prevent situations where people who have been with the company for many years are fired because their skills are no longer requested by customers.”

**Trainings not working:** It was clear that the employees were interested in their own development and training. They had asked for trainings, but as it seemed that they would not receive any they decided to take the matter into their own hands. The transcripts describe situations when staying in customer premises on one’s own time and studying the needed skills.

“Personal development possibilities and trainings have been really hard to get. There were a lot of discussions about training but they never realized. To learn test scripting and automation the learning had to be done on one’s own time at the customer premises without anyone to teach.”
It is clear that the employees were willing to walk the extra mile for their personal development, but they felt that the company was not willing to do the same for them, which caused imbalance in feel of mutual commitment. Being the subcontractor in the customer premises was also sometimes an obstacle to getting trainings the customer was arranging:

“The subcontractor status makes it difficult to develop yourself. For example, if the customer has some kind of training, you cannot participate as you are a subcontractor.”

**Not enough challenging tasks:** Trainings are not the only way to develop skills. In some cases it was clear that the employee had had challenging assignments in the history, but that the things had changed lately:

“When I first joined the company I learned a lot of new and interesting stuff. Lately there has been no challenge at all.”

This “no challenge at all” is a clear sign to the employee that the work he is doing is not developing his competence.

**Competence developing to wrong direction:** There were also cases where people felt that they were developing new skills and competencies. The problem was that what they learned was not really what they wanted to learn. This was seen as creating a gap between the current work and the work the employee hoped to do in the future.

“Assignments were good, challenging enough to develop himself. Anyway not fully matching the past experience and future hopes.”

“Didn’t have challenging enough task, too much testing related work and he was feeling that he will forget his C++ skills.”

**Work circulation not working:** In order to competence development through project assignments it is imperative for the work circulation to work. If it is not working, there is a risk that people will get stuck in one project for years. It seems like the employees had not usually been too keen to demand the job circulation as it would have meant a risk of being without a customer project:

“For too long a time doing the same old work, for the same old customer. There has been some tries to change the project, but because the customer does the contracts on a quarterly basis, the continuance has been offered before new secure customer projects have been available.”
“I think there could have been more support regarding personal development, but honestly I could have been a bit more active in it.”

I see this lack of competence development, in both trainings and through challenging work opportunities, as one of the key drivers for people to leave a company. If you feel that you are developing skills that are demanded by many of the companies on the market, you might as well remain in the company you are currently working for. If the company goes down, you have still learned valuable skills and your position on the job market is better. On the other hand, if you are in a company in which the future looks challenging and you have a feeling that the competence development is not working, there is no reason why you should stay in the company. It is just the opposite; you need to find yourself a new employer as quickly as possible.

3.4. Emergent theory
At this point of my analysis the core category is trust. This trust is abstract trust that is not aimed at anything concrete, but will operate in the organizational context. It could be described as a generic feeling that “the life will be fine for me in the future if I continue working here as I have done”. Based on the interviews trust is a key factor for the employee when making the decision to leave a company. I have found three elements that contribute to employee’s trust (figure 6 below). These elements are “faiths” that the employee has towards aspects of the employer and his own future.
The first “faith” element is the faith that the employee has towards his supervisor. As said in the coding section, my assumption is that the supervisor is a key factor affecting how an employee perception of the company develops. A good supervisor-subordinate relationship helps in building a positive view of the company and thus enables a better development of citizenship behavior and commitment and lowers the intention to leave company. The second element contributing to trust is faith in strategy and company. The employees of the company are working in a knowledge intensive field. While their main expertise might not be in how the company should be run or in the development of company strategies, it is clear that many employees had strong opinions about these issues. If the chosen strategy does not make sense to the employees for one reason or another, it will deteriorate trust the employees feel. The employee does not have faith anymore that the future of the company is plausible, thus, he or she needs to take action. The final element is the faith that the employee has in himself. This includes competence development and keeping skills up to date. As long as there is faith that the skills the employee has are needed or that the needed skills will be learned there is no need to change the employer.

The big issue with the created model is that “faith in oneself” seems to have more weight than the other two categories. Many of the leavers had given really positive
comments about the company, strategy, management and supervisors, but still they decided to leave. Why is that? My theory is unable to explain this behavior. One possibility would be to do quantitative analysis to find correlations and causalities, but it would not give the proper explanatory power that I am after. To develop this theory with explanatory power, I need to start my literature analysis. The idea is to look for information about trust in an organizational setting as well as to find out what the current discussion regarding employee-employer relationship reveals. In contrast to typical literature analysis, my goal is to use as old material as is feasible and use sociological and psychological definitions if needed. The point is to take a few steps backwards in the organizational discussion and start building a new theory from as far back as possible. I think this way it will better embrace the idea of classical grounded theory research in which the goal is to avoid theory creation based on multiple generations of scientific discussion. To a certain extent, such as when defining the state of the current employee-employer relationship, using new material cannot be avoided, but for the definition of trust and faith I think I can use my own discretion to find a suitable platform in scientific discussion from where to build my own theory.
4. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is dedicated to literature review. It contains two main parts: career and trust. As the goal of this thesis is to gain an understanding of people’s behavior in a situation in which they are changing an employer, it is important to first understand what the employees are after in today’s world as well as what the companies are offering. This will build the foundations for further discussion about the decision to leave company. The second part, dealing with trust, concentrates on providing an understanding of what the current discussion about trust inside an organization is and how trust affects employees. In the empirical data section of the previous chapter trust was quite clearly seen, but a proper understanding of the science behind trust is needed for theory creation of this thesis. Reviewing both career and trust allows me to set up the pieces needed for the theory in the next chapter where I will build a bridge between career, trust and the decision to leave.

4.1 Career

4.1.1 History of career

During the last few decades careers have gone through a drastic change. Baruch (2006) does not see this change as a new phenomenon, but more like a pendulum swinging between individuals and organizations taking responsibility for the career. He sees this employment revolution having four separate major steps (table 2).
In pre-industrial societies there were no large corporations to take care of the “career” as we understand the term today. This changed during the industrial period when people started to move into cities and be employed by industrial enterprises. In this shift careers became the responsibility of the employer. As the technological development increased productivity of individual, the industrial work started to decline in western world during the mid-20th century and the pendulum started the movement towards individuals taking responsibility for their careers (Baruch 2006). Since the 1980’s companies have been re-structuring their organizations and tearing down old bureaucratic hierarchies. This development has pushed workers out of traditional company driven career development into a new “boundaryless career” (DeFilippi & Arthur 1994) and forced them to take more responsibility for their own future.

During industrial employment, career was seen as the responsibility of the organization (Gutteridge et al., 1993) and most of the organizations had hierarchies to support this (Sullivan 1999). Career advance was seen as rising in the organization ladder (Townsend 1970) through competition for limited promotional opportunities (Rosenbaum 1979). Since then world has changed. Now people have multiple identities at work, different commitments and conflicting obligations (Ibarra 2003; Cohen 2003; Wiley 1987). At the moment the pendulum seems to reside in the hands...
of the individual. This shift has manifested itself through a change in the psychological contract between employers and employees (Conway & Briner 2005). Rousseau (1989), author of the psychological contract, defines it as “individual's beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that focal person and another party”. The contract is unilateral, meaning that while an individual believes that another party is obligated to reciprocity, it does not actually bind others to the relationship. The shift in the nature of the psychological contract means that organizations of today are not offering secure employment, but opportunities of development for those who are needed and suitable for the work companies are offering (Herriot & Pemberton 1995, 1996). For an individual this means discovery of different career goals (Baruch 2004) and the re-definition of career success to something else than just climbing in the hierarchy (Gunz & Heslin 2005).

4.2.3 Contemporary career

Contemporary careers are usually called “boundaryless career” (Arthur & Rousseau 1996) or “protean career” (Hall 1996). In their book Arthur and Rousseau (1996) list six different meanings of boundaryless career:

1. Boundaryless career is like the stereotypical Silicon Valley career that moves across the boundaries of separate employers.
2. Boundaryless career is like those of academics or carpenters that draw validation—and marketability—from outside the present employer.
3. Boundaryless career is like those of real-estate agents that are sustained by external networks or information.
4. Boundaryless career that break traditional organizational assumptions about hierarchy and career advancement.
5. Boundaryless career that involve an individual rejecting existing career opportunities for personal or family reasons.
6. Boundaryless career that are based on the interpretation of the career actor, who may perceive a boundaryless future regardless of structural constraints.

They also see that a common factor between these six definitions is independence from traditional organizational career development. Sullivan and Arthur (2006) have
identified two dimensions of employee mobility in boundaryless career: physical and psychological. The meanings 1 and 4 can be seen as describing physical mobility while the rest are part of psychological mobility. This model can be presented in a two dimensional matrix seen in figure 7.

Figure 7: Two dimensions of boundaryless career (adapted from Sullivan & Arthur 2006)

According to this model, boundaryless career is not an “either or” position but a degree of mobility in physical and psychological continua (Sullivan & Arthur 2006). The people found in quadrant 1 show low levels of physical and psychological mobility. As an example of such employee, Sullivan and Arthur (2006) describe a NASA engineer with long in-house career who has high education, but lacks transferable knowledge as NASA is the only employer who requires the employee’s specific skills. In quadrant 2 are, for example, young people eager to travel, who offer their skills as waiters and bartenders. These people show a great deal of physical mobility, but lack the willingness or possibility to psychological mobility. In quadrant 3 people sustain high expectation of their own employability without actually changing employers. This group includes people such as respected academics, experienced management consultants or skilled nurses (Sullivan & Arthur 2006). The employees with high mobility of both types are in quadrant 4. These people change their employers often and shift their career orientation. As an example, Sullivan and Arthur (2006) give a chef that collects experience from a variety of different restaurants and finally opens one himself.
Hall (1996) defines future careers: “The career of 21st century will be protean, a career that is driven by the person, not the organization, and that will be reinvented by the person time to time, as the person and environment change”. Baruch (2006) describes that in essence “protean career is the contract within oneself, rather than between oneself and the organization.” This drastically changes how career is seen. Companies are no longer even pretending to offer stable employment but the development of employability (Baruch 2001). Briscoe and Hall (2006) combine the previously described three concepts of boundaryless career, psychological mobility and physical mobility with protean career. As a model for protean career they use two dimensions: value-driven and self-directed. The former means the extent of how much a person’s internal values guide his career and measure its success while the latter describes one’s ability to be adaptive in terms of performance and learning demands (Briscoe & Hall 2002). These two dimensions create four different prototypes for identifying different protean orientations. Persons who are not value-driven or self-directed are considered to be “dependent”. They cannot define priorities for themselves or behaviorally manage their own careers (Briscoe & Hall 2006). “Reactive” people are not value-driven, but are self-directed in their careers. These people might lack the sufficient perspective to guide their careers. If the person lacks self-direction, but has values guiding his actions, he is considered “rigid” and might not be able to fully shape their careers. The final option, the “protean” career, means a person has values to guide his career development and has the required self-direction. When combining “boundaryless career” and “protean career”, a total of 16 different combinations are formed. Out of these 16, Briscoe and Hall (2006) choose eight they think most likely to be encountered in the contemporary career context. Table 3 presents these chosen archetypes.
Table 3: Protean and boundaryless combinations (adapted from Briscoe & Hall 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Self-directed</th>
<th>Value-driven</th>
<th>Psychological mobility</th>
<th>Physical mobility</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost/Trapped</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reacts quickly to opportunities, survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortressed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Finds stable opportunities in predictable organizations that match values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanderer</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Continuously finds new rides to “hitch.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealist</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Find organizations that match values, curiosity, but does not require mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization man/woman</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Finds stable organizations in which basic performance competence can be demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid citizen</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Person-organization fit a must. Mobility a threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired gun/hired hand</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Identifies and responds to best opportunities to provide services across boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protean career architect</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Leverage capability into meaningful impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Career archetypes and motivators

By using these archetypes Segers et al. (2008) analyzed almost 14 000 answers given by employees from nine different countries and 18 different fields to gain an insight into what the motivators of each archetype are. They found that in the Scandinavian countries involved in their study (Denmark, Norway and Sweden) protean career architects were overrepresented. Scandinavia also scored relatively high in
individualism, which then downplayed to motivators related to physical mobility. If looking at industry sectors, protean career architects were dominating in marketing, government and the public sector, health and social work, consulting and science, and research. The telecommunications sector was observed to have more “hired gun/hired hand” archetypes. The Internet/new technology industries were dominated by “trapped/lost” individuals. High education was found to correlate with physical mobility, managing one’s own career and with psychological mobility. Educated people seemed to become managers as high self-directness leads to more development activities. They also seemed to have lower requirements for job security due to physical mobility. People with less than five years of work experience seemed to belong to a “curious/wanderer” archetype. This indicated, according to Segers et al. (2008), that people entering workforce are going through a trial and error phase at the beginning. Once they have a few years of experience, people seem to shift towards a “hired gun/hired hand” archetype as it was the most prominent group among people with 3-10 years of career experience and the age of under 40.

4.2.5. Conclusion
Career development responsibility can be seen as a pendulum that swings between the individual and corporations taking responsibility in turns. Currently, after the industrialization period when corporations were responsible of the careers, the pendulum is again moving towards individuals. This swing can be seen from how employees see their careers and what they value in them. In the core of the discussion is a psychological contract, which is the unilateral contract between the employee and the employer. It contains the reciprocity the employee expects from the employer for his contribution. Previously, employees expected that their hard work and dedication would be rewarded with things such as stable employment, climbing in the company hierarchy and getting a better salary while in today’s world the reward could be learning important skills, doing a shorter work week and spending more time with one’s family.

During current career period, employee behavior can be characterized with four different attributes seen in figure 8.
Sullivan and Arthur (2006) look at the willingness (psychological mobility) and ability (physical mobility) to be mobile in the career world: how employees cross the traditional organizational and career boundaries with their personal choices. Briscoe and Hall (2006) look at what drives a personal career. For them, contemporary career development requires two elements: personal values to guide the way and capabilities to adapt to changes. With these four elements combined, the person is truly “protean” and can navigate through the modern work life building a career best suited for him or her.

4.1 Trust

4.1.3 Trust in organizations

Mayer et al. (1995), in their seminal work on trust in organizations (cited 8618 times according to Google Scholar at the onset of writing this chapter), use the following definition of trust: “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party”. They also separate three factors that an individual uses to establish the trustworthiness of another party: ability, benevolence and integrity. Also the trustor’s propensity to trust affects the experienced trust. Figure 9 illustrates this model.
Perceived trustworthiness is a characteristic of the trustee. Ability is the domain ability of the trustee on the task at hand. Mayer et al. (1995) use the example of technical expertise on the domain ability, which is not transferable to e.g. interpersonal communication. Benevolence is the perception of positive orientation towards the trustor. It is the extent of how much the trustee wants to do good for the trustor, excluding personal gains. An example the researchers give is the relationship between a mentor and a protégé in which there is no need for the mentor to be helpful. Integrity is the perception of how well the trustee is following the principles the trustor finds acceptable. These three factors have different weight as the relationship between the trustor and the trustee develops. Mayer et al. argue that integrity is the most important factor during the early phase of the relationship as there is no experience from benevolence. Later on, as the relationship evolves and more experience of others’ behavior is gained, benevolence increases its importance.

Propensity to trust is affected by several factors, including developmental experiences, personality types and cultural background. In addition to the trustee’s and the trustor’s personal characteristics also the perceived risk affects if the trustor is willing to trust the trustee. There is no risk just in being willing to be vulnerable.

---

**Figure 9: Integrative model of organizational trust (adapted from Mayer et al. 1995)**
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Outcomes of risk taking
Once a person has actually assumed a risk on himself because of the actions the other party is taking the act of trusting happens. It is important to note that not all risk taking involves trust. Mayer et al. (1995) use an example of a farmer planting seeds. In this case a farmer takes a risk that a sufficient amount of rain will come and the growing season will go well. In this case there is no identifiable “another party” to be trusted and thus to be vulnerable on. Finally, the outcomes of the trust acts of trusting will update the perceptions of the trustee’s abilities of trustworthiness (Mayer et al. 1995).

Another widely cited study (3884 times according to Google Scholar at the onset of writing this chapter) on trust in an organizational setting is done by McAllister (1995). While the model of Mayer et al. (1995) does not make separation if the trustee is an organization or a person, McAllister’s model is focused on interpersonal trust in organizations and especially on how managers form trust with their peers. In the model, McAllister (1995) divides trust into two separate dimensions: cognition and affect based trusts. He argues that trust is cognition based as we choose who we trust and who we do not trust. At the same time, he understands that trust is also affective as people make emotional investments in their relationships and believe that these investments are reciprocated. These emotional links between individuals can form the affective basis of trust. In the model, cognition based trust is the result of three external and easily observable components (figure 10): peer reliable role performance, cultural-ethnic similarity and professional credentials. Affect based trust is the result of internal values of the trustee. These can be, according to McAllister (1995), observed from the citizenship behavior that the trustee expresses. Another important factor for affect based trust is frequent interaction as without interactions between the trustee and the trustor, there is no relationship where to bind the trust.
Affect and cognition based trust are also linked to each other. McAllister (1995) argues that once enough cognitive proof of trustworthiness regarding the trustee exists, the trustor can make attributions regarding the motivations of the trustee’s citizenship behavior. Once affective trust is formed it is not easily revoked and might remain even if the original cognitive basis is invalidated. According to McAllister (1995) it is important to note that this does not make affective trust a “higher level” of trust than cognitive trust. Both trusts are separate and have unique manners, antecedents and outcomes.

4.1.4 Trust antecedents
The first meta-analytical review on trust, its antecedents and outcomes was done by Dirks and Ferrin (2002). Their goal was to review the relationship of trust and other constructs used in leadership literature. They mainly used McAllister’s (1995) view on trust in their work, but added overall trust into it. According to McAllister (1995) interpersonal trust can be divided into two separate dimensions: cognitive and affective. Overall trust was added because many existing studies of those days were using only a single overall measure of trust.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) listed ten antecedents for trust (in order of magnitude):
1. Transformational leadership
2. Perceived organizational support (POS)
3. Interactional justice
4. Procedural justice
5. Distributive justice
6. Transactional leadership
7. Participative decision making
8. Unmet expectations
9. Propensity to trust
10. Length of relationship

Their findings were that transformational leadership style is more effective in trust creation than transactional style. The difference between transformational and transactional comes from what the leader and the follower offer each other (Burns 1978). Transformational leaders offer purpose that goes beyond short term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Transactional leaders focus on the exchange of resources. Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) describe this difference so that the followers of transformational leaders identify themselves to the needs of the leader, and transactional leaders and their followers exchange something that the other wants. Transformational leadership actually had the strongest relationship to trust out of the ten studied antecedents. Perceived organizational support had the second strongest relationship. This was followed by the three organizational justice concepts. Distributive justice (Adams 1965) is concerned about the fairness of resource distribution. Procedural justice is concerned about the fairness of the process which leads to outcomes (Leventhal et al. 1980). Interactional justice is concerned about the treatment of an individual when decisions are made and the way in which these decisions are communicated (Bies and Moag 1986). Interactional and procedural justices had a roughly equal relationship to trust, and distributive justice, being the third type, had a somewhat weaker relationship than the other two justice conceptions. Distributive justice was roughly equal in relationship to the previously mentioned transactional leadership. The three justice conceptions were followed by participative decision making and unmet expectations. Propensity to trust was seen as the weakest factor to have influence while the length of the relationship was found to have no appreciable relationship to trust.
Burke et al. (2007) conducted their own multi-level review and integration article regarding trust in an organization. Their study was mainly based on Mayer’s integrated model of organizational trust (1995), but was applied in a leadership context. Their main contribution to the discussion was adding team and organizational factors to trust antecedents. As a team factor they identified psychological safety. Their proposition regarding psychological safety was that it would moderate the relationship of antecedents of trust and trust in leadership. When an individual perceives strong psychological safety in the team, it will strengthen the relationship between leader characteristics and trust in leadership. Safety may also compensate some of the leader’s characteristics. As the relationship of a team leader and a team member does not exist in a vacuum, Burke et al. (2007) argue that also the organizational climate will affect trust. This organizational factor will moderate trust antecedents and trust in leadership. This moderation happens through organizational activities such as hiring procedures, compensations and trainings as well as how these organizational procedures are attached to the leader.

In addition to the previous comprehensive reviews there has been multiple other studies focusing on different antecedents of trust. Gilbert and Tang (1998) found, in an early study of theirs, that work group cohesion and communication were important antecedents of trust. This aligns with the review of Burke et al. (2007).

Tan and Tan (2000) argue that while trust in supervisor and trust in organization have a significant correlation they have different antecedents. According to their findings, trust in supervisor was positively correlated with the ability, benevolence and integrity of the supervisor. Trust in organization was correlated with procedural and distributive justice as well as with perceived organizational support. These findings regarding organizational trust are well aligned with the findings of Dirks and Ferrin (2002). Tan and Tan’s study also clearly shows how the model created by Mayer et al. (1995) can be utilized in a study regarding interpersonal trust.

Bijlsma and van de Bunt (2003) studied perceived managerial behaviors and the connection these have on trust. They found that managerial support, guidance, monitoring and openness were all important antecedents. Support was found to be the most significant antecedent and openness the least significant one. This complements the review of Dirks and Ferrin (2002) with new information.
Insecure future of the organization and employment can be seen to lead to distrust towards the organization (Kiefer 2005; Wong et al. 2005). Also inadequate working conditions and poor treatment are possible mistrust contributors (Kiefer 2005). Organizational factors, such as structure, HR policies, HR procedures and organizational culture, have been identified to positively affect employee perception of organizational trust (Whitner 1998).

Six (2007) has developed a “normative frame” in which interpersonal trust can be built in organizations. This normative frame includes four different elements:

1. Legitimate distrust situations must be removed through interest alignment arrangements.
2. Both individuals must regularly perform actions that convey positive relational signals.
3. Both individuals involved in a trouble situation must at least act in ways that are not perceived as negative relational signals.
4. Organizational policies must be put in place that stimulate frame resonance.

When this frame is in place, both parties in a trust building process will want to continue the relationship in the future creating a positive circle.

4.1.5 Trust outcomes
Tan and Tan (2000) found that the outcomes of organizational and supervisor trust are different. Trust in organization was found to correlate positively with commitment and negatively with turnover intention. Supervisor trust was found to correlate with innovative behavior and satisfaction with the supervisor.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) studied the outcomes of trust. They listed eleven different trust outcomes (in order of magnitude):

1. Job satisfaction
2. Organizational commitment
3. Intent to quit
4. Belief in information
5. Decision commitment
6. OCB – Conscientiousness
7. OCB – Courtesy
8. OCB – Sportsmanship
9. OCB – Altruism
10. Job performance
11. OCB – Civic virtue

The most significant relationship between trust and outcome was job satisfaction, followed by organizational commitment. The third in significance was intention to quit. Belief in the information provided by the leader was the fifth in significance and the last of the attitudinal outcomes was commitment to decisions. All the organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs in the list above) were found to have a relationship with trust. Job performance was located between altruism and civic virtue. In addition to the outcomes mentioned above, trust was also found to be correlated with satisfaction an employee feels towards his leader and the leader-member exchange. These findings regarding OCB have later been reproduced at least by de Gilder (2003), who found OCB being strongly and positively related to trust when examining core employees. In case of contingent employees, there was no such link. De Gilder (2003) also found that people who trust in an organization’s policies are less likely to exit and neglect.

Tyler (2003) argues that internal motivation is going to be increasingly important in the future and thus trust is an important research topic. According to him, trust can be seen as internally or socially generated social motives. He divides trust into “instrumental trust” and “social trust”. The Latter one he also calls “motive-based trust”. Of the meaning of this social trust he gives an example: “With a doctor... I cannot evaluate his or her competence, but I can make an inference about whether they are sincerely trying to do what is in my best interest.” His findings suggest that social trust has a strong influence on extra-role behaviors and attitudes.

Hopkins and Weathington (2006) studied trust and distributive and procedural justice concepts in an organization that went through a downsizing process. They found that trust mediated procedural justice and organizational satisfaction as well as affective commitment. In the case of distributive justice, trust mediated turnover intentions.
Paillé et al. (2010) studied the link between perceived organizational support, satisfaction and trust. They found that workplaces that encourage trust sustain the employees in their desire to co-operate, which in turn decreases the intention to leave. What they saw surprising was that, while perceived organizational support increased the organizational citizenship behavior to co-operate, it did not explain the employee intention to leave. As a possible explanation they speculated there might be a mediator that was not considered between the perceived organizational support and the intention to leave.

4.1.6 Faith
The concept of “faith” has received little or no research in an organizational context. The previously mentioned integrative model of organizational trust by Mayer et al. (1995) does not speak about it at all. McAllister (1995) uses faith as defined by Rempel et al. (1985) and acknowledges it has sociological foundations (Lewis & Weigert 1985). According to Lewis and Weigert, interpersonal trust can be divided into emotional and rational dimensions (table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationality</th>
<th>Emotionality</th>
<th>Virtually absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ideological trust</td>
<td>Rational prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Emotional trust</td>
<td>Mundane, routine trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtually absent</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>Fate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table, faith is seen as emotional trust that is virtually devoid of rationality. Rempel et al. (1985) used a somewhat similar and religious context for defining the word. Faith, or belief as it is seen in religion, goes beyond available evidence to accept the assumed truth. The argument that Rempel et al. (1985) make is that faith in personal relationship is similar. The hopes and dreams individuals invest in their relationships are not guaranteed to realize. Faith is a manifestation of emotional
security that allows individuals to go beyond the available evidence and be assured that their partner will be responsive and caring despite the missing cognitive proof (Rempel et al. 1985). While saying that faith goes above the evidence, Rempel et al. (1985) also note that past experiences with another person play a role in relationship. They use two additional elements in their definition of trust: predictability and dependability. These two are more connected with past experiences than faith, but are still distinctive from faith. Rempel et al. (1985) argue that faith is more connected to personal dynamics than predictability and dependability, such as personal security and self-esteem, which contribute to the extent to which a person is willing to take emotional risks in uncertain circumstances. Predictability and dependability are seen to reflect another person’s motives for caring that will foster confidence and emotional security (Rempel et al. 1985).

4.1.7 Conclusion
Based on the literature, trust in organization can be divided into two separate parts: organizational trust and interpersonal trust. Organizational trust in literature is heavily based on the theory by Mayer et al. (1995). While the theory can, and has been, used with interpersonal trust, many of the studies regarding interpersonal trust have foundations in the writings of McAllister (1995). It is also clear that trust in an organizational context has many antecedents and wide repercussions due to having direct effects on employee behavior or by acting as a mediator to other forces. One of these outcomes is the intention to leave as shown in figure 11.
In the literature faith has been seen as a certain type of trust - trust without a cognitive basis. This means faith only has the emotion dimension from Lewis and Weigert’s (1985) model and thus is closer to the affective trust McAllister (1995) describes. In figure 11 faith can be found inside the interpersonal and organizational trust box. Lewis and Weigert (1985) identified eight other trust types in their model, but those are not relevant for this thesis. Mayer et al. (1995) also expect that the trustee must be something clearly identifiable. This means that a person cannot have, for example, religious trust. He can only have religious faith as the trustee of religion cannot be clearly identified. In this thesis, faith will later be defined separately from trust.

4.3 Conclusion of literature review
At this point I think I have managed to collect enough information and clarification from the literature to continue building theory again. It is clear that the current discussion regarding trust’s influence on the intention to leave does not take into account how the concept of career has developed during the last few decades. These two discussions are currently separate. This is a significant flaw in the theory. The foundation of trust research is in the period when career concepts and the expectations that the employees had were completely different from today’s world. The trust discussion acknowledges that the trust an employee feels has a significant relationship with the intention to leave (Dirk & Ferris 2002). At the same time, career discussion clearly identifies that today’s workforce is physically and psychologically more mobile than ever before. What this increased mobility means for companies in relation to employees’ intention to leave is not taken into account...
in the discussion, it only describes that the employees are more capable and willing to change employers. The important question, “why people leave”, remains unanswered and hidden. Figure 12 illustrates this separation.

![Career discussion diagram](image)

**Figure 12: Current separation of career and trust discussions.**

In the next chapter I will argue and show that faith needs to be taken out of the trust discussion and moved to the career context. Once this is done it will harmonize these two discussions into one with the power to explain why people leave company.
5. FINALIZING THEORY

Finalizing the theory starts from describing the theoretical framework of the thesis. Usually this part is done at an earlier phase of the work, but as the methodology used has been classical grounded theory I have postponed defining the framework as late as possible. Before literature analysis I did not know where the empirical data was leading me and which journals would come relevant. Now that the literature review has been done, I have the tools for the framework. After describing the theoretical framework I will define certain key concepts used in this thesis. Once the concepts have been defined, I will bring more data into theory creation in the form of annual reports of the company in case. This is needed as it will supplement my theory with crucial data regarding the employee backgrounds and help me justify my findings. In the last part of this chapter I will use all previous material to rebuild my theory.

At this point of theory creation and grounded theory process, I have decided to disregard many of the earlier codes I made in the data familiarization phase. While they provided good ways to look at the data in the start of the data analysis I have now become fully committed to the path that I am following with career and trust. That being said, at this point, to be more consistent with the current organization theory, I need to adjust my terminology so that faith and trust switch places. Faith becomes the core category and is affected by trust categories.

5.1. Theoretical framework

This thesis has stable foundations in management and organization studies. As the goal of the study is to gain information on employees when they resign, it also looks for help from psychology and sociology. These two foundation sciences are used to gain insight into certain phenomena that affect how people behave. Using psychology and sociology is done to avoid existing management and organization research from contaminating the research under work. The reason for usage of foundation sciences is in the classical grounded theory research method. The idea of classical grounded theory is to develop theory from the real world instead of multiple generations of previous assumptions that build on top of each other (Walker & Myrick 2006).
5.2 Definitions

For trust I am inclined to use the same definition as Mayer et al. (1995): “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party”. It grasps both interpersonal and impersonal trust as it speaks only about “another party” without restricting it too much. The only required premise is that both parties need to be clearly identifiable. Being identifiable is needed to be object of actions. This allows trust to be seen as a relationship between the employee as a person and the employer as an organization.

In the literature faith was seen as a type of trust. For this thesis it is required that they to be separated. For the definition of faith I use same theological basis as Rempel et al. (1985). In this thesis faith is “the willingness of a person to be vulnerable on little or no evidence that the future will meet the expectations”. The difference can be clarified by using the same example of the farmer planting the seeds as given by Mayer et al. (1995). The Farmer does not “trust” that, in future, there will be rain (as there is no-one to be trusted), but instead he has “faith” that rain will come and the crop will grow as he has planned (weather forecasts lose accuracy when time distance grows, but for several years there has been enough rain during the growing season). By this definition the faith can also be affected by the historical evidence, but it is more based on the internal characteristics of the person having faith. Also it defines faith as something that only a person can have. This means that organizations cannot have faith. Individual managers can make decisions to be vulnerable based on their own risk taking capabilities, but the organizations itself does not have characteristics such as self-esteem and personal security that are required to make the “leap of faith”.

Career, in this thesis, follows the definition of protean career by Hall (1996): “The career of 21st century will be protean, a career that is driven by the person, not the organization, and that will be reinvented by the person time to time, as the person and environment change”. This definition separates the career of the employee from the current employer. From the employee point of view it makes no difference if the career continues in the current organization or in another one. For the employee, the
organization is just a tool for building one’s expertise to achieve the career he envisions, nothing else.

5.3 New data
As stated in the analysis chapter, the biggest problem with the theory was that an employee’s personal view of the future seemed to be the element that had the biggest impact on the decision to leave the company. Faith in the company or supervisors seemed to be the only moot point as many of the people were completely happy with the management and the company overall, but still decided to leave. This led me to look for information about how careers are seen in today’s work environment and now I need to compare this information with the employee base of the company. I think this comparison is mandatory as it is the foundation for my reasoning and arguments regarding faith. If the employees can be matched with highly mobile workforce of protean careers it can be argued that they are making the decision to leave the company from their personal, value based reasons regarding their careers. A key factor in the decision would be faith that this envisioned career will be fulfilled. If the person does not have faith that the envisioned career will happen in this company, he or she is willing to change the company.

As the employment ending interview transcripts do not contain information such as employee age, employment length or background education I had to rely on the annual reports to get the background of the people who were working in the company. Figure 13 shows the education distribution from the 2009 annual report.

![Education Distribution](image)

**Figure 13:** Education distribution in 2009 annual report
The report also told that the average employment duration was 2.76 years and the average age among the employees was 33.1 years. The annual report of 2010 had a bit different values. These can be seen from figure 14.

![Employment duration (years) and Education](image)

**Figure 14:** Employee information in 2010 annual report.

When comparing this employee data to a previously mentioned study by Segers *et al.* (2008) about protean careers and motivators, I think one can draw some conclusions. First, transcripts used as the data in this thesis are from sites located in Finland. I would argue that employees in Finland are quite close to the ones in Scandinavian countries, in which protean career architects were found to be overpopulated. This would imply that among employees “protean career architects” are relatively common. As the company operates in the B2B ITC subcontracting and consultancy sector, it suggests that many of the workers would be from “protean career architect”, “hired gun/hired hand” or “trapped/lost” archetypes, based on the study of Segers *et al.* (2008). The workers have a high level of education and this would suggest high psychological and physical mobility according to Segers *et al.* (2008). While annual reports do not tell us what the total length of work history among employees is, it will tell how many years the employees have been in the company. When this number is compared to the age and the education background of the employees, it would suggest that people have some years of work experience. I would claim that most of them have less than five years of work experience or to follow the classification by Segres *et al.* (2008), 3-10 years of work experience at the most. The Former were found to be dominated by the “curious/wanderer” archetype and the latter by the “hired gun/hired hand”. What all of these archetypes have in common (except “trapped/lost”) is that they show high psychological and/or physical mobility.
Based on the above reasoning I think it is safe to assume that the employees of the company are the ones with high psychological and physical mobility. They have matching characteristics such as the field they work in, length of career, education and geographical location. As a conclusion I can say that the employees of the company are mostly interested in pursuing careers of their own visions regardless of external situations.

5.4 Rebuilding theory

Based on the concepts of trust, faith and career, my findings on protean careers and the empirical data found in employment ending transcripts as well as in annual reports, I am ready to compose theory. Psychologically and physically mobile “protean career architects” or “hired gun/hired hand” archetype representatives create their vision of career according to the protean career definition. For them, employers are only tools to reach this future and they are mobile to change their employer if they feel that the current one is not the right one for their career needs. In the core of the theory is faith. It works in the career context. The trust the employee feels in the organization can affect the faith that the person has for his career fulfillment. In the case that the employer is capable of fulfilling the envisioned career of the employee, but trust is not the defining factor in the decision to leave. Figure 15 visualizes the theory.
Figure 15: Faith as crucial component in intention to leave.

The Arrows represent the influence of each component in the theory. There are two “lines of effect” in the decision to leave company that can be followed. The First line of effect comes from the envisioned career. This envisioned career is something that the employee has created for himself that might be separate from the current employer. From the career point of view, employers are just tools for achieving envisioned career. Another line of influence starts from trust antecedents. These antecedents build up the trust that the employee feels towards the current employee. After this point in figure 15, the line of effect goes from the organization context to the career context. Organization and career can overlap if the employee’s envisioned career can be fulfilled in the current organization, but faith cannot exist in the organization alone without the career context. Purely in the organizational context the employee expectations are aimed towards organization and are trust as defined by Mayer (1995), not faith. If the career and organization overlap, trust can affect the faith that the employee has for his career fulfillment. By being trustworthy, the employer can enhance the employee’s faith that the envisioned career will be fulfilled in the current organization. This career context gives the subjective base and the explanatory power to the faith. If the employee, for example, envisions himself in a good managerial position, he might or might not have faith that it is possible with the current employer. This decision depends on how much he trusts his supervisor or company practices to give him such opportunities. On the other hand, the employee might believe that, while he does not trust that his supervisor is wise
enough or that the practices are in place to give him the opportunities for career progression, he is still good enough to draw attention and he will still get his chances to develop career. Another example would be an employee who decides to leave company to work in a different field even though he trusts supervisors and the company. In this case, the employee trusts the company, but does not have faith that his aspirations about working on something completely different could be fulfilled inside the current organization. The career shown in figure 15 contains the mobility characteristics of the protean career architects and hired hand/hired gun archetypes. This means that the model visualizes the intention to leave process of individuals who have high mobility.

Before literature review my original theory could not provide an explanation for the behavior found in the interview transcripts. The message was highly mixed. It was not a surprise that people who did not trust the management or the ones who had their salary increases forgotten decided to leave, but many of the transcripts showed that the people resigning were happy with the company and even felt sorry about leaving. Now, due to the new theory, the employees’ decisions to leave company are logical. The theory created can easily be reflected against the empirical material:

**The Trust antecedent** examples given here are the antecedents listed by Dirk and Ferrin (2002) in their meta-analytical review on trust. The reason for choosing this particular set of antecedents is the fact that it was the first trust review done up to that date. It has been later supplemented by newer findings, but it will still provide a good set of well-founded and established antecedents. Table 5 summarizes the findings from the transcripts. As the interviews are not designed to measure trust antecedents the examples are my interpretations on what could contribute towards each of the antecedent.
Table 5: Example comments from transcripts on trust antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Has been excellent, the superior has had a very good knowledge of how things are done. Sometimes had a feeling that the superior already knows what is the end results when giving, e.g. an action point. The supervisor has changed often (four supervisors in a three year period) and thus no good relationship could be formed between the superior and the subordinate (each development discussion were held by a different supervisor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived organizational support</td>
<td>According to [employee] the manager always “nodded and showed understanding of his arguments about the project” but then the actions of the management were not in line with this. I can only speak about my own site, but this is a very warmhearted and easy going work community, which provides interesting assignments. [Company] treats people in a more flexible and courteous way than an average company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td>The supervisor would have needed training in her social skills and in how to encounter different kinds of people. I would have hoped a little different touch on how to handle things. Should have focused more in equal information flow. The superior work and leading has always been ok or even great (own supervisor and site manager). Leading has always been in shape and especially how the employees are respected and admired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td>There have been ongoing challenging times in the company and at a personal level, but the co-operation has always worked very well from the employee’s point of view. The vision is that an employee is taken care of and he/she is always respected. The anchor feeling. Old [acquired company] people have managed to get hold of all the key positions and thus have blocked others outside. They have been doing a good job, but it still gives bad insider taste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional justice</td>
<td>Lot of mistrust towards the top management, organizational changes, constant co-operative negotiations and cutting of benefits, but then the top management gets a better reward system. People have been treated equally and in an upright manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative decision making</td>
<td>Communication is often too abstract. In site meetings we go through too high level a strategy and there is no site management’s point of view on things. On the positive side, things have been going forward and we have persistently pushed them forward. Getting people to work more together is desirable. The supervisor has been interested in [the employees’] opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet expectations</td>
<td>Salary increase was already agreed with the supervisor and communicated with the site manager, but it was later on forgotten. Nothing to complain. Everything has been handled well and done as agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to trust</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the examples above could be applied to several antecedents, such as comments about changing supervisors. A frequently changing supervisor will hamper all supervisory work as the relationship between the employee and the supervisor is constantly changing. The last item, propensity to trust, is a personality
trait of the individual and it is impossible to evaluate from the transcripts. It is clear that the trust antecedent results are mixed and have individual variation how well antecedent have been fulfilled. There were employees who were happy about how things were handled, which provided no hints that there was infraction in their founding of trust. At the same time other employees strongly expressed that the antecedent was not met.

**Trust** contains both interpersonal and impersonal trust. The trust an employee feels has multiple antecedents in the organization as we have seen in the literature review. As already described, it is easy to draw conclusions about trust towards both directions (people who trust / people who do not trust). What was common to all these people was that they decided to leave the company regardless of their experienced trust.

**Envisioned career** is the vision that a person has for his career. This may include working with certain technologies, a good enough salary, working in a high profile company, an important position or even a completely different field of work. In the transcripts former employees described different reasons for why they decided to leave the company. There were people who wanted to work in a bigger multinational company or a company with a better profile:

```
“Had a long-time dream of working for a truly international and prestige company like [new employer].”

“A New contract with a high profile international 3D graphics company – looking for a new job as the current assignment was not challenging enough or development oriented.”
```

Some felt that they had more to contribute, but could not see how that would be possible. The way I interpret this is that leaving the company was, for these people, the only way to get this more influential position:

```
“[Employee] has the capacity to take on bigger challenges, and we were unable to present a clear roadmap of how the company could offer him that. He is moving on to utilize his full potential.”

“More interesting responsibilities and significantly better salary (+25%).”

“[Employee] had ambitions to participate more to developing us as a company. If she would have got a chance as a group manager, she probably would not have left the company now.”
```
Many of the interviewed personnel expressed that they were pursuing their dream career:

“Got a job in the game industry, which has been his dream.”

“[Employee] has been in the company for a long time, but now a friend made an offer he couldn't resist. Liked working for us, but the 3D business was more interesting.”

There were even people who decided to take the entrepreneurial step:

“[Employee] left to work with Android and to be a partner in a new startup company.”

People were leaving to see the world:

“Additionally [employee] has previously hoped (not during his career in [company]) to move to central Europe, closer to the Alps. Now it is possible.”

Some people decided to change out from the mobile business, but still felt like continuing in technological work:

“Also [employee] wanted to get out of the Mobile Handset business. Previously [employee] was in another company for 9 years and in total has about 10 years of S60 mobile design, test and integration experience… He felt that it was time to find work in a new industry sector in Finland.”

“[Employee] feels that the IT sector doesn't really suit her, and that is the reason why she decided to apply to a completely new field. Plans to move to another city have also contributed towards the resignation. She wants to get distance to her/the previous work, the whole IT sector and Helsinki. Yearns for a change.”

Finally, there were people who had decided to leave the business sector for good and head towards a completely different career:

“Moves to Joensuu to study theology.”

“Understandable decision. [Employee] has been on a study leave studying business administration for long and now wants to change to a corresponding field.”

As shown above, the employees did not use the term “career” themselves when describing what they were after when they decided to leave. They only gave descriptions of what they wanted to do. This is well aligned with the boundaryless and protean career concepts according to which employees create their careers
independently of the current employer and career contains things such as rejection of career development for family reasons. This means that the concept of career is interpreted much more widely than in the traditional organization focused career. It can be seen as a strong message that the employees are mobile and do not see their future in one organization only building traditional career progression. In some cases, such as the one in which the person wanted to go to work in an international high profile company, the decision to leave could be interpreted to be motivated by a desire to obtain a more “traditional career”. Still, the person made the decision to leave to get this “traditional career”, thus showing a strong personal vision of career development.

**Faith**, the key concept in this theory, is a unilateral belief or hope that the future will be as expected. It exists in the career context and represents the hopes and believes that the career a person envisions for himself will come true. When combined with the organization in which the person is working, it determines the employees’ intention to leave the company. As shown in figure 15, faith can be affected by the trust an employee feels, but it is still separate from it. This means a person can have strong trust towards the company, peers and supervisors but still not have faith that the current company is the one that is able to provide him the career he is envisioning. There may be multiple reasons for this. The career he envisions may be, for example, in a completely different field. In the transcript examples of envisioned careers there was a person who left the company to study theology as it was his dream. Another one wanted to see the Alps. I do not think there is anything the company could have done to provide these employees faith in their envisioned careers while keeping them employed. A company can only strengthen trust in things that are in its power to provide. An envisioned career as theologian is not something that an ICT company can give nor it is feasible to believe a company will set up a site in the Alps just because one of the workers wants to live closer to them. This clearly indicates that faith works inside the career context, not in the organization context.

As seen in the step-by-step example taken from the transcripts, faith in envisioned career fulfillment acts as crucial component in the decision to leave. Trust, while it has a strong relationship with the intention to leave, both directly and through mediating distributive justice and turnover intentions, is not the one that drives
people to change company. This is a significant finding as it changes the dynamics between the employee and the employer. For the organization it is no longer a question about what the organizational actions should be to reduce the intention to leave, but to understand that an employee is an acting subject who has his own career dreams and who is willing to act based on these dreams. If the company wants to have a long lasting relationship with the employee it needs to understand and know what kind of a career the employee wants. The fact is that the employee of the future will build the career he wants for himself. The company just needs to adjust itself if it wants to be part of this career.
6. CONCLUSION

This thesis is based on roughly 300 employment ending transcripts of ICT subcontracting company. From those 300 transcripts the ones containing interviews of resigned people were chosen for closer examination. In the analysis it was found that employees describe lack of faith towards the company, the supervisors and oneself. Faith in oneself seemed to be the most dominant one of the three. People were giving positive comments about the company and the supervisors, but still decided to leave. This led to combine findings of the empirical data in transcripts with current career discussion to create theory and model with explanatory power.

The new model introduced in figure 15 makes the individual stories found in the transcripts understandable and logical. There are no more gaps or inconsistencies in why people decided to leave even though many of them said only positive things about the company. The model adds faith inside career context where it acts as a crucial component in the decision to leave. The clarity of the explanation comes from the protean career concept combined with faith that the employees feel towards the fulfillment of their envisioned career. Introducing faith as a new concept, separated from trust, gives faith new explanatory power. One of the contributions of this thesis is the way it suggests how faith works over temporal dimension between individual and non-concrete abstract image of future, thus giving it strong subjective basis. This subjective nature cannot be seen if employees are being observed from an organizational or a third party point of view as is done in current trust discussion. Therefore, faith should not be considered only as a trust without cognitive basis. The concept of faith also acts as the needed link between the trust and career discussions. Thus, the answer to the research question is:

Faith in one’s envisioned career acts as a crucial component between trust and the decision to leave in ICT subcontracting and consultancy company, based on employment ending interview transcripts.

This thesis has several managerial implications. In the future, personal career will be increasingly important as the western world moves towards knowledge intensive creative industries. According to current career literature, these fields are heavily populated with high mobility and employees who have strong values as well as capabilities and abilities to change if needed. This means that the employers of the future need to be more and more interested in what the dreams and goals of their
employees are. They need to understand that, in many ways, the tables have turned. It is no longer the employees who are competing for employers, but the employers who are competing to get the best employees for themselves. To gain these highly sought individuals, employers need to become partners with their employees on the journey towards envisioned career. It is sometimes clear from the beginning that the paths will go separate ways at some point, but with co-operation between the employer and the employee, this period of partnership can be truly beneficial for both. Both parties just need to be on the same page regarding the needs of one another and the capabilities of reciprocity.

As said in chapter 2.1.2 classical grounded theory does not provide a detailed description of the research process. It only gives four steps that can be used to evaluate the theory created: fit, understandability, generalizability and control. The fit of classical grounded theory for studying employment ending interview transcripts was well founded. The area is well known, but the findings are often mixed. This means that a research method with capability to create a theory with explanatory power was needed. As I have done my best to explain all the organizational terminology, I believe that this theory is understandable to non-professionals. As the concepts of trust, faith and career are abstract it makes the theory somewhat complicated, but I trust a layman can read it and gain needed understanding on how careers are seen in today’s world, how trust is formed inside organizations and what the outcomes of trust are as well as how career and trust are linked together. Generalizability is always a difficult question for qualitative research as the goal is not to make theories that can be generalized outside the empirical material used in the theory creation. That being said, the findings of this thesis can be generalized to both career and trust discussions. Findings will complement each discussion with an insight into an employee’s intention to leave as well as provide a link between the two separate discussions. The last of the four steps of evaluation is the control the created theory gives to the user over the time. I have done my best to keep my grounded theory process as transparent as possible to the reader from the choosing of the method to the final findings. This gives the thesis the needed internal reliability and validity. As such I would like to assess that the theory, while possibly non-generalizable to wider population, should be taken into account when considering
employees in the fields or backgrounds that fulfill the characteristics of protean career architects and hired gun/hired hand.

The study is not without limitations. First, it is important to note that I made multiple decisions to focus on certain areas during the research process. There were a lot of topics that could have been studied using the empirical material. For example, the time period from which the transcripts were taken could provide an interesting research topic. The world was heading to global recession and that can surely be somehow seen in the transcripts. This kind of temporal study could be combined with the geographical sites of the company. I am sure there would be important findings to be made. The material could have also been used to analyze the influence of the supervisor in the decision to leave as all the interview transcripts contained the supervisor information. The empirical material itself provided some limitations to the study. The study was conducted in a narrow field: the ICT subcontracting and consultancy sector. It would be interesting to see how the concept of faith would emerge in different fields as I assume it was now dependable on the high psychological and physical mobility of the employees working in the ICT sector. Also, the thesis was written based on the employment ending transcripts of one company. I wonder if the conclusions remained the same if the company had been different. It would also be interesting to interview those people who have decided to stay in the company. If the lack of faith in career fulfillment has been the trigger for leaving the company, I would assume that people still working in the company continue to have faith in their career future.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Template used in employment ending interview

1. Common
Unit / Site:
Employee’s name and ID-number:
Superior:

2. Employment
Starting date of employment:
Tasks in the beginning of employment:
Ending date of employment:
Tasks in the end of employment:
Reason of ending the employment:
New employer (new job):

3. Employee’s experiences
- in work assignments (what’s good / what needs to be improved):
- in colleagues (what’s good / what needs to be improved):
- in superior work (what’s good / what needs to be improved):
- in Company as an employer (what’s good / what needs to be improved):

4. Company
If someone asked you to tell him/her about Company, what would you tell him/her:

5. Comments of Superior
Superiors view on leaving and the reasons for leaving:

6. Feedback
Go through the feedback in personal discussion forms (feedback from/to superior).
Ask him or her to return the parking card.

Wish the leaving employee good luck in his/her new job!
Appendix 2: Template used in employment ending interview

1. Common
   Employee’s name:
   Superior:
   Unit / Site:

2. Employment
   Starting date of employment:
   Ending date of employment:
   Job description:
   Reason of ending the employment:
   New employer (new job):

3. Employee’s feedback
   a) about task
   b) about colleagues
   c) about working environment
   d) about superior work
   e) about Company as an employer

4. What would employee tell about Company if someone would ask opinion?

5. Additional information

Superior fills in
View of reasons why employee is leaving the company: