

5-4-2012

# The determinants of voluntary job turnover in Chinese medium and small enterprises: a case study

Jia Jia LI

Follow this and additional works at: [http://commons.ln.edu.hk/socsci\\_fyp](http://commons.ln.edu.hk/socsci_fyp)



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Li, J. J. (2012). The determinants of voluntary job turnover in Chinese medium and small enterprises: a case study (UG dissertation, Lingnan University, Hong Kong). Retrieved from [http://commons.ln.edu.hk/socsci\\_fyp/4](http://commons.ln.edu.hk/socsci_fyp/4)

This UG Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Open Access Dissertations at Digital Commons @ Lingnan University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Social Sciences – Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Lingnan University.

# **The Determinants of Voluntary Job Turnover in Chinese Medium and Small Enterprises: A Case Study**

by

Li Jia Jia

Senior Thesis Work

Advisor: Wei Xiangdong

Department of Social Sciences  
Lingnan University, Hong Kong  
May 4, 2012

# Contents

	Page
Abstract	3
Chapter 1 Introduction	4
Chapter 2 Literature Review and Hypotheses	6
2.1 Literature Review	6
2.2 Hypotheses	8
Chapter 3 Methodology and Data	12
3.1 Test of Mean Differential	13
3.2 Regression	13
Chapter 4 Analysis of Results	15
4.1 The Comparison of Mean	15
4.2 Regression Results	21
Chapter 5 Conclusion	25
Appendix A Questionnaire	27
Appendix B Table 1 -- Descriptive statistics and variable meanings	31
Appendix C Table 2 -- Comparison of Mean for the Two Groups of Worker	33
Appendix D Table 3 -- Determinants of Voluntary Job Turnover, Logistic Regression Results	36
Appendix E Table 4 -- Significant Determinants of Voluntary Job Turnover, Logistic Regression Results	38
Reference	39

## **Abstract**

The small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in China are developing rapidly. They are becoming more and more important to China's economic restructuring and to the national economic development. However, since SMEs started appearing relatively late and the development history in China is relatively short, a lot of aspects are still unripe and a series of problems exists. Especially, the job turnover rate is commonly high in Chinese SMEs. The high level of turnover will badly affect the survival and development of SMEs. This research focuses on the factors that affect job turnover in China. The factors are divided into six models, which are personal or family, adaptation, adaption, job satisfaction, management performances, and cost of turnover. After conducting surveys in a Dongguan company, the data are collected and analyzed to test the hypotheses derived from these six models. We find strong evidence to support the main predictions from these models and our finding here is broadly in line with previous studies done for western countries.

## Chapter 1. Introduction

In the last 3 decades, Chinese economy has developed at a phenomenal speed with an annual growth rate averaged over 10%. Such a high speed of growth is largely contributed by its high rate of saving and investment as well as abundance of labour supply. However, in recent years, China is experiencing increasingly a labour shortage problem, especially for its labour-intensive manufacturing sector and in coastal regions. For example, according to the survey done by American Chamber of Commerce(<http://web.resource.amchamchina.org/cmsfile/2012/04/23/a819e00948c7796f7db25851c8807036.pdf>) in China with its members, the estimated job shortage rate is 20% in the labour intensive regions of East and South China. In addition, the same survey also reports that the job attachment rate in China is really low. Chinese workers engagement rate is below than American workers and also far below that of the world average. Furthermore, nearly 40% of the younger employees (born after 1980s) have the intention to leave their current positions within the next 12 months. So American firms in China rate the finding, hiring and retaining employees as their top concern of doing business in China now. All these make the study on the determinants of employee turnover in China particularly relevant and important. Yet, few existing study have managed to do so. This study aims to fill such a vacuum.

More specifically, the purpose of this study is to find out the determinants of voluntary job turnover rate in small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in China. The reasons why I focus my study on the SMEs are the follows. First, the financial and material resources of China's SMEs are limited, and cannot be compared to the capital and actual strength of big companies. So the workers, especially the talented ones, have played an important role in Chinese SMEs' survival and development. However, it seems the turnover rate in these enterprises is even higher. In 2009, the China Economic News pointed out that the annual turnover rate of ordinary labor reached 50% in Chinese SMEs, the turnover rate of some pharmaceutical producers even reached 70%. Second, Chinese SMEs are developing very fast, and have become

the main strength of the national economy and social development. As of late September 2009, there were 10.3 million registered enterprises in Chinese business. According to the standards of SMEs' in China (for industrial SMEs, a staff number of less than 300 or a registered capital of less than 8 million RMB, and for non-industrial SMEs, a staff number of less than 200 or a registered capital of less than 5 million RMB), 10.23 million of these were SMEs, which is about 99% of all enterprises. SMEs created more than 55.6% of the Chinese GDP, 74.7% of the industrial output, 58.9% of the services, 46.2% of tax revenue, and 62.3% of export. SMEs also provided over 75% of jobs, applied for about 65% of patents, brought more than 75% of technological innovations, and invented over 80% of new products. SMEs have become the most dynamic component in the economic growth of China. The stability of SMEs influences the development of society. Third, due to the time and resource constraint I face, it is difficult to collect data for large enterprises.

The existing literature shows that employee voluntary job turnover is affected by many factors. They are related to personal and family, adaption to the living environment around the firm, job satisfaction, management performances and job turnover costs. To test which of these factors influence the voluntary job turnover rate of Chinese workers working with SMEs, I conducted a survey with a SME in Dongguan, Guangdong Province. The company has about 250 employees, and I managed to collect 185 useable questionnaires back. Based on the carefully designed questionnaire, I can then test both the individual effect of these potential determinants and the joint explanatory power of all these determinants together. My main finding indicates turnover cost is the most important factor that determines voluntary employee turnover rate in China

In what follows, I first conduct a literature review and show the relevant theory in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 presents the methodology and data. The main analyses of the data and discussion of the results are contained in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 provides some concluding remarks.

## **Chapter 2. Literature Review and Hypotheses**

Labor turnover refers to the staff leaving the organization voluntarily. The way of leaving is passive for enterprises. It brings a lot of costs to both employers and employees. To the employer, it suffers the loss from hiring and training workers and unexpected interruption to its daily production and business due to loss of employees. It may also incur other losses such as loss of production and business secrets as well as important customers to its competitors. For employees, they also incur costs from training, job search and relocation, although the gain must outweigh the loss for employees. The overall gain or loss to the society may be undetermined. However, given the net loss suffered by the employers, it is quite likely the society as a whole suffers a loss from turnover.

### **2.1. Literature Review**

The study on voluntary turnover can be dated back to the early influential work by March and Simon (1958). They pointed out that turnover is affected by the perceived ease of movement and desirability of movement, which are reflected by job alternatives and job satisfaction. When workers become dissatisfied with their job, they would like to compare to other jobs, and leave if other jobs are better than the current one (Mobley 1977). So job satisfaction and job alternatives are interconnected to affect the turnover.

There are many factors that cause turnover in traditional attitude models. The most used constructs are job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Generally, satisfaction and commitment are consistent to negatively influence turnover (e.g., Jaros, 1997). More recently, some researchers modify the traditional attitude models and introduce new concepts. Irving, Coleman and Cooper (1997) measure occupational commitment based on responses from 232 employees in a variety of

occupations within a single organization. And their analysis suggested that 3 forms of occupational commitment are distinguishable: affective, continuance, and normative commitment, across occupations. Shore and Tetrick (1991) test a new measure of perceived organizational support. They examine this by studying 330 participants in a large corporation headquartered in the southeastern United States. Aquino, Griffeth, Allen & Hom (1997) hypothesize that employees' outcome and supervisor satisfaction result from referent outcomes, justifications, and the likelihood of amelioration. These satisfaction facets are then related to turnover through withdrawal cognitions. Wright & Cropanzano (1998) use positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) as control variables to examine the relationship of emotional exhaustion to job satisfaction, voluntary turnover, and job performance.

Traditional models also suggest that negative attitudes and job search also cause turnover. But whether turnover is successful or not mainly depends on job market. Attitude-turnover is frequent when the unemployment rates were low. Blau (1993) suggests active job search behavior has a stronger relationship to voluntary turnover than preparatory job search behavior or general effort job search, and it accounts for significant additional turnover variance beyond work attitude and withdrawal cognition variables. Bretz, Boudreau and Judge (1994) suggest that dissatisfaction with different aspects of the organization and job are more strongly related to job search than are perceptions of greener pastures. In addition, Carsten and Spector (1987) find the magnitude of satisfaction–turnover relations range from  $-.18$  to  $-.52$  across studies facing different unemployment rates, which means turnover is relatively higher when unemployment rates were low. Overall, most traditional attitudes in turnover emphasize on job attitudes (like satisfaction and commitment) and ease of movement (reflected in perceived alternatives and job search behavior).

However, some research report there is weak relationship between attitudinal variables and turnover. Hom and Griffeth (1995) and Griffeth et al. (2000) get this conclusion from a quantitative review. And in the narrative review, Maertz and



Campion (1998) point out the link of attitude, search and turnover are not strong enough and hence these models have neglected lots of other useful points.

Some researchers have tried to analyze the turnover from other aspects. They found that individual reasons will cause turnover. Chan (1996) used the relationships among cognitive misfit, job performance, and actual individual turnover, and examined a sample of 253 engineers in either a staff engineering function or a research and development (R&D) engineering function. His results from logistic regression show that significant and substantial incremental validity in predicting actual turnover over the predictability provided by performance.

Cohen (1995) examined the relationship between work commitment forms (e.g., organizational commitment, occupational commitment, job involvement, Protestant work ethic, work involvement) and nonwork domains through the data of 238 usable questionnaires. The unions, teams and other work related groups can cause some people to stay on the job (Reichers 1985).

New turnover theories from Lee & Mitchell (1994); Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel & Hill (1999) show that (1) some people are satisfied with their jobs, but they still leave the job; (2) they do not necessarily search for new job before leaving; (3) they may leave the job just because a shock.

## **2.2. Hypotheses**

Based on the above literature review, I can summarize the theory on employee voluntary turnover into the following six models and derive the corresponding hypotheses.

**Model 1. Personal and family background** – many personal or family background factors can influence a person's voluntary turnover decision. According to Chan (1996), many individual reasons cause turnover. In this surveyed company, we

consider the factors include gender, age, education, marital status, spouse's working status, living arrangement and the need to take long-term care of family member(s).

*Hypothesis 1. Job turnover can be affected by individual and/or family factors.*

**Model 2. Adaption** – This model focuses on employees' adaption to the living environment around their workplace, not just in the company. Most respondent choose "Yes" when ask whether feels adapted to the current living environment. There are lots of migrant workers in Dongguan, so it is easy for them to adapt this city and area. Since having family members and friends living nearby can reduce the difficulty level for an employee to adapt to the living environment, it is expected that this will negatively influence an employee's turnover decision. On the other hand, having family members and friends living nearby may help an employee to acquire more job information, and therefore reduce the search cost. This can also mean that it is positively associated with turnover.

*Hypothesis 2. Job turnover can be negatively/positively associated with employee adaptation and having family members/friends living nearby.*

**Model 3. Job Satisfaction** –Job satisfaction measures the utility an employee derives from his/her job, and therefore affects the turnover decision. And there are lot of researches, even the original research by March and Simon (1958) show that job satisfaction significantly influences job turnover. We have a range of measures on job satisfaction covering satisfaction with income, work itself, working pace, working environment, job stability, income stability, relationship with supervisors, relationship with co-workers, promotion chance, the scope for using your own initiative, work time, fringe benefits, reward system, training opportunities. We also ask workers their overall job satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 3. Job turnover is negatively associated with high job satisfaction*

**Model 4. Loyalty** – The loyalty related with the job satisfaction at some extent. When the staffs have high satisfaction with the company, or the company can provide good arrangement for them, they will increase the loyalty to the firm. And then decrease the probability of turnover. And the loyalty in this research is similar with the organizational commitment in the reviews' researches, so it is another reason that needs to consider these factors according to past researches. When we test the loyalty from employee to the company, we firstly ask whether the employees would like to share many of the values of their organization. Many of them have good opinion in this question. Staffs always want to have a good working condition in their job, they are of course willing to share the values of their organization. However, it is belong to the loyalty that the staffs have expectation to the firm. The loyalty is directly affected by the sense of pride.

*Hypothesis 4. Job turnover is negatively correlated with employee's high level of loyalty.*

**Model 5. Management Performance** – Such as the research from Cohen (1995), he pointed out the unions, teams and other work related groups can cause some people to stay on the job. So we need to consider the practices of management that affect job turnover in this company. Whether the company's organization can be supported by the staffs, and then benefit to the company, the efforts can be seen from the staffs working and the results of questionnaires. Some related factors are contained as follow:

Teamwork, Managers relied upon to keep promises, Managers are sincere to understand employees views, Managers understand about meeting responsibilities outside work, Management encourage further education, Management fair, Management respect worker's opinion, Management encourage worker's participation

*Hypothesis 5. Job turnover will be affected by management performance.*

**Model 6. Cost of Turnover** – Low cost if leaving job, Hard to change job

The last issue is the cost of turnover, which is directly related with the turnover. These factors were stated as ease of movement or job alternatives in past researched. It is just like Mobley (1977) said when workers become dissatisfied with their job, they would like to compare to other jobs, and leave if other jobs are better than the current one. So in this research we consider when the staffs think it is easy to change job or there is low cost if leaving job, it is easy for they leave the company once they are not happy in it. When we ask whether they think they will lose many when leave, they probably answer “Yes (1)”. But the mean differential still show the change side would like to choose “NO (0)” in this question. In the data, we show the dummy =1, if the employee think he/she will not suffer a lot if he/she left current job in low cost if leaving job.

*Hypothesis 6. Job turnover is directly affected by the cost of turnover.*

### **Chapter 3. Methodology and Data**

In order to test the hypotheses listed in the last Chapter, I need to have the relevant data. I collect the data by carrying out an employee survey with a SME in Dongguan. Dongguan, as a famous modern manufacturing industry city, is thought as the world manufacturing industry base. It has formed the modern manufacturing industry system, including the electron and communication equipment, clothing, furniture, shoes etc. In this manufacturing city, there are lots of private enterprises. The surveyed company is located in one industrial district of the town. This company produces different kinds of tins, which belongs to the manufacturing industry. This kind of company is very representative as a SME in manufacturing industry in China and fits our purpose of studying job turnover in China well.

I designed the survey questionnaire as such that it contains all the crucial information needed for the study. In the first part, it includes basic personal and family background information, such as age, gender, education qualification, marital status, number of children. It also covers the information on the living arrangement of the employee, i.e. whether the employee is living with his/her family members, whether or not the employee has family members and/or friends living nearby, and whether or not the employee needs to look after some close relatives on daily basis. In the second part, it includes various questions on job arrangement, such as working time, teamwork arrangement, etc. It also includes information on training, workplace participation, information, communication and other management practices. The final part covers the questions on job satisfaction (both overall and on various specific facets), loyalty, feelings about the management and turnover intention and cost. The actual questionnaire used in the survey is attached in Appendix A.

The survey was carried in March 2012. In order to get employees to tell the truth, the survey was conducted anonymously. Before the survey, the employees were also told that all their answers would be kept confidential from the firm and this was also stated

on the questionnaire. To attract more employees to fill the questionnaire, I also announced that a lucky draw will be held and everyone filled the survey questionnaire will have a chance to win a prize of 500 yuan. This strategy proved to be quite successful. During the survey period, there were 233 employees in this company. In the end, I got back 182 completed questionnaires. The survey reached a nearly 80% successful rate. Amongst these 182 respondents, 41 or 22.5% declared that either they have already submitted a resignation letter (7) or are thinking about quit (30). The remaining said that they have no intention to quit. In addition, there were already 11 staffs had applied for resignation before fill out the questionnaires, but they still in the company. The descriptive statistics of the main variables are listed in Table 1.

### **3.1. Comparison of Means**

In order to test which factors really affect employee voluntary turnover decisions, we first separate the sample to two groups: one with intention to leave and the other without. We then calculate the mean values for the main variables separately for these two groups. The corresponding t-test statistics on the significance of the differences in means are also calculated. So if the mean value of a particular variable is significantly different for the two groups this is a potential variable that may influence employee turnover decision.

### **3.2. Regression Analysis**

Next, we run multiple regressions to test various hypotheses. Since our dependent variable: the intention to quit, is a dummy variable that takes value of 0 or 1, the corresponding regression should logit or probit. We use logit model for our analyses. To be more specifically, we run the following regression model:

$$p\{Turnover = 1\} = f(X\beta) = \frac{e^{X\beta}}{1 + e^{X\beta}}$$

Where  $X$  is a vector of independent variables and  $\beta$  are the estimated coefficients of

the variables in  $X$ . If the estimated coefficient is positive and significant it means the corresponding variable with this coefficient has positive impact on turnover, vice versa.

## Chapter 4. Analyses of Results

In this Chapter, I first present the results on the comparison of means. I then discuss the results from various logistic regressions.

### 4.1. The Comparison of mean

These influence factors can be classified into 6 big models. That is the staffs would like to change their job may be due to these 6 models' reasons. And then it can be analyzed by the mean comparison (mean of not change job factors minus mean of change job factors) of variables for the two groups of workers. (Table 2)

**Model 1. Basic Information** – Gender, Age, Education, Married status, Spouse's working condition, Take long-term care families, Occupation.

In the mean comparison, this basic information's variables have different distance. Firstly, the age difference is relatively large (-4.42). The average of "change job" staffs is higher than "not change job" staffs. Normally, the younger may would like to find a match job through changing jobs and work in different jobs to get more experience. But in this survey, we got the adverse data. And the negative mean differential seems significant (T-test=44.957). It can be analyzed with married status together, because the mean differential of married is negative (-0.195), too. It means averagely the number "change job" staffs is larger than "not change job" staffs. The people who get married would like to find a match job to firm their families. When they cannot get what they really need from a company, they would like to change job. The married person cannot be like the young people who have not too much burden from families. The young people who have not get married can work for themselves and play for themselves. So the younger may more consider the factors outside working, such as friends nearby, entertainment, and so on. But the married people much consider the working quality. On the other hand, whether employee's spouse have job or not will also influence the employee's consideration of turnover. In the



survey, this variable's mean differential is negative 0.171, and the differential is relatively significant (T-test=8.438). Averagely, if the employee's spouse have job, he/she would have higher probability to change job. It is related with the analysis above about the marriage. If their spouses have job, they would be more relieved to find a better job for their lives and families. So it can be easily understood that the employee relatively would like to change job if their spouse have job. In addition, we consider whether the employee has any family member(s) who need his/her long-term care. This factor related with the families in other way. According to the reasons of resignation that the company recorded in the roster, some staffs resigned because of familial obligation. When the human resources manager asked more detailed, most of them would said that they need to take care their families at home. Even though the HR manager would persuade the staff to stay, and make more money for their families, there are still appear some reasons about take long-term care of families. So we will put this factor to analyze the turnover.

The education seems have some influence for job turnover normally. And lots of Job turnover research will consider about the education's influence, which higher education's staffs would more like to change job. The high education can easier to find a job, and easier to adapt a new job, so the cost of them is lower. Actually, most of respondents in this research have junior high school educational level. There is low proportion of higher education, such as high school education and college. So the education have not highly affect turnover of the junior staffs.

Different occupations have different mean differential. The production workers and other worker have large difference in means, but one is positive side (0.227) and other one is negative side (-0.115). The other workers here include security guard, driver, cleaner and cooker. Because the research is survey the whole worker in a company, include junior staffs and top employees, the production workers represent a high proportion in the respondents. From the mean differentials, the other workers do not need training for their occupation. For example, the drivers need to learn to drive by themselves, but not learn in the company. The companies also do not need to give extra training to other workers when they enter the new company. So the companies

are easy to accept this type workers and it is easy for other workers to change job. But the production workers need to accept some training from company when they start working. So the cost of change job will be higher and relatively have lower probability to change job. Based on the mean differentials, we assume the occupation will also affect job turnover.

**Model 2. Adaption** – Family members nearby, Friends nearby, Adapt (this region)

The mean differentials show the slight difference of family members nearby (0.028). There is the relatively big influence from friends nearby (-0.101). And the negative number shows that the staffs are likely change job when there are friends nearby. It can be realized that the staffs' consideration would influence by near friends, because the friends are not limited in the same company, can be outside company. So when the staffs have friends outside the company, they will be easier compare to different companies from friends' suggestions, and then consider change job. However, HR manager also mentioned that they would more like to recruit new employees from the current staffs in the company. This method not only can easily recruit new employees, but also easy to keep the staffs, and then keep the turnover rate. So the company put forward the reward, which the staffs can get the reward when they introduce the new employee to the company. Of course, the management should be done well to attract the new employees from other companies.

**Model 3. Job Satisfaction** – With income, With work itself, With working pace, With working environment, With job stability, With income stability, With relationship with supervisors, With relationship with co-workers, With promotion chance, With working challenge, With work time, With fringe system, With reward system, With training chance, With overall.

First of all, the overall satisfaction has high difference in these two groups (mean differential=0.87, T-test=51.164). So the job satisfaction is really play a big role in affecting the turnover. The satisfaction is reflected in different parts, just like the income, environment, challenge, firm arrangement, and the relationship with

supervisors and co-workers, etc. From the statistic, all mean differentials in the job satisfaction are higher in the unchanged one. So the job satisfaction is much important for a firm to keep staffs. With the five level satisfactions, the income, promotion chance, working challenge, work welfare, award system and training are most be cared. Even all the satisfactions are high in unchanged side. As we know, income is the main issue that the staffs consider. So the income satisfaction seems much important for the management to pay attention. With the income satisfaction, the staffs would consider the other factors than can influence the income, such as the promotion chance, working challenge, training chance, fringe benefit, and reward. The mean differential in promotion satisfaction is 0.97 and working challenge is 1.133, which are higher than lots of other factors. However, the staffs always hope to go to the high level position and can earn more from their promotion. The reward system satisfaction is the highest data in the job satisfaction. Generally, the staffs of course want to earn more besides the normal income and would not like to lose many from their mistakes. And also want to get more fringe benefits from the company and their efforts, such as the insurance, social security and entertainment provide. If they can earn more from their extra effort, they would be happier to stay. So if the staffs do not like the reward system and fringe benefit in some companies, it is easy for them to have turnover. In addition, the training chance satisfaction has large difference from the questionnaires (mean differential: 1.022). Even the company provides the same chance to the staff, they have different opinions for the training chance. From the same chance to get training, the large difference seems belongs to the individual issue. The change side staffs maybe think that the training is not enough for them to work. The satisfactions of the relationship with supervisors and coworkers have large difference in these two groups. Compare to the co-worker relationship, the mean differential in satisfaction of relationship with supervisors is higher (mean differential: 0.799). It means the relationship with leaders has higher influence for the turnover decision. It is easy to understand that the relationship with leaders would affect the staffs' opinion and working quality. It is not necessary that always for the leaders stand high above the masses to show their authority. The equal relationship is more

and more important in company and society nowadays, especially for the SMEs. The relationship between leaders and subordinate have better to keep be like friends sometimes. It is not only easy for the leader manage the subordinate, but also well for the working operation in the company. So the relationship with supervisors can be a big factor for staffs to have turnover decision.

**Model 4. Loyalty** – Share values, Proud of the job, Proud of the firm.

The mean differentials of the sense of pride in job and firm are significant. One is 0.717 (t-test=57.603), other one is 0.822 (t-test=55.815). When the staffs are proud of their jobs and company, they will more willing to stay, and work harder to show their ability. In addition, when they loyalty to the job and firm, they will talk with the jobs and the firm's advantages to their friends. Their friends in the company will be also affected by the optimistic values, and the friends outside the company have more choices for their jobs, that they will consider enter this company. So we can see how important the loyalty factors are.

**Model 5. Management Performance** – Teamwork, Managers relied upon to keep promises, Managers are sincere to understand employees views, Managers understand about meeting responsibilities outside work, Management encourage further education, Management fair, Management respect worker's opinion, Management encourage worker's participation

Overall the mean differential in those factors are positive sides that the unchanged side have better agreement than change side. The means of agreement of firm's management are all above 4, which mean they are satisfied with the management generally. The largest differential is whether the staffs can participate in firm's decisions (1.014). It can be seemed that the staffs also would like to join into the company's some decisions. This company has set a staff representative meeting for the subordinates. They have this meeting in each month, and record the matter every month. The staffs can give their suggestions and opinions in the meeting, and the records are sent to the managers. If the suggestions are advisable, the managers would

take action to fulfill the opinions. That are all can be seemed from their records. In addition, their also have a suggestion box that the staffs can give their suggestions in this way. However, the staffs also want to be a part of the company. When they have some influences in company's decisions, they would more pound of the efforts, and then work harder for their job to show their results. Nowadays the society tend to be more democratic, not dictatorship. The managers can collect lots of information or suggestions from subordinates, and it is more effective for the firm's operation. When the staffs get what they really need, they will be happier and even would more like to provide more useful massages for the leaders. That is a better way for the supervisors to manage the staffs, and it is also a good way to stay staffs. If the leaders cannot manage the subordinate staffs effectively and work forcefully, the staffs are hard to follow their leaders' arrangement. This condition will easily cause turnover. And then the second largest differential is the respect from management to staffs (0.97), which is related with the first one to some extent. When the managers respect the staffs' decision, they will be more satisfied with their job and firm, and pound of them. So the management is quite important, especially when the management can get the high levels of agreement from the staffs. The management cannot just consider their profits, the important part is the staffs benefit. Let the staffs can work for the company voluntarily.

And then seems the teamwork factor is significant in mean differential (0.411), the difference is quite big for dummy. If the job can work in a team, the pressure can be shared distributive. Or they can help with each other when they meet some difficulties. Of course, the teams should be organized well that the workers can work in a happy environment. However, the teamwork factor plays an important role in job turnover.

#### **Model 6. Cost of Turnover** – Low cost if leaving job, Hard to change job

The mean differential of "low cost if leaving job" shows the negative number (-0.625). It means more staffs in "change job" side think they can leave the job and firm easily without too much loss. After ask whether the employee considering change job, we directly ask whether hard to change job. The difference (0.742) is also significant.

Almost the “not change job” staffs leave the “Yes” information. And there are still 10 of the 44 “change job” staffs choose hard to change job. However, there are 77.3% staffs choose easy to change job in “change job” side. When it is easy to change, the staffs would like to work in different places to decide which one is finally fit for them.

## **4.2. Regression Results**

Hypothesis 1 posits that job turnover can be affected by individual and/or family factors. As noted in table 3, occupation seems to be very influential. Production workers and skilled workers/supervisors seem to have lower job turnover. These results are consistent with the findings in mean differentials. This types of workers need to be provided training when they start working, it has high cost for them to change jobs. In model 1, the factor of occupation has relatively significant effect to job turnover. So the result can show Hypothesis 1 across the occupation

Hypothesis 2 points out that job turnover can be negatively/positively associated with employee adaptation and having family members/friends living nearby. The most significant variable in this model is whether the employee has friends nearby. For this factor, we assume the employee can easily adapt this area if he/she has friends nearby. But the correlation in “friends nearby” and job turnover is 1.085 (p-value <0.1). The positive relationship shows the staffs would like to leave, if there are friends nearby. This result is also same with the analysis in mean differentials. The staffs have high adaptability in different job with friends nearby, so tend to change jobs. However, it is the kind of adaptability that influences the job turnover. Hypothesis 2 is supported

Hypothesis 3 asserts, “Job turnover is negatively associated with high job satisfaction.” Firstly, we get the relationship between job turnover and overall job satisfaction. The result is quite significant (p-value < 0.01), and the negative coefficient (-2.192) shows the staffs would like to change job when they are relatively not satisfied with the job. The job satisfaction is arranged from 1, very dissatisfied, to 5, very satisfied, which have stated in table 1. With the high negative relationship between job turnover and

overall job satisfaction, secondly, we get some job satisfaction in different factors. From table 3, the satisfaction with working challenge and training chance is most significant ( $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). And the results are similar to the mean differentials. If the staffs can get the satisfied working challenge, then they can get more chance to promote them and earn more in higher level. And the relationship with supervisors is quite important for staffs to stay in the company (coefficient = -0.848,  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ). So the significant results can support the hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4 holds, "Job turnover is negatively correlated with employee's high level of loyalty." According to the negative coefficient (-1.620), when the staffs proud of the firm, they will be unlikely change job ( $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). The exp. coefficient is relative high (0.198). It means that to raise the sense of pride in firm by 1 level, the probability of the worker thinking of leaving the job will be reduced by 0.198. In addition, when the staffs proud of job, it is likely that they will stay (coefficient = -1.456,  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ). These senses of pride are belonging to the loyalty to firm. Thus, hypothesis 4 is supported.

In hypothesis 5, job turnover will be affected by management performance. The all factors we put into independent variables are significant in different levels. The relationship between job turnover and teamwork is -2.512 ( $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ), which is most significant. And then the participation factor is negative related with job turnover ( $B = -1.531$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.5$ ). When consider the management fair and management respect worker's opinion, the correlations are in  $p\text{-value} < 0.1$ . However, they are relatively significant in model five, which represent the management performance. So, hypothesis 5 is supported, too.

Finally, hypothesis 6 presents job turnover is directly affected by the cost of turnover. First significant relationship is between "low cost if leaving job" and job turnover ( $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). The positive coefficient (1.957) reflect the workers would like to change job when the leaving cost of is lower. And the exp. coefficient (7.077) shows the high effect from cost of leaving job to job turnover. Secondly, we consider the

factor that is related to the external issue. The negative coefficient between “hard to change job” and job turnover gives the reasonable results. If the employee thinks it is hard to change job, they would more like to stay. The both two variables in cost of turnover have high significant level. In sum, hypothesis 6 is largely supported.

In table 4, we pick out the most relative and significant variables in each model from table 3. The purpose of table 4 is to find out the most significant variables in all of the factors. Because job satisfaction is an important issue to consider job turnover, we firstly consider the variables with overall job satisfaction. And then we add the significant individual job satisfaction to get the regression. From the p-value in table 4 in first part, the occupation in model 1 is still significant, which the production workers have negative relationship with job turnover ( $p\text{-value} < 0.1$ ). And the clerical/sales in this firm is the significant variable ( $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ), but the exp. coefficient is close to zero show the relationship between clerical/sales and job turnover.

The over satisfaction has significant correlation with job turnover, which the coefficient is negative 1.424 ( $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ). This result supports our hypothesis that the job satisfaction has high effect to job turnover. In addition, the exp. coefficient (0.241) with the negative direction coefficient shows when the satisfaction level increase from 4 (satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), the probability of the staff consider leaving the job will be decreased by 0.241. With the significant relationship between overall satisfaction and job turnover, let's look at the regression of significant individual satisfaction. When compared with lots of other significant variables, the job satisfaction with the scope for using your own initiative is relatively significant ( $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ). The correlation between job turnover and satisfaction with this variable is -1.928, which shows the negative relationship between them. The same direction with overall satisfaction supports this factor to influence job turnover.

The coefficient between management respect worker's opinion and job turnover is -2.454 (with overall satisfaction) and -2.415 (without overall satisfaction), which is reasonable for our hypothesis. Even the workers have different views in management



performance, it seems they are more focus on the management respected on their opinion. But the significant is not strong enough when compared to the cost of turnover.

As the analysis in hypothesis, we state that hypothesis 6 (job turnover is directly affected by the cost of turnover) is largely supported. When put all significant variables together to get regression, these variables about cost of turnover is the most significant model (both  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ) when consider overall satisfaction. Especially, the positive relationship between job turnover and “low cost if leaving job” has a high exp. coefficient (28.591). It shows that have low cost if leaving job, the probability of the worker thinking of leaving job will be increased by 28.591. The high correlation and significance tell us the highest effect from cost of leaving job to job turnover.

## Chapter 5. Conclusions

According to the above analysis, we know there are lots of factors affect the job turnover. And then the most significant one is the cost of turnover. When the employee considers the cost he/she will suffer if he/she leaving and whether hard to change job, it will affects his/her decision of turnover. So the company can focus on this issue to maintain the turnover rate. However, the cost of turnover is related to the other factors, such as job satisfaction, management practices, loyalty, and staffs' personal issues. So the company still needs to do well in different aspects, just like the factors of six models in this paper.

For example, the relationship between supervisors and subordinates is quite important nowadays. And this issue it is not only for one company, it can be significant for all enterprises, even for the society. The survived company also pointed out their phenomenon of the relationship between leaders and staffs. In normal times, they would hold some entertainment activities together, such as hiking, playing basketball, holding singing competition, etc. In the office, the leaders would not make for show. They can talk as friends. Such kind of relationship can be supported by the workers, and make the staffs work more ease. When the workers applied for resignation, HR manager would talk with the applied workers face to face, because the manager would like to persuade them to stay and want to improve their management skill through the workers opinions. Some workers want to go home to take care of their old parents, and the manager will help the workers to analyze this issue. If they give up the working chance and take care of parents without income, their living will become worse. Some workers will get advice from manager and stay finally. This behavior shows the harmony of this company, and it is really keep the staffs effectively. And this company pays attention to staffs' participation that we mention above, which have employee representatives meeting and suggestion box. With the high rate of participation, the staffs will have higher embeddedness. And then the staffs will be more proud of the firm. So, we can see the turnover factors are interconnected. When

one company does well in different parts of management, the cost of leaving will increase and the worker will think it is hard to leave this company.

Job turnover is a diffused problem in China. SMEs not only need to do a lot of measure to control it, but also need to consider the relationship between different factors. However, it is a long road for China to maintain stability of turnover.

## Appendix A

### Keng-Hui Company Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

#### Basic Information

1. Are you male or female? ( 1 ) male ( 0 ) female
2. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the highest education level you have reached?( 1 ) below primary school;  
(2) primary school; (3) junior high school; (4) high school; (5) College or above
4. What is your marital status? (1) never married; (2) married; (3) widowed or  
divorced
5. What is the employment status of your spouse? (1) working full-time; ( 2 )  
working part-time; (3) self-employed; (4) farming; (5) house worker; (6) Others  
(please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is the living situation of you with your spouse? (1) living together in  
company hostel; (2) living together outside company; (3) not living together
7. How many families live or work nearby? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How many friends live or work nearby? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Do you need to look after any family members or relatives who have long-term  
physical or mental illness, or who have problems related to old age? (1) yes; (0)  
no
10. Are you adapt to this city or region's life? (1) yes; (0) no

#### Working Condition

11. How long have you been working in this factory? \_\_\_\_\_ month(s)
12. What is your current job title? (1) production worker; (2) quality control; (3)  
skilled maintenance worker; (4) supervisor; (5) monitor; (6) group leader; (7)

driver; (8) security guard; (9) clerical; (10) senior managers; (11) salesman; (12) shipping officer; (13)cooker; (14) purchasing agent; (15) cleaners; (16) accountant

13. How many hours do you usually work per week? \_\_\_\_\_ hours
14. What is the monthly average number of hours you have to work overtime?  
\_\_\_\_\_ hours
15. Can you decide your own start or finishing time of work? (1) yes; (0) no
16. Do you usually work on your own or in a team? (1) work in a team; (0) work alone
17. If you work in a team, who arrange the team? (1) free combination; (2) company arrangement
18. How many townsmen in your team? \_\_\_\_\_
19. Are you having a cordial working relationship with your groupmates? (1) yes; (0) no
20. Do you think you are fit for this company? (1) yes; (0) no
21. Are you satisfied with the management system in this company? (1) yes; (0) no
22. Do you think you can develop your strength in this company? (1) yes; (0) no
23. Do you think you will lose many when you leave this company? (1) yes; (0) no

### **Welfare Condition**

24. Were you provided with any training when you first started to work here? (1) yes ;  
(0) no
25. If yes, how long did the training last? \_\_\_\_\_ days
26. Do you receive regular training? (1) yes ; (0) no
27. Do you think that the training provided by this company is enough to enable you to carry out your present work well? (1) yes ; (0) no
28. Do you satisfied with the entertainment that is provided by this company? (1) yes ;  
(0) no

29. Does your employer provide the following benefits to you? (1) Medical insurance; (2) Workplace injury insurance (3) Endowment Insurance (4) paid maternity leave

**Job Satisfaction**

30. How satisfied are you with your job here?

(5- very satisfied;4- satisfied; 3- neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; 2- dissatisfied; 1- very dissatisfied)

the amount of pay that you receive	1	2	3	4	5
the work itself	1	2	3	4	5
the pace at which you work	1	2	3	4	5
the environment in which you work	1	2	3	4	5
your job security	1	2	3	4	5
the stability of the pay that you receive	1	2	3	4	5
your relationships with supervisors/managers	1	2	3	4	5
your relationships with co-workers	1	2	3	4	5
the promotion opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
the scope for using your own initiative	1	2	3	4	5
your hours of work	1	2	3	4	5
fringe benefits	1	2	3	4	5
reward system	1	2	3	4	5
the training opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
your satisfaction overall with the job	1	2	3	4	5

31. Will you consider change job? (1) yes ; (0) no

32. Do you think it is easy to change job? (1) yes ; (0) no

33. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about working here?

(5- strongly agree; 4- agree; 3- neutral; 2- disagree; 1- strongly disagree)

I share many of the values of my organisation	1	2	3	4	5
I feel proud to tell people what job I do.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel proud to tell people which company I work for.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here can be relied upon to keep their promises	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here are sincere in attempting to understand employees' views.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here understand about employees having to meet responsibilities outside work.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here encourage people to develop their skills.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here treat employees fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here are willing to seek the views of employees or their representatives.	1	2	3	4	5
Managers here allow employees or their representatives to influence decision making.	1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix B

**Table 1 Descriptive statistics and variable meanings**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
<b>Job turnover</b>	0.225	0.419	Dummy=1, if the employee is considering change jobs
<b>Guangdong province</b>	0.059	0.237	Dummy=1, if the employee's hometown in Guangdong province
<b>Gender</b>	0.559	0.509	Dummy=1, if the employee is male
<b>Age</b>	29.360	8.915	The number represent the age of employee
<b>Below primary or primary school</b>	0.082	0.276	Dummy=1, if the employee has below primary school or primary school education
<b>Junior high school</b>	0.742	0.439	Dummy=1, if the employee has junior high school education
<b>High school</b>	0.137	0.345	Dummy=1, if the employee has high school education
<b>College or above</b>	0.038	0.193	Dummy=1, if the employee has college or above education
<b>Married</b>	0.654	0.477	Dummy=1, if the employee is married
<b>Spouse working</b>	0.599	0.491	Dummy=1, if the employee 's spouse has job
<b>Spouse living together</b>	0.253	0.436	Dummy=1, if the employee's spouse is living together with his/her spouse
<b>Family members nearby</b>	0.582	0.495	Dummy=1, if the employee has family member(s) live or work nearby
<b>Friends nearby</b>	0.824	0.382	Dummy=1, if the employee has friend(s) live or work nearby
<b>Take long-term care</b>	0.187	0.391	Dummy=1, if the employee has any family member(s) who need his/her long-term care
<b>Adapt</b>	0.984	0.128	Dummy=1, if the employee feels adapted to the current living environment
<b>Occupation:</b>			
<b>Production worker</b>	0.786	0.411	Dummy=1, if the employee is production
<b>Skilled worker/supervisor</b>	0.132	0.339	Dummy=1, if the employee is skilled worker/supervisor
<b>Clerical/sales</b>	0.049	0.217	Dummy=1, if the employee is clerical/sales
<b>Other worker</b>	0.033	0.179	Dummy=1, if the employee is other worker
<b>Fit for this company</b>	0.918	0.276	Dummy=1, if the employee thinks he/she fit for this firm



<b>Satisfied with the management</b>	0.901	0.299	Dummy=1, if the employee satisfied with the management in this company
<b>Develop strengths</b>	0.901	0.299	Dummy=1, if the employee thinks he/she can develop strength in this company
<b>Low cost if leaving job</b>	0.324	0.469	Dummy=1, if the employee think he/she will not suffer a low cost if he/she left current job
<b>Training good for your work</b>	0.978	0.147	Dummy=1, if the employee think the training is good for his/her job
<b>Job satisfaction:</b>			
<b>with income</b>	3.852	0.844	
<b>with work itself</b>	4.154	0.647	
<b>with working environment</b>	4.302	0.699	
<b>with relationship with supervisors</b>	4.302	0.822	
<b>with relationship with co-work</b>	4.412	0.729	
<b>with promotion chance</b>	4.044	0.820	
<b>with the scope for using your own initiative</b>	4.560	0.783	
<b>with fringe benefit</b>	3.978	0.892	
<b>with reward system</b>	4.181	0.851	
<b>with overall</b>	4.137	0.764	
			Five Likert Scale Categorical variables: value=1: very dissatisfied value=2: dissatisfied value=3: neither satisfied nor dissatisfied value=4: satisfied value=5: very satisfied
<b>Hard to change job</b>	0.819	0.386	Dummy=1, if the employee thinks it is hard to change job
<b>Share the values of my organization</b>	4.291	0.671	
<b>Proud of the job</b>	4.214	0.667	
<b>Proud of the firm</b>	4.198	0.677	
<b>Managers understand about meeting responsibilities outside work</b>	4.247	0.673	
<b>Management fair</b>	4.198	0.685	
<b>Management respect worker's opinion</b>	4.335	0.715	
<b>Management encourage worker's participation</b>	4.176	0.745	
			Five Likert Scale Categorical variables: value=1: strongly disagree value=2: disagree value=3: neutral value=4: agree value=5: strongly agree

## Appendix C

**Table 2 Comparison of Mean for the Two Groups of Worker**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Mean of not change job factors</b>	<b>Mean of change job factors</b>	<b>Mean differential</b>	<b>T-test</b>
<b>Guangdong province</b>	0.064	0.044	0.019	-5.011
<b>Gender</b>	0.560	0.556	0.005	6.487
<b>Age</b>	28.291	32.711	-4.42	44.957
<b>Below primary or primary school</b>	0.092	0.049	0.043	-3.731
<b>Junior high school</b>	0.716	0.829	-0.113	12.158
<b>High school</b>	0.142	0.122	0.02	-2.160
<b>College or above</b>	0.050	0.000	0.05	-5.254
<b>Married</b>	0.610	0.805	-0.195	9.995
<b>Spouse work</b>	0.560	0.732	-0.171	8.438
<b>Spouse living together</b>	0.248	0.268	-0.02	0.619
<b>Family members nearby</b>	0.589	0.561	0.028	7.350
<b>Friend nearby</b>	0.801	0.902	-0.101	15.115
<b>Take long-term care</b>	0.206	0.122	0.084	-0.868
<b>Adapt</b>	0.986	0.976	0.01	23.143
<b>Work period(mth)</b>	10.844	10.366	0.478	13.656
<b>Production workers</b>	0.837	0.610	0.227	11.604
<b>Skill worker/supervisor</b>	0.128	0.146	-0.019	-2.364
<b>Clerical/sales</b>	0.028	0.122	-0.094	-5.443
<b>Other workers</b>	0.007	0.122	-0.115	-6.344
<b>Weekly working hour</b>	40.000	40.634	-0.634	390.759
<b>Over-time hour(monthly)</b>	88.000	87.257	0.743	110.834
<b>Decide work hour by own</b>	0.950	0.925	0.025	19.295
<b>Teamwork</b>	0.972	0.561	0.411	13.507
<b>Free combination</b>	0.028	0.100	-0.072	-5.409
<b>Townsmen in group</b>	0.936	0.659	0.278	14.116
<b>Cordial working with groupmates</b>	0.979	0.683	0.296	15.444
<b>Fit for this company</b>	1.000	0.634	0.366	15.152
<b>Satisfied with the management</b>	0.986	0.610	0.376	14.469

<b>Develop strengths</b>	0.986	0.610	0.376	14.469
<b>Low cost if leaving job</b>	0.177	0.829	-0.652	3.265
<b>Provide training when start working</b>	1.000	0.878	0.122	19.916
<b>Training time(day)</b>	1.993	2.500	0.237	35.056
<b>Regular training</b>	1.007	0.878	0.129	19.422
<b>Training good for your working</b>	1.000	0.902	0.098	20.835
<b>Satisfied with the entertainment</b>	4.596	4.463	0.132	68.344
<b>Medical insurance</b>	1.000	0.976	0.024	23.836
<b>Work injury insurance</b>	0.993	0.895	0.098	18.793
<b>Endowment insurance</b>	0.312	0.450	-0.138	2.606
<b>Maternity insurance</b>	0.879	0.684	0.195	12.660
<b>Income satisfaction</b>	4.007	3.317	0.69	46.015
<b>Satisfaction in work itself</b>	4.220	3.927	0.293	36.504
<b>Working strength satisfaction</b>	4.191	3.780	0.411	56.372
<b>Working environment satisfaction</b>	4.440	3.829	0.61	58.697
<b>Job stability satisfaction</b>	4.284	3.805	0.479	61.359
<b>Income stability satisfaction</b>	4.035	3.488	0.548	51.149
<b>Satisfaction of relationship with supervisors</b>	4.482	3.683	0.799	51.691
<b>Satisfaction of relationship with co-workers</b>	4.546	3.951	0.595	59.043
<b>Promotion chance satisfaction</b>	4.262	3.293	0.97	47.266
<b>satisfaction with the scope for using your own initiative</b>	4.816	3.683	1.133	53.717
<b>Work time satisfaction</b>	4.468	3.878	0.59	58.283
<b>Fringe benefit satisfaction</b>	4.170	3.317	0.853	44.924
<b>Reward system satisfaction</b>	4.440	3.293	1.147	46.774
<b>Training chance satisfaction</b>	4.461	3.439	1.022	51.279
<b>Overall satisfaction</b>	4.333	3.463	0.87	51.164

<b>Hard to change job</b>	0.986	0.244	0.742	9.636
<b>Share values of my organization</b>	4.411	3.878	0.533	60.823
<b>Proud of the job</b>	4.376	3.659	0.717	57.603
<b>Proud of the firm</b>	4.383	3.561	0.822	55.816
<b>Managers relied upon to keep promises</b>	4.440	3.707	0.732	59.119
<b>Managers are sincere to understand employees' views</b>	4.426	3.707	0.718	58.925
<b>Managers understand about meeting responsibilities outside work</b>	4.404	3.707	0.697	58.091
<b>Management encourage further education</b>	4.362	3.634	0.728	56.498
<b>Management fair</b>	4.482	3.634	0.848	56.399
<b>Management respect worker's opinion</b>	4.553	3.585	0.968	54.724
<b>Management encourage worker's participation</b>	4.404	3.39	1.014	51.144
<b>Sample Size</b>	141	41	---	---

## Appendix D

**Table 3 Determinants of Voluntary Job Turnover, Logistic Regression Results**

**Dependence Variable:** The employee will consider change job.

	Model 1 (basic information)		Model 2 (M1+adaption)		Model 3 (M1+Job satisfaction)				Model 4 (M1+ Loyalty)		Model 5 (M1+Managem ent Performance)		Model 6 (M1+ Cost of turnover)	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	Overall satisfaction		Satisfaction with diff. variables		B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
<b>Independence variables</b>														
<b>Guangdong province</b>	-.342	.710												
<b>Gender</b>	-.055	.946	-.130	0.878	.156	1.169	-.212	.809	.111	1.117	-.092	.912	-.112	.894
<b>Age</b>	.020	1.021	.005	1.005	-.004	.996	-.040	.961	.053	1.054	-.052	.949	.006	1.006
<b>Below primary or primary school</b>	16.715	181674												
		56.86												
<b>Junior high school</b>	17.498	397304												
		82.68												
<b>High school</b>	17.053	254623												
		91.18												
<b>College or above</b>	-16.732	.000												
<b>Married</b>	.079	1.083	.807	2.240	1.239	3.452	1.216	1.013	.406	1.500	1.935	6.927	-.209	.811
											**			
<b>Spouse work</b>	.414	1.513												
<b>Take long-term care</b>	-.529	0.589												
<b>Occupation:</b>														
Production worker	-2.677	0.069	-2.798	.061	-4.544	.011	-3.499	.030	-3.396	.034	-4.102	.017	-3.916	.020
	**		**		*				**		**			
Skill worker/supervisor	-2.578	0.076	-2.698	.067	-4.346	.013	-4.117	.016	-3.723	.024	-4.618	.010	-2.311	.099
	**		**		*		***		**		**			
Clerical/sales	-1.432	0.239	-1.368	.255	-2.192	.021	-5.746	.003	-3.564	.028	-4.440	.012	-1.845	.158
					**		**		**		**			
Other worker														
<b>Family members nearby</b>			-.547	.579										
<b>Friends nearby</b>			1.085	2.959										
			***											
<b>Adapt</b>			-1.307	.271										
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>					-2.192	.112								
					*									

<b>Job satisfaction:</b>														
With income														
With work itself														
With relationship with supervisors														
With relationship with co-work														
With promotion chance														
With the scope for using your own initiative														
With fringe benefit														
With reward system														
With training chance														
<b>Share the values of my organization</b>														
<b>Proud of the job</b>														
<b>Proud of the firm</b>														
<b>Teamwork</b>														
<b>Management fair</b>														
<b>Management respect worker's opinion</b>														
<b>Management encourage worker's participation</b>														
<b>Low cost if leaving job</b>														
<b>Hard to change job</b>														

\* — sig. at 1% (  $p < 0.01$  )

\*\* — sig. at 5% (  $0.01 < p < 0.05$  )

\*\*\* — sig. at 10% (  $0.05 < p < 0.1$  )

## Appendix E

**Table 4. Significant Determinants of Voluntary Job Turnover, Logistic Regression Results**

Dependence Variable: The employee will consider change job.

Independent variables	With overall satisfaction		Without overall satisfaction	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
<b>Occupation:</b>				
Production worker	-7.064***	.001	-7.836	.000
Skill worker/supervisor	-5.936	.003	-6.050	.002
Clerical/sales	-8.329**	.000	-10.564***	.000
Other worker				
Friends nearby	-1.590	.204	-1.204	.300
Overall satisfaction	-1.424**	.241		
<b>Job satisfaction:</b>				
with relationship with supervisors			-.423	.649
with the scope for using your own initiative			-1.928**	.145
With training chance			-.847	.429
Proud of the job	-1.267	.282	-1.645	.193
Proud of the firm	1.645	5.179	1.224	3.401
Teamwork	.363	1.438	1.112	3.040
Management fair	-.959	.383	.214	1.239
Management respect worker's opinion	-2.454***	.086	-2.415***	.089
Management encourage worker's participation	-1.232	.292	-.585	.557
Low cost if leaving job	3.353*	28.591	3.828**	45.958
Hard to change job	-3.697*	.25	-3.802**	.002

\* — sig. at 1% ( $p < 0.01$ )    \*\* — sig. at 5% ( $0.01 < p < 0.05$ )    \*\*\* — sig. at 10% ( $0.05 < p < 0.1$ )

## Reference

Adrian J, Loan-Clarke John, Morrell, M Kevin and Wilkinson.2008 “Organisational change and employee turnover”, Personal Review.

Ahlswede Oliver, Christ Oliver, Disk R.V, Grubba Cornelia, Hohfeld Corinna, Hauptmeier Martin, Moltzen Kai, Stellmacher Jost, Tissington P.A and Wagner Ulrich. 2004. “Should I Stay or Should I Go? Explaining Turnover Intentions with Organizational Identification and Job Satisfaction”, British Academy of Management.

Akhtar Syed, Ding D.Z and Ge, G.L. 2008. “Strategic HRM Practices and Their Impact on Company Performance in Chinese Enterprises”, Human Resource Management.

Aquino, K., Griffeth, R. W., Allen, D. G. & Hom, P.W. 1997. Integrating justice constructs into the turnover process: A test of a referent cognitions model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1208-1227.

Blau, G. 1993. Further exploring the relationship between job search and voluntary individual turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 313-330.

Bretz, R. D., Boudreau, J. W. and Judge, T. A. 1994. Job search behavior of employed managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 275-301.

Campion M.A and Maertz C.P. 2004. “Profiles in Quitting: Integrating Process and Content Turnover Theory”, *Academy of Management Journal*.

Carsten, J. M., & Spector, P.E. 1987. Unemployment, job satisfaction and employee turnover: A meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 374-381.

Chan, D. 1996. Cognitive misfit of problem-solving style at work: A facet of person-organization fit. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 68, 194-207.

Cohen, A. 1995. An examination of the relationships between work commitment and nonwork domains. *Human Relations*, 48, 239-263.

Francesco A.M, Peng K.Z and Yan Ming. 2011. “The Differential Effects of Job Design on Knowledge Workers and Manual Workers: A Quasi-Experiment Field Study in China”, *Human Resource Management*.



Gerhart Barry, Lee T.H, Trecor Charlie O and Weller Ingo. 2008. "Understanding Voluntary Turnover: Path-Specific Job Satisfaction Effects and The Importance Of Unsolicited Job Offers", *Academy of Management Journal*.

Griffeth, R.W., Hom, P.W., & Gaertner, S. 2000. A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463-488.

Griffeth R.W and Maertz C.P. 2004. "Eight Motivational Forces and Voluntary Turnover: A Theoretical Synthesis with Implications for Research", *Journal of management*.

Heywood John S, Siebert W. Stanley and Wei Xiangdong, "Job Satisfaction and the Labor Market Institutions in Urban China",

Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. 1995. *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Irving, P. G., Coleman, D. F., & Cooper, C. L. 1997. Further assessment of a three-component model of occupational commitment: Generalizability and differences across occupations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 444-452.

Jaros, S. J. 1997. An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.

Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 1994. An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 51-89.

Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A. 1998. 25 years of voluntary turnover research: A review and critique. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 13, 49-81.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. 1958. *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.

Mobley, W. H. 1977. Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 237-240.

Neely Andy, Wang Zhijun, Yaghi Bassil and Youell Nigel. "Enterprise Performance Management: The Chinese State of the Art", Peking University.

Reichers, A. 1985. A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-476.

Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. 1991. A construct validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 637-643.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. 1998. Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 486-491.