DOI 10.70286/ISU-24.12.2025.010

FORECASTING EMPLOYEE TURNOVER AND SLA FAILURES IN LOGISTICS: AN HR RISK MODEL BASED ON EARLY INDICATORS (ATTENDANCE, OVERTIME, INCIDENTS, QUALITY)

Kovalchuk Mykola
HR Manager - Delivery LLC
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7239-7061

Here's what actually happens in a logistics company when things start falling apart. A senior warehouse supervisor-let's call her Maria-has been with the company for six years. She knows every workaround, every client's quirks, every way to squeeze efficiency out of an aging facility. Last quarter, she started staying late every night. Then she stopped responding to weekend messages. Two weeks ago, she snapped at a driver over something trivial. Yesterday, she gave notice.

Management is blindsided. Operations scrambles to replace her. Three weeks later, shipment errors spike by 30%. A key client's SLA is breached. Nobody connects these dots because nobody was looking at the right data. Maria's overtime hours, her declining communication, her uncharacteristic irritability-these weren't random. They were a countdown clock that everyone ignored.

This paper argues for something logistics companies desperately need but rarely build: predictive systems that connect workforce behavior to operational collapse before both happen. Not through surveys or annual reviews, but through the mundane digital breadcrumbs people leave behind-clock-in times, overtime requests, incident reports, quality checks. The data exists. The predictions are possible. The question is whether anyone's paying attention.

Most logistics companies track turnover the way they track weather-they measure it after it happens and hope the pattern doesn't repeat. HR reports quarterly attrition rates. Operations reports SLA compliance. These metrics share one fatal flaw: they're autopsy reports, not warning systems.

The real indicators appear weeks or months earlier in patterns that cross departmental boundaries. When Kara et al. (2022) studied ERP integration failures, they found organizations consistently struggling because different system modules don't talk to each other. HR data lives in one system, quality metrics in another, operational performance in a third. Each system holds part of the story, but nobody's reading the whole book.

Think about what this means in practice. Your HR system shows that warehouse attendance has dropped 8% over three months. Your quality system shows package scanning errors increased 15% in the same period. Your operations system shows on-time delivery rates declined 12%. Three separate problems? No. One problem manifesting in three places-your warehouse team is falling apart, probably because they're understaffed, overworked, or both.

But here's where it gets worse. Even when companies try to integrate systems, they often prioritize the wrong factors. Bhatt et al. (2021) documented how organizations select ERP systems based on technical specifications and cost rather than integration capabilities that would enable predictive analytics. Companies buy sophisticated tools, then use them as expensive calculators rather than early warning systems.

The result? Managers react to crises instead of preventing them. A distribution center loses three drivers in two weeks, so HR rushes to hire replacements. Meanwhile, nobody asks why those drivers left simultaneously or whether the remaining team is about to follow. The new hires arrive three weeks later, undertrained and overwhelmed, just in time for the busiest shipping period. Delivery failures cascade. Clients complain. The cycle repeats.

Look at what's sitting in your timekeeping system right now. Jamal in receiving has called out sick the last five Mondays. Is he allergic to Mondays? Does he have a chronic condition that mysteriously flares up every weekend? Or is his Sunday night supervisor making his life miserable enough that he can't face Monday mornings? Your attendance software knows he's absent. It doesn't know-and doesn't care-that this pattern means he's probably gone within a month.

Or check the overtime logs from your main distribution hub. Sarah's been pulling 65-hour weeks since August. Management loves her-look at that dedication! Except Sarah isn't dedicated anymore. She's trapped. You're short three workers and rather than hire, you're bleeding Sarah dry. She knows it. She's started taking recruiters' calls during her lunch breaks. By the time you notice her performance slipping, she'll have an offer letter.

Here's what really gets overlooked: the workers who suddenly stop helping. Marcus used to volunteer for Saturday shifts. He'd cover for sick colleagues. He'd stay late when shipments ran behind. Then three weeks ago he just... stopped. Clocks in at 8:00, clocks out at 4:30, doesn't answer his phone after hours. Everyone thinks Marcus finally learned work-life balance. Wrong. Marcus learned he's leaving, he just hasn't told you yet. Workers don't set boundaries with jobs they plan to keep-they set boundaries with jobs they're already mentally done with.

And those incident reports collecting dust in your safety files? Last month, a forklift operator reported a near-miss in aisle 7. Two weeks later, someone else nearly got hit in the same spot. Last week, it happened again. You've got three reports about the same dangerous situation, and your response was filing them alphabetically. That intersection is going to seriously injure someone, probably right before your workers' comp audit. But the bigger problem isn't the forklift-it's that three different workers filed reports that nobody acted on. They noticed you don't actually care about safety, just documentation. That realization spreads faster than you'd think.

Your best packer ran 99.2% accuracy for three years straight. Last month she dropped to 94%. This month-89%. You think she got lazy? She's 43, two kids, mortgage payments. She didn't get lazy-she's either so exhausted she can't see straight anymore, or something's exploding at home and she's physically present but mentally somewhere else, or-worst option-she already accepted another offer and she's just waiting for her quarterly bonus to vest. Either way, your packages are going to wrong addresses and she's gone within weeks.

Now here's where it gets messy. You've got a driver running 55 hours weekly-a lot, but he's managing. His colleague on the same route does 52 hours-also handling it fine. Suddenly both jump to 65 hours, both start showing up late, both get sloppy with delivery documentation. You see these numbers separately and think: tough week, happens to everyone. You don't see that their dispatcher is an idiot who added five new stops without adding time, and both drivers are already interviewing elsewhere. Yusof et al. (2022) wrote about non-linear interactions in fuzzy logic, but forget the academic jargon-you just need to grasp that two exhausted drivers plus one incompetent dispatcher equals catastrophe, not simple addition.

Stop chasing precision. You won't predict that Olga quits March 23rd at 2:30pm. This isn't fortune-telling. You need to spot that your entire night shift at Warehouse 3 is circling the drain. Over three months, overtime spiked 40%, accuracy dropped 18%, three people filed incident reports, half the shift shows up late regularly. Each number alone-maybe coincidence. Together-your shift is collapsing and you've got maybe a month to fix it before mass resignations and client complaints hit.

You could build a fancy machine learning algorithm that discovers quality decline only predicts turnover when combined with high overtime but not otherwise. Or that drivers signal departure two weeks out while supervisors telegraph it three months early through completely different behaviors. Great. Then your algorithm screams that Warehouse 4 is about to implode, and you do... what? Add staff? Raise wages? Fire the manager? Cut workload? The algorithm doesn't know. It just yells "fire!" and you're the one who has to find the extinguisher.

Gore (2022) documented how ports in Italy, UAE, and India had data showing problems, understood something was wrong, but did nothing-bureaucracy, conflicting priorities, unwillingness to disrupt established processes. You'll hit the same wall. System says: "Night shift in danger." Management responds: "We know, but it's peak season, we'll deal with it in January." January arrives-the shift already quit, your biggest client just cancelled their contract, and now you're explaining to executives why you ignored three months of warnings.

Then there's the creepy factor. Workers aren't dumb-they notice when companies suddenly start tracking their every move. If employees figure out that every clock-in, every overtime hour, every quality check feeds algorithms predicting when they'll quit, they'll either game your system or tell you to shove it. You want transparency? Try explaining to your warehouse crew that you're monitoring their bathroom breaks and sick days to predict their "flight risk" without sounding like a dystopian nightmare.

Worse: what happens when managers treat people flagged as "high turnover risk" differently? You train supervisors to watch these employees closer, you stop investing in their development because why bother if they're leaving, you exclude them from important projects. Congratulations-your prediction just created its own reality. The employee might have stayed, but you treated them like they were already gone, so they left. Self-fulfilling prophecy isn't a bug in your model-it's management screwing up the response.

Flip the whole thing. Stop trying to predict which individuals will quit. Start identifying which parts of your operation are so broken that multiple people want to escape simultaneously. When five workers in the same department all show warning signs, that's not five personal problems-that's one departmental disaster. Maybe the supervisor is incompetent. Maybe workload exceeded human capacity. Maybe you haven't adjusted wages while competitors raised theirs 20%. Whatever it is, it's systemic, and targeting individuals misses the point entirely.

This changes what you're actually asking. Not "which employees will quit" but "which teams are we failing so badly that everyone wants out?" Not "who's at risk" but "where did we break our own operation?" The dashboard should flag that Distribution Center 2's weekend crew is underwater-not because you want to surveil individuals, but because that entire team needs help before they collectively walk out and take your SLA compliance with them.

For logistics operations, this means building dashboards that integrate workforce and operational data in real-time. When a facility shows rising overtime, declining quality, and increasing absenteeism while simultaneously handling higher volumes, that's straightforward cause and effect-current staffing is inadequate for current demands. The SLA failure is predictable and preventable if someone notices and acts before the crisis hits.

The technical implementation requires feedback loops where operational outcomes continuously refine the predictive model. When the model predicted high turnover but turnover didn't occur, what was different? When SLA failures happened without warning signs, which indicators did the model miss? Machine learning systems improve through exposure to prediction errors, but organizational learning requires that someone reviews those errors systematically and adjusts both models and responses.

If workforce behavior predicts operational failures this reliably, that carries uncomfortable implications. Most SLA breaches aren't caused by random bad luck or unforeseeable circumstances-they're caused by predictable workforce problems that management either didn't notice or chose to ignore.

When a distribution center misses delivery targets because half the experienced workers quit within three weeks, that's not a sudden crisis-it's the inevitable conclusion of months of warning signs. When a warehouse operation fails quality audits because overworked employees are making preventable mistakes, that's not a training problem-it's an operational design problem where management chose impossible productivity targets over sustainable performance.

The data makes this visible in ways that are hard to ignore. You can't claim surprise when three months of escalating overtime, declining quality scores, and increasing incidents preceded the crisis exactly as the model predicted. At that point, the failure isn't predictive analytics-it's management.

This is probably why many organizations resist building these systems. It's comfortable to treat turnover and SLA failures as unfortunate but unavoidable. It's uncomfortable to have data showing that leadership decisions directly caused both problems and that the warning signs were visible months in advance.

The logistics companies that figure this out won't use HR-risk models as surveillance tools-they'll use them as diagnostic systems that reveal where organizational design fails workers. When the model flags a team in crisis, the appropriate response isn't tightening control or replacing workers-it's investigating why that team is struggling and providing whatever support enables sustainable performance.

This might mean reducing workload even though productivity targets suffer short-term. It might mean replacing supervisors who generate consistent warning signals across their teams. It might mean acknowledging that compensation or scheduling practices have become untenable and require fundamental revision. The model makes problems visible, but solving them requires organizational courage and resources.

The alternative is continuing to manage logistics operations the way most companies do now-reacting to crises, replacing workers, apologizing to clients, and repeating the cycle. The early indicators will keep appearing in the data. The predictions will remain accurate. The question is whether anyone with authority will pay attention before the crisis hits instead of after.

References

1. Bhatt, N., Guru, S., Thanki, S., & Sood, G. (2021). Analysing the factors affecting the selection of ERP package: A fuzzy AHP approach. Information Systems and e-Business Management, 19, 641–682.
2. Gore, A. (2022). Towards sustainable port management: Comparative evidence from Italy, UAE and India. International Journal of Technology Management & Sustainable Development, 21, 331–351.
3. Kara, H., Cherifi, K., & Zemmouchi-Ghomari, L. (2022). Failure case studies and challenges in ERP integration. International Journal of Innovation in the Digital Economy, 13, Article 9.
4. Yusof, N., Hashim, N. L., & Hussain, A. (2022). A review of fuzzy Delphi method application in human-computer interaction studies. AIP Conference Proceedings, 2472, Article 040026.