Review of: "Employee Development and Turnover Intention: A Meta-Analytical Review"

Navya Kumar

Abstract

- To include one or two key findings and novelty of this research

1. Introduction

- Introduction should include researchers' motivations for undertaking this study in the first place, set a context/story to pull in the reader, convince why this study is important and relevant 'now'
- Define what you mean by "employee development" and "turnover intention"
- Segment does not speak to turnover intention sufficiently and how it is linked with employee development

2. Concepts of This Study and Turnover Intention

- The intent of this segment is not clear. Is the paragraph developing a model? Are these hypotheses?

3. Methodology

- The study claims to use PRISMA, so please demonstrate the step-wise filtering and rejection/acceptance criteria. With 3 large databases, only 23 'suitable' studies remained. Does not sound credible. What is meant by 'suitable'? Keywords are so broad that across Scopus, Web of Science, and ProQuest, the researchers are sure to have pulled tens of thousands of papers. How did they narrow to 23? There is no time bound, no other explanation. Simply stating "criteria of Zangaro and Soeken (2007)" is insufficient. Please see the details Zangaro and Soeken (2007) actually shares and replicate. Their sources and intents were entirely different; hence, simply stating that paper does not help.
- What are these 23 papers? What were their samples? What were their findings?
- Where is the description of the analysis process? How were results from 23 diverse studies unified? Since Zangaro and Soeken (2007) is cited, please refer to their Data Analysis section. Were similar steps followed? If so, state them.

4. Findings

- How is training & development different from competence development, from professional development, etc.? It is unclear these are not overlapping concepts.

5. Discussion

- Not sufficiently detailed. How do the findings match up to expectations (there were no hypotheses)? How do they match up to what's been noted in most other papers?
- Should discuss the impact of each antecedent.

6. Conclusion and Implications

- Implications should be a separate segment devoted to practice/managerial implications of study findings--the "so what" of the study. Flesh out more on what managers could do around enabling employee development and ensuring employees "feel" they are developing. Many of the research results involve employees 'feeling' they are getting/not getting something, not whether the organization is actually giving it.
- Flesh out more on how managers should better convey developmental feedback--only stating it won't make people quit can give the impression there is no nuance to feedback delivery. Developmental feedback encompasses negative feedback as well, which needs to be handled with sensitivity.
- Research limitations and future scope not covered. Should be included along with a separate Conclusion.

Overall

- Where is the literature review that shows the gap--that this area chosen by the researchers indeed needed additional/directionally different investigation?
- Include fresher research--3 to 5 years old; old citations--unless seminal--make one wonder if the field is no longer attractive and active or if the researchers are not up-to-date.