Stallion Journal for Multidisciplinary Associated Research Studies
ISSN (Online): 2583-3340
Volume-5 Issue-4 || August 2026 || PP. 112-115 https://doi.org/10.55544/sjmars.5.4.14

Knowledge Retention During Employee Turnover: Protecting Organisational Memory and Operational Continuity

Dr. Stanley A. V. Paul[1]; Snr., Dr. Stanley A. V. Paul[2]; Jr., Dr. Andre Martin[3], Dr. Justin Joseph[4], Dr. Kobina Akim Wilson[5] and Dr. Genève Phillip-Durham[6]
[1,2,3,4,5,6]Professor, University of Excellence, Management and Business (U.E.M.B.), Georgetown, GUYANA

[1]Corresponding Author: principal@uemb.edu.gy

www.sjmars.com || Vol. 5 No. 4 (2026): August Issue

Date of Submission: 16-08-2026	**Date of Acceptance:** 23-08-2026	**Date of Publication:** 30-08-2026

ABSTRACT

Employee turnover threatens operational continuity when organisations lose the ability to interpret records, exercise experienced judgement or coordinate activities previously sustained by particular individuals. Retaining documents alone does not resolve this problem. This conceptual article draws on scholarship concerning organisational routines, public-sector innovation, frontline learning and workforce turnover to distinguish stored information from usable organisational memory. It proposes a risk-based retention framework organised around critical tasks, knowledge concentration, transfer mechanisms and demonstrated successor capability. The analysis examines procedural, interpretive, relational and historical knowledge, explaining why each requires different preservation practices. It also considers the danger of retaining obsolete routines and the ethical limits of extracting knowledge from departing employees. The article argues that retention should be evaluated through the organisation's ability to perform and adapt after a departure, rather than through the volume of material collected. Practical implications are developed for managers responsible for continuity in resource-constrained organisations.

Keywords- knowledge retention; employee turnover; organisational memory; operational continuity; routines; knowledge transfer.

I. INTRODUCTION

An organisation may retain every file associated with a departing employee and still lose essential knowledge. Colleagues can locate the record but not understand why a decision was made, recognise when a procedure requires adaptation or identify the person who can resolve an unusual problem. The departure exposes a difference between possessing information and retaining the capacity to use it. This problem is particularly significant where a small number of employees perform specialised functions. A university administrator may understand the exceptions embedded in a records process. A business employee may recognise early signs of supplier difficulty. A manager may know why a previous operational reform failed. These examples describe different forms of dependence, none of which can be adequately assessed by counting documents. The article's central argument is that knowledge retention should be organised around continuity of capability. The relevant question is what the organisation must still be able to do after an individual leaves. This orientation makes retention selective, practical and testable. It also distinguishes the present analysis from broader discussions of national migration or labour-market shortages: the focus is the internal preservation of task capability during organisational turnover.

II. CONCEPTUAL APPROACH AND LITERATURE

The analysis uses seven scholarly articles selected for their relevance to routines, knowledge institutionalisation, knowledge sharing and workforce transitions. Becker (2004) reviews the concept of organisational routines and identifies

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

Stallion Journal for Multidisciplinary Associated Research Studies
ISSN (Online): 2583-3340
Volume-5 Issue-4 || August 2026 || PP. 112-115 https://doi.org/10.55544/sjmars.5.4.14

ambiguities in its use. Ferguson and Blackman (2019) examine how innovative practices become organisational knowledge in a public-sector case. Hartmann and Hartmann (2020) propose ways to capture frontline innovation during a crisis. Hong (2025) analyses organisational memory and turnover in the United States federal information-technology workforce. These contributions provide different forms of evidence. Hong's study concerns a specific administrative and technological setting; the public-sector case does not establish universal effects; and the frontline innovation paper develops a conceptual argument. The present manuscript is therefore a conceptual synthesis, not a systematic review or a report of a tested retention intervention. Organisational memory is defined here as the retained capacity to retrieve and interpret experience for present action. This working definition includes records, routines, relationships and shared understanding. It excludes the assumption that everything remembered should continue to govern practice. Effective memory must support informed adaptation as well as continuity.

III. FOUR FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE AT RISK

Procedural knowledge concerns how recurring work is completed. It includes sequences, decision points, required inputs and responsibility for exceptions. Written procedures can preserve part of this knowledge, especially when the task is stable and the instructions reflect actual practice. Their value declines when they describe an ideal process that employees routinely bypass. Interpretive knowledge concerns recognising what a situation means. An experienced employee may notice that a familiar discrepancy indicates a deeper problem, or know when an apparently routine request requires escalation. Such judgement is difficult to capture through a sequence of steps alone. Examples, contrasting cases and explanations of decision criteria may be more useful than increasingly elaborate instructions. Relational knowledge concerns access to people and the ability to coordinate with them. A contact list records names but may omit who has relevant expertise, which relationships require careful handling and how responsibilities interact. Transfer therefore requires introductions, clarification of roles and opportunities to build working relationships, rather than merely handing over a directory. Historical knowledge concerns why current arrangements exist. A system may contain safeguards introduced after a previous failure, compromises shaped by external constraints or practices retained through habit. Without that history, a successor may repeat an unsuccessful change or preserve a procedure whose original justification has disappeared. These categories are analytical distinctions rather than isolated compartments. A complex task usually combines all four. Mapping them helps managers choose a retention method appropriate to the capability at risk instead of assuming that one repository can preserve every form of knowledge.

IV. DIAGNOSING CRITICAL DEPENDENCIES

Retention should begin with the organisation's important activities. Managers can identify tasks whose interruption would materially affect service, compliance, financial control or institutional credibility. They should then ask who can perform each task independently, where relevant knowledge resides and how difficult replacement would be. A simple risk judgement can consider three dimensions: the consequence of losing the capability, the concentration of knowledge and the time needed to restore competence. These dimensions should inform discussion rather than be combined into a falsely precise numerical score. A rarely performed task can be critical if failure has serious consequences and only one person understands it. The diagnosis should include dependencies concealed by job titles. An employee may provide informal support across several departments without that contribution appearing in the formal role description. Interviews with colleagues and observation of recurring requests can reveal such work. Managers should remain alert to the possibility that visible seniority and actual knowledge concentration differ. Hong (2025) finds that centralised authority and task standardisation moderate the relationship between turnover and project delays in federal information-technology work. The study supports attention to organisational structures that retain task knowledge. It does not imply that centralisation is always preferable. The practical question is which structures preserve capability in a particular setting and what costs they introduce. Dependency analysis should begin before an employee announces departure. AlKaabi and Davies (2022) examined early-retirement intentions in a Middle Eastern policing organisation and identified relationships involving work, family imbalance and limited support for workplace stress. The outcome studied was intention, which should not be equated with actual retirement. Their evidence nonetheless connects knowledge continuity to workforce conditions. Managers can use that insight to examine avoidable pressures, plan overlap for vulnerable roles and offer support without treating an individual's age or personal circumstances as a deterministic forecast.

V. MATCHING RETENTION METHODS TO KNOWLEDGE

For recurring procedures, a concise task guide should identify purpose, inputs, steps, common exceptions and escalation routes. The guide should be tested by someone other than its author. If a competent colleague cannot complete the task using the guide and available resources, the document has not yet demonstrated its practical adequacy. For interpretive knowledge, structured case discussion can reveal reasoning. A departing specialist can explain a difficult example, identify the cues that mattered and compare it with a superficially similar case requiring a different response. Recording the distinction

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

Stallion Journal for Multidisciplinary Associated Research Studies
ISSN (Online): 2583-3340
Volume-5 Issue-4 || August 2026 || PP. 112-115 https://doi.org/10.55544/sjmars.5.4.14

is often more valuable than recording a long description of everything the specialist knows. For relational knowledge, overlap and joint work are important. A successor can participate in relevant meetings, observe how commitments are negotiated and gradually assume responsibility. The objective is not to reproduce the predecessor's personality. It is to establish the relationships and role understanding needed for legitimate coordination. For historical knowledge, a decision record should explain the problem, alternatives considered, reasons for the choice and conditions under which it should be reviewed. Such a record protects context without requiring an exhaustive institutional history. It also makes future change easier because a successor can distinguish an essential safeguard from a contingent arrangement.

Becker's (2004) review cautions that routines are conceptualised in different ways. This matters operationally because a written rule and a pattern of enacted coordination are not necessarily equivalent. A retention programme should inspect how work is actually accomplished before deciding what must be documented or taught. The relationship network through which knowledge moves also requires attention. Scheuer et al. (2023), combining network analysis and interviews in a Canadian long-term-care facility, found that decentralised leadership could support knowledge sharing, with effects contingent on relationship quality and status hierarchies. This evidence concerns a particular healthcare setting. Its analytical contribution here is to make access to knowledgeable colleagues visible. A retention plan should identify who can interpret a record, demonstrate an exception or connect a new employee to expertise, as well as where the record is stored.

VI. TRANSFER REQUIRES DEMONSTRATED USE

Knowledge transfer should not be declared complete when a handover meeting occurs. Attendance establishes exposure, not capability. A more credible standard is whether the recipient can perform the relevant activity, explain important decisions and recognise when assistance is required. The test should be proportionate to the task and avoid creating unnecessary operational risk.

A staged transfer can begin with observation, proceed to supported performance and end with independent execution under review. For an irregular task, a realistic scenario can provide evidence of understanding. The outgoing employee and successor can then identify gaps while correction remains possible. This sequence turns handover into a learning process rather than a ceremonial exchange of files. Ferguson and Blackman (2019) identify the importance of a supportive setting, trust and practices that cross organisational boundaries in their public-sector case. Their findings suggest that knowledge institutionalisation depends on relationships and managerial conditions as well as formal systems. The implication developed here is that employees need time and permission to teach, ask questions and expose uncertainty. Managers should also distinguish the recipient's learning needs from the departing employee's explanatory habits. An expert may compress several judgements into an apparently simple instruction. Asking the recipient to demonstrate the task reveals assumptions that the expert no longer notices. The resulting clarification can improve the process for future employees as well.

VII. PRESERVING ADAPTATION AND AVOIDING OBSOLETE PRACTICE

Retention can become counterproductive when organisations preserve practices without examining their continuing value. A procedure may have been appropriate under a previous system, customer base or regulatory arrangement. Copying it faithfully can reproduce the original conditions of error rather than preserve useful expertise. Every important knowledge item should therefore carry enough context to support review. A task guide can identify when it was last checked, who owns it and which changes would require revision. A decision record can distinguish enduring principles from assumptions that may no longer hold. These modest controls make memory revisable. Hartmann and Hartmann (2020) discuss the opportunity to capture frontline innovation made visible during crisis conditions. Their argument highlights the possibility that useful practices disappear when extraordinary circumstances recede. The corresponding challenge is to determine which innovations remain valuable once normal conditions return. Preservation should include evaluation, not automatic institutionalisation. New employees also bring knowledge that can challenge inherited assumptions. A retention programme should invite questions about why work is organised in a particular way. The goal is informed continuity: successors understand the reasons behind existing practice well enough to preserve, adapt or replace it responsibly.

VIII. INCENTIVES, ETHICS AND RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS

Employees may hesitate to share knowledge if expertise provides job security, status or influence. A retention programme cannot resolve this tension through moral exhortation alone. Managers should recognise teaching and documentation as legitimate work, allocate time and avoid penalising employees for the temporary reduction in output that transfer may require. The organisation also has responsibilities towards departing staff. Retention should occur within appropriate employment arrangements, confidentiality obligations and respect for personal information. Managers should not assume unlimited access after departure or treat privately held professional relationships as organisational property. Where continued assistance is needed, its terms should be agreed clearly. Resource constraints require prioritisation. A small organisation may not need an elaborate knowledge platform. It may gain more from tested task guides, shared access to

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

essential records and a modest amount of planned overlap. Technology should solve an identified retrieval or coordination problem rather than become a substitute for deciding what knowledge matters. Access controls remain important. Making information available to successors does not justify indiscriminate disclosure of confidential employee, student or client records. Retention design should preserve the information needed for legitimate work while maintaining appropriate boundaries. Operational continuity and responsible information management should be addressed together. Matošková (2024) examined high-commitment human-resource practices and knowledge sharing through a cross-sectional survey of 480 permanent employees. The reported relationship supports examining recruitment, autonomy, development and performance practices together. Because cross-sectional associations cannot by themselves establish causation, the study should not be read as a guarantee that a particular incentive will preserve expertise. For the present framework, the implication is organisational coherence: staff need time, recognition and appropriate opportunities to share knowledge throughout employment, rather than an urgent documentation request at departure.

IX. EVALUATION AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

The most useful measures concern performance after transfer. Managers can examine whether critical tasks continue, whether errors or delays increase and whether successors can resolve ordinary exceptions. Document counts and training hours provide evidence of activity but cannot establish successful retention. Evaluation should distinguish knowledge loss from other causes of disruption. A successor may understand the task but lack authority, staffing or access to necessary systems. Attributing every post-departure problem to inadequate handover would obscure these organisational failures. A review should therefore examine capability, resources and decision rights separately. Future research could compare documentation-only approaches with guided practice, investigate which forms of knowledge are most vulnerable in small organisations and examine how overlapping departures affect coordination. Longitudinal observation would be particularly useful because an apparently successful handover may fail only when an unusual case arises months later.

X. CONCLUSION

Knowledge retention is successful when an organisation can continue important work and adapt intelligently after employees leave. Achieving that outcome requires identifying critical dependencies, distinguishing forms of knowledge, selecting appropriate transfer methods and testing the recipient's ability to use what has been retained. Records, relationships and routines all matter, but none is sufficient alone. A capability-based approach protects continuity while preserving the possibility of learning from new employees and changing circumstances.

REFERENCES

[1] AlKaabi, F. A. M., & Davies, A. (2022). Future-proofing organizational knowledge management and human resourcing: Identifying early retirement predictors in a modern police force. Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 16(4), 676-695. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paac005

[2] Becker, M. C. (2004). Organizational routines: A review of the literature. Industrial and Corporate Change, 13(4), 643-678. https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dth026

[3] Ferguson, S., & Blackman, D. (2019). Translating innovative practices into organizational knowledge in the public sector: A case study. Journal of Management & Organization, 25(1), 42-57. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2017.25

[4] Hartmann, M. R. K., & Hartmann, R. K. (2020). Frontline innovation in times of crisis: Learning from the Corona Virus pandemic. Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice, 14(4), 1092-1103. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paaa044

[5] Hong, J. H. (2025). When does employee turnover matter? Analyzing the role of organizational memory in the federal IT workforce. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 35(4), 434-451. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaf019

[6] Matošková, J. (2024). The effectiveness of high-commitment human resource practices for employee knowledge sharing. Journal of Management & Organization, 30(6), 1960-1982. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2023.33

[7] Scheuer, C.-L., Voltan, A., Kumanan, K., & Chakraborty, S. (2023). Exploring the impact of decentralized leadership on knowledge sharing and work hindrance networks in healthcare teams. Journal of Management & Organization, 29(1), 139-158. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2020.37

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)