

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Job Behavioral Factors and Turnover Intention: A Case Study at Sime Darby Property Limited

Amran Awang*, Abdul Razak Amir, Wirda Osman

Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia.

*Corresponding Author: Email: amranawang@yahoo.com

Abstract

Some job behavioral factors are utilized to examine their relationship with turnover intention among 201 employees in Sime Darby Property (Malaysia) Limited. Job satisfaction, job stress, organizational commitment, job enrichment and person-organization fit are the job behavioral factors selected for the study. The variables used in the study justify the reliability scores consistent with indicators in previous studies. Research methodology justifies the quantitative requirements of simple random sampling, social desirability bias and response error. Multiple regression analysis (MRA) was used to verify five hypothesis developed in the study. Prior to establishing the hypothesis testing results some MRA assumptions were considered showed in linearity, normality, collinearity test and Durbin-Watson index. The result support previous studies when job satisfaction is high turnover intention among the employees become lower, and when job stress is high the tendency for employees to leave the organization also high.

Keywords: *Job enrichment, Job satisfaction, Job stress, Organizational commitment, Person-organization fit, Turnover intention.*

Backgorund of the Study

Human resources managers in many countries in Asia have a sleepless night due to the employee turnover [1]. That make issues on turnover intention research has been extensively conducted worldwide. It has become a central research topic about nearly ninety years [2,3] about two decades turnover and it effect being a major concern of the management [4,5]. Turnover has being a major problem and critical issues for management until today. Much attention has been given toward the factors that contribute to turnover intention especially toward employee's turnover behavior [6]. Turnover can give many implications in financial and operation of the organization [7]. These issues lead to organization losses in their skilled and experienced employees, decreasing productivity, and customer satisfaction of the company. In addition, turnover also lead to increasing cost of training and expatriation losses [8].

Many organizations treat turnover as a serious problem and start taking preventive actions to maintain and retain their high-skilled employees in the organization, among others orientation and training programs have been adopted [9]. Literature about correlates of employee turnover has been well developed [2,10]. Mobley [11] noted

that by using the categories of correlates of employee turnover, turnover is more likely in a robust economy with low unemployment rates and in lower-paying industries, when high routinization and task repetitiveness, and when low supervisory consideration, integration and communication and high centralization. Turnover has a positive relationship with the expectation to find another jobs and high intention to quit. Elangovan [12] said that the most important and immediate antecedent of turnover is the intention to quit. That led the most researchers more focus on turnover intention rather than actual turnover.

Abbasi and Hollman [13] note that \$11 billion of visible and hidden costs of turnover annually need to be carry out by the organization. It gives the negative consequences to the organization in term of financial cost. However the organization also must mitigate the turnover effect which give an impact to the organization such as disruption of efficiency, decrease in morale, customer relations [13] and resulting in the organizational performance [14].

Turnover can be categorized in two categories which is voluntary or involuntary, as well as

functional or dysfunctional [14] and each of it will contribute varying effects on the organization. Voluntary turnover can be defined as a process of an individual makes a decision to stay or leave the firm, is usually dysfunctional and can be the most detrimental to the organization [11]. Abbasi and Hollman [13] warn that the smartest and most talented employees will be more likely to leave the organization. When they leave the organizations, their experience, knowledge and talent leave with them resulting in output delays caused by their vacancy [13], which can lead to organizational dysfunctional. On the other hand, involuntary turnover can be defined as a process the organization assumes control over an employee's decision to stay or leave. Typically, the process focuses on removing underperforming employees; it is labeled as functional [14].

Previous studies on turnover have focused on factors contributing to turn over and the organizational costs related to turnover. The reverse of organization gains receives from retaining quality employees are the organizational cost related to turnover. It is varies between 70 percent and 200 percent of departing employee's salary in order to cover the cost of replacing an employee [15]. According to Hom and Griffeth [16] there are four types of cost incurred due to the high turnover which is separation cost (include all cost regarding laying off the employee), replacement cost (relate to hiring new employee in the organization), training cost (includes formal and informal training cost) and vacancy cost (due to non-productivity gap between the loss of an employee and the hiring of a replacement). Meanwhile, Pfeffer [17] note that there are three types of cost incurred which is the direct replacement cost, the indirect costs transition period that affect the workload, morale and productivity of the remaining employees, and the costs of lost opportunities.

From the previous research, there are several factors that contribute to turnover intention which is inadequate wages, few opportunities for career advancement and lack of administrative support and respect. There are negative relationships between age and job tenure associated with turnover and the relationship between turnover and other variable have been ambiguous in most of the literature. Other variable such as education, absenteeism, sex, professionalism, aptitude, performance, interest, and source of referral for the job has been determined as factors that contribute to turnover. However, recently shows that women are more frequently quit rather than men [18].

Job satisfaction (such as promotion, job enrichment, coworkers, supervision, salary, working environment and working condition) and organizational commitment has a negative relationship with turnover intention. Randolph [19] indicated that turnover intention among new employees will reduce while their job satisfaction will increase when their ideas are consistent with the organizations. Meanwhile, Linnehan and Blau [20] note that when new employee perceive the workplace is different from what they expected after they enter it, the turnover intention of new employees will be increased. Similarly, Jasper [21] revealed that there are relationships between job expectancy and employee job satisfaction. George and Jones [22] conclude that the way people experience work can influence intentions to leave or stay in the organization. Therefore, this study examines factors that contribute to turnover intention among the employee's in Sime Darby Property Berhad, Malaysia. The call for the study is due to dearth of empirical evidence prevails within Malaysian organizations especially in human resource management as cited in Ab Rahman [23]:

The turnover rate in Malaysia has increased from 9.3% in year 2009 to 10.1% in year 2010. The highest turnover rate found to be recorded by the financial services (18.3%) and high-tech/IT industry (20%). However, the chemicals industry with 6.3% of turnover rate is the lowest rate among the industries.

According to the research, it is a difficult task to retain employees due to the demand and opportunity factor, which encourage employees to leave an organization. The top three reasons for the employees to leave an organization are due to better external opportunity (67.3%), limited growth opportunities (46%) and further studies (38%) [23].

This study capitalizes on issues regarding the extent of job factors such as job satisfaction, job stress, job enrichment, organizational commitment and person-organization fit in explaining turnover intention among the employees in Sime Darby Property Limited. The aims of the research are to seek answers for how those job factors explain turnover intention?

The study explored into one of the largest government linked corporations (GLCs) investigating her employees' job factors and turnover intention. Sime Darby Property is a leader in building sustainable communities with a

global presence. It is an integrated property player involved in property development, asset management, hospitality and leisure. Currently, Sime Darby Property has a significant presence in the Asia-Pacific region with projects in Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, Vietnam and China. In 2007, Sime Darby Property is created through the integration of the property arms of the former Golden Hope Plantations Limited, Kumpulan Guthrie Limited and Sime Darby Limited.

Theoretical Development

Turnover Intention

According to Cotton and Tuttle [2] turnover is an individual estimated probability that they will stay or leave an employing organization. Meanwhile, Meyer [24] justifies turnover intention as conscious willfulness and deliberate intention to leave the organization to seek for other alternatives job opportunities in other organization. In the same vein, Hom and Griffeth [10] noted that turnover intentions as an individual voluntary to withdrawal from the company and intent to search for alternative employment. Turnover is conceptualize as the movement of an employee over the boundaries of the organization [25].

Aneil and Gretchen [26] classify turnover into two categories which are involuntary and voluntary. Involuntary turnover occurs when employee is being terminate, discharged or other reason which the cause of leaving the company is not by the intention of the employee while voluntary turnover occur when employee leave the company because of their own decision due to several factors. The factors including, job satisfaction, performance problems, unmet job expectations, job stress and lack of career development opportunities.

Today, employee's turnover being the importance concerns of Human Resources Management of the company where it place in the first ranking of the organization concerns. There has been a greater focus of organization on people leaving rather than entering the organization [25]. The voluntary turnover adversely affects an organization's ability to perform such as reduce the productivity, slow down the progression of work, minimize the total output and performing below the scale [10]. The cost that the organization incur due to the high level of turnover such as separation cost, replacement cost, training cost and vacancy cost [16]. The organization also has to face the consequences losses in organizational efficiency, business

culture, effectiveness and corporate knowledge. It is better for the organization to retain the employees rather than spent money on such financial cost [27].

Fishbein [28] noted that turnover intentions are one's behavioral intention to separate from current job. It was constructing from the beliefs-attitudes-behavioral intentions model. The relationship between behavioral intention and attitudes about the job or organization were reported significant from the most previous studies [29]. Turnover intentions has been review rather than actual turnover due to the two reason which is employees make conscious decision before actually leaving their jobs and it is more practicable to do cross-sectional study rather than longitudinal research by tracking down to see whether they have left [30].

According to Tett & Meyer [31] and Parasuraman [32], turnover intention can predict future quitting behavior well. There was the linkage between the actual behavior of leaving and turnover intention. Highlighting behavioral intentions are the single best predictor of turnover and turnover intention are the key element in the modeling of employee turnover behavior. Therefore, the primary prevention principle, preemption of a quit intention can be an effective step to halt the contributing factor of wanting to quit. The organization also must impose effective policies on human resource retention.

Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

The meaning of job satisfaction can be clarified in various definitions. According to Rinehart and Short [33] job satisfaction is essentially any combination of psychological and environmental circumstances and as the extent to which person derives pleasure from a job. The pleasure includes salary, treatment to the employees, company consideration and management value. Shah [34], identify job satisfaction as the feelings an employee has about the job as well as satisfaction in certain criteria such as pay, supervision, morale and opportunity for advancement.

In the other words, job satisfaction is the degree of individual satisfaction with all aspects associated with the current job which not directly related to the current job content and the degree of an individual's feelings towards and satisfaction with their current job activities, responsibilities and achievement. Many researchers have theorized that job satisfaction is

a key antecedent of turnover intentions [35]. Generally, job satisfaction is defined as employees concern on their job, their expected, wanted, needed, or perceived to be fair [36].

According to Prince [25], job satisfaction is one of the factors or reasons for employee intentions to leave the organization. Meta-analytical studies show a consistently modest correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Rasch and Harrell [37] found that the employees who have low job satisfaction toward their work tend to have high intention to leave that organization and seek for other job outside. Similarly, result in Hom and Griffeth [16] suggesting higher turnover intention when level of job satisfaction become lower. A study conducted by Shah [34], every unit of reduction in job satisfaction reflected approximately a one-half standard deviation increase in the intent to leave. Furthermore, Lee, Gerhart, Weller, and Trevor [38] reported that there are negative relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with turnover intention.

Hence we posit: *H1: High job satisfaction explains lower turnover intention.*

Job Stress and Turnover Intention

Recently, there is a rapidly expanding body of international literature on examining job stress due to the negative impact on the individual employee. Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau, [39] noted that job stress can be viewed as an individual's reactions to work environment characteristics which indicate poor fit between the individual abilities and the work environment demand.

Meanwhile, Health Advocate Inc. [40] views job stress as harmful physical and emotional state of the employees responses that occur when the jobs exceed the capabilities, abilities, needs, wants, or resources of the employees. However, others have defined stress differently, and these definitions have been reviewed elsewhere. In addition, job stress can affect the organizational outcomes such as in job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment which can lead to turnover intentions [31].

In general perspective, job stress means improper occupational stress which affects the mental and physical of the employees. In psychology, job stress is a form of stimulus or reaction or interaction between the individual and environment which can endangers their health. An employee who experience job stress will

contribute to negative consequences such as being passive, anxious, anger, headache, sleepless, decrease of job involvement, absence from work and have high intention to leave the organization [41].

Employees who feel they have little control toward their work were faced higher stress levels. The factors may contribute to job stress such as low salaries, unrealistic job expectation and heavy workloads, lack of opportunities growth and advancement and job security. Additionally, previous studies show that longer working hour (overtime) can result in poor mental performance, illness and workplace injuries which will increase the employees intention to leave the organization [40].

Previous studies have shown that job satisfaction and job stress has been hypothesized and empirically tested which is subject to the meta-analysis. The analytical result proved that job stress is a predictive of numerous negative attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Employees who feel stress while doing their job will experience job dissatisfaction and have a greater propensity to leave the organization. Stress related problems among employees contribute to negative affect toward the organizational which lead to increased absenteeism, decreased organizational commitment and high turnover rate [42].

Many researchers found that job stress have a positive relationship with the job satisfaction and the intention to leave their job. Similarly, Heydarian and Abhar [43] found that there is a positive relationship between work related stress and turnover intention. Moreover, the victims of the job stress face a lower quality of life and dissatisfaction with their job. Job stress commonly occurs when the individual employee have conflict with their job duties, work load and time pressure.

Fisher [44] iterated that the effect of stress is costly when relate to the individual in term of emotional consequences such as dissatisfaction toward their job and to the organizational in term of low quality of performance and high intention to leave the organization. Collins [45] and Sanders [46] argued that job related stress have a positive relationship with turnover intention (intention to leave the job in the organization).

Hence we posit: *H2: High job stress explains higher turnover intention.*

Job Enrichment and Turnover Intention

Job enrichment is an attempt to motivate employees by giving them the opportunity uses the range of their abilities [47]. Herzberg, an American psychologist developed the concept in the 1950s. It can be contrasted to job enlargement which is simply increases the number of tasks without changing the challenge. Job enrichment has been described as vertical loading of a job, while job enlargement is horizontal loading. An enriched job should ideally contain: a range of tasks and challenges of varying difficulties including physical and mental, a complete unit of work including a meaningful task and feedback, encouragement and communication [48].

According to Parker [49] job enrichment is the increase in an employee's responsibility and control over employees work. Job enrichment allows the employees to expand their responsibilities, change their role, and create new competencies without have to leave their current position or leave their organization. Employing job enrichment an organization is supposed to get high potential employees who are talented workers with several competencies [50].

Job enrichment is an effective tool to motivate the employees. If the employees are provided with a sense of responsibility, the employees will be highly motivated to do their work, increase their performance and increase the intention to remain in the organization. When the job is enriched, the employees furnish five core characteristic such as task significance, task variety, task identity, autonomy and feedback [51].

Job enrichment is a feeling derived from works itself. Properly structured job make people feel like human being and much appreciated by their organization rather than units of production and the pressures arising from social and technological changes. There is a need for something more in life rather than material possessions. Labor turnover, frustration and absenteeism are industrial action that has been shown by the employees when they feel that they do not have a chances or opportunities to use their abilities to expand their job scope or to execute multitasking [52].

Hence: *H3: High job enrichment explains lower turnover intention.*

Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

Organizational commitment is an attachment to or identification with the organization and has

been seen as an emotional response toward a positive appraisal at the workplace. The employees will demonstrate a strong desire to stay or stick in the organization if they believe strongly in the organization's values and goals [42].

In addition, Perryer, Jordan, Firms, Travaglione [53] conceptualize organizational commitment as the relative strength of employees involvement in or identification with the organization. It was viewed as a stable attitude which is reflecting a general affective response towards the organization as a whole and more stable and global rather than employee satisfaction. Generally, it was more closely related to the achievement of long term organization goals.

Meanwhile, Helena, Praveen, & Evyan [54] verify that organizational commitment as an attitude which reflects the strength of the linkage between the organization and the employees. Employee attitudinal variables as well as behaviors (such as turnover, performance and organizational citizenship behaviors) and job satisfaction are closely related to the organizational commitment. Furthermore, the organization can create a harmonious relationship with the committed employees who can increase the employees' loyalty to the organization [54].

In a meta-analysis conducted by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsk [24] concluded that committed employees are less likely to have an intention to leave the organization compared to the employees who are not committed. The organization will gain more benefit with the committed employees because it can reduce the organization cost. The organization does not have to carry out extra cost occurs from the high number of employees leave the company or high turnover rate. The productivity and performance of the organization also was not disrupted by the turnover [24]

Previous studies confirmed that organizational commitment play the important role in the turnover process and it indicate that job satisfaction and organizational commitment has negatively related to turnover intentions [24,42].

Hence: *H4: High organizational commitment explains lower turnover intentions.*

Person-Organization (PO) Fit and Turnover Intention

Person-organization fit is a person's personality, goals and values which associate with those of the organization [55]. On the other hand, Kristof [56] conceptualizes PO fit as the compatibility between

the employee and the organization. It happens when one of them provide the needs or share a similar characteristic or both.

According to Piasentin and Chapman [57], PO fit can be explained, firstly as a supplementary fit. Supplementary means an individual possesses characteristic similarly with the organization characteristics. Secondly as a complementary fit. Complementary fit mean where an individual fills a void or adds something that is missing in the organization. Thirdly is need supplies fit. Need supplies need mean where an individual's needs are fulfilled by the organization. Fourthly, demand abilities fit. Demand abilities fit mean where an individual's abilities meet the demand of the organization.

PO fit matches the individual with the characteristics of the organization [58]. PO fit is popular in organizational behavior and personnel management because it is significantly affects employees' turnover intention, organizational citizen behavior, pressures, working attitude, ethical behavior and job performance which decreased attention in the academic and practical management field. As widely accepted concept, there are three component of PO fit. First, the similarity between employees' personalities and organization characteristics. Second, the compatibility of goals between employees and the organization and third, the consistency between employees' values and the organizational culture [59].

In twenty first century, persons are likely demonstrating concern in choosing the most appropriate organization for them to work and appropriate job for them to perform much better. The priority have been shifted from the conventional models which based on knowledge, skills, abilities for jobs to hiring for organizational compatibility which fit the individual personality, beliefs and values with the organizational culture, norms and values.

Attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model suggest that work values are an important aspect of both individuals and organization to be compared meaningfully and directly. Values have become widely accepted in operationalizing PO fit. Employees will potentially select themselves out form the organization if they perceive that they are misfit with the organization. Much has been claimed that a high degree of PO fit will give an impact toward the organization in job seeking intentions, psychological strain, ethical conduct, knowledge acquisition and knowledge sharing, job

performance, organizational identification and turnover [60].

Numerous studies used needs and values to make a comparison between the persons and organization. People values fit was an important attributes to establish PO fit. Previous studies has examined that person value fit have used a wide variety of conceptualizations such as preferences and perceptions of organization cultures, instrumental, cognitive and affective work values. PO fit theories show that people will leave the organization if their characteristics do not fit or match with the organization. Fit is depending on the individual perception and it is very subjective. The best indicator to measure PO fit is by asking people directly about their perceived fit or combining people reported values with the perception of organizational values [55].

According to Hoffman and Woehr [61] in organizational behavior study, PO fit is the moderator of the relationship between job performance and turnover. While Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson [62], find that PO fit have strong relationship with job satisfaction and organizational commitment and more moderate relationship with turnover intentions. On the other hand, Elfenbein and O'reilly [63] stress that it is important to pay attention on the fit of values between the employees and the organization. From that the researcher will known whether the employees are more willing to remain with the organization or have an intention to leave the organization. The better PO fit, the fewer employees have an intention to quit from the organization.

Hence: H5: *High person organization fit explains lower turnover intentions.*

Methodology and Findings

Sampling and Demographic Descriptives

The population in this study refers to the entire group of people who work at Sime Darby Property Berhad. The total employees work in this company as July 31st, 2012 are 803 employees, where 416 of them work in executive positions and another 387 work in non-executive positions. A total of 350 employees were randomly selected as respondent after performing the proportionate simple random sampling procedure. Data collection process then achieved the response rate at 57 percent when 210 questionnaires were returned and usable for analysis.

The descriptive analysis revealed that most of the employees in Sime Darby Property were among the younger bracket where 80 percent of the respondents' age were between 20-40 years old and 20 percent were those more than 40 years old. The gender representation was almost equally distributed between male and female employees. Majority of the employees here was Bumiputera represented by 80 percent and other races represented by 20 percent. Most of the respondents were married represented by 60 percent and 40 percent were single. The education level among the respondents were those graduated from college up to masters degree represented by 90 percent and the rest 10 percent were high school graduates.

The three department representation were about equally distributed where 70 percent of them were in executive positions and above. However, job tenure representation showed about 30 percent had been working for more than 7 years. Subsequently, about 12 percent were those with higher pay bracket of above RM7,000.00 per month.

Instrument and Variables Descriptives

This study utilized questionnaires comprise of 40 items divided into three section where 9 items were for demographic variables. Four independent variables in the first section consist of 5 items for each of them were adapted from

previous studies. Items representing job satisfaction were adapted from Rasch and Harrell [37] Rinehart and Short [33], Spector [36], Prince [25], Park and Kim [35]. Job stress was adapted from Tett and Meyer [31], Chiu et al. [42], Ismail [64], Lee and Chuang [41]. Job enrichment was adapted from Hackman [65], King-Taylor [48], Whittington [51]. Organizational commitment was adapted from Tett and Meyer [31], Meyer et al. [24], Chiu et al. [42], Helena et al. [54] and Perryer et al. [53]. And PO fit adapted from, Zimmerman and Johnson [62], Piasentin and Chapman [57], Michael [60] Elfenbein and O'reilly [63] and Liu et al. [59]. There were 6 items for turnover intention representing the dependent variable adapted from Mobley [11]. Independent and dependent variables' items utilized five point Likert-scale ranked from strongly disagree to strongly agree where 1 - "strongly disagree", 2 - "disagree", 3 - "slightly agree", 4 - "agree" and 5 - "strongly agree".

Data collection procedures utilize self-administered approach where the respondents were given ample time to fill up the questionnaire. This procedure helps reduce

response and social desirability error. Nederhof [66] suggested self-administered questionnaire among the nine measures in coping with this kind of bias.

Table 1: Reliability indicator for variables

Variable	Cronbach's alpha	No. of items	Cronbach's alpha in previous studies	No. of items
Turnover intention	.71	6	.84 - .92	4
Job satisfaction	.73	4	.91	9
Job stress	.84	5	.80 - .87	5
Job enrichment	.72	5	.92	20
Organizational commitment	.86	5	.73 - .82	16
PO fit	.81	5	.85	15

The variables of the study were treated further ensuring that the goodness of measures justified as in previous studies. Prior to executing the composite scale treatment, we ran the reliability test to each item in ensuring its consistency and stability as suggested in Hair et al. [67]. Results in reliability analysis indicated items to be computed as the composite of the variable. Utilizing composite scores as the variable prevented the study from measurement error as suggested in Hair et al. [67]. Table 1 justified Cronbach's alpha of all variables proved stable

and consistent as compared to similar indicators from previous studies.

The descriptive analysis of all variables presented in Table 2 proved free from serious data error and relationship error such as multicollinearity. Means and standard deviation showed all variables were representable of all items used in the questionnaires, the standard deviation proved that most of the respondents were lenient towards higher magnitude of the scale. All correlations between variables showed significant relationship except job enrichment and turnover intention that proved otherwise.

Table 2: Descriptives and correlation analysis

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Job Satisfaction	3.43	0.66	-				
2. Job Stress	2.55	0.66	-.21**	-			
3. Job Enrichment	3.40	0.55	.56**	-.15*	-		
4. Organizational Commitment	3.53	0.65	.55*	-.22**	.64**	-	
5. Person Organization Fit	3.46	0.69	.56**	-.16*	.39**	.50**	-
6. Turnover Intentions	2.66	0.62	-.27**	.56**	-.08	-.18**	-.22**

** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Hypothesis Testing

A single level multiple regression analysis (MRA) was performed in justifying the hypothesis of the study. The analysis utilized SPSS 15.0 that verified the coefficient of determination showed in model summary and beta coefficients as indicator of the hypothesized relationship. Decision in utilizing MRA justified all hypothesis statements that stated the relationship were directional. MRA performed the analysis in two stages, first stage, the model summary significance was observed and second stage verified the significance of unstandardized beta coefficients of each relationship. For analysis in stage two to be valid was subjected to significant F change showed in model summary at $p > .05$ at least as suggested in APA .

The results showed in Table 3 proved that the research model was significant showed in significance F change at $p < .01$. The model was explained in coefficient of determinations showed in $R^2 = .350$, adjusted $R^2 = .334$ and R^2 change = .350. The standard error of estimate = .50 and F Change = 21.03 significant at $p < .01$. The model

explained 33.4 percent of variance in turnover intention contributed by the five job factors independently. The model furnished its predictive ability indicated in the small value of standard error of estimate [67]. In similar vein, assumptions for MRA that the variables were normally distributed, linear and free from uncorrelated error terms we examined normal distribution graphs, scatterplot diagram and Durbin-Watson (DW) index respectively. All assumptions were verified when the graph showed normal bell shaped curve and the scatterplot proved free from heterocedastic distribution as suggested in Hair et [67]. The DW index was 2.005, a value in between 1.5-2.5 proving no serious error in uncorrelated terms.

Beta coefficient showed job satisfaction (unstd. beta = -.164) and job stress (unstd. beta = .487) significantly explain turnover intention in Sime Darby Property Limited at $p < .05$ and $p < .01$ respectively. Therefore $H1$ and $H2$ were substantiated. $H1$ proved that job satisfaction and turnover intention were inversely related, when

Table 3: Multiple regression analysis results

Variable	Unstandardized beta	t	Standard error
Intercept	1.767**	5.607	0.315
Job Satisfaction	-0.164*	-2.236	0.073
Job Stress	0.487**	8.791	0.055
Job Enrichment	0.164	1.841	0.089
Organizational Commitment	-0.025	-.324	0.078
Person Organization Fit	-0.073	-1.121	0.065
R	0.592		
R Square	0.350		
Adjusted R Square	0.334		
Std. Error of the Estimate	0.50271		
R Square Change	0.350		
F Change	21.033**		
Df1		5	
Df2		195	
Durbin Watson		2.005	

** $p < .01$ and * $p < .05$.

job satisfaction was high the turnover intention reduced. On the other hand, *H2* suggested that job stress was positively related to turnover intention, high job stress contribute to higher turnover intention.

On the contrary, the study was unable to substantiate job enrichment, organizational commitment and PO fit in their relationship with turnover intention. However, unstandardized beta coefficients of organizational commitment and PO fit showed relation direction as hypothesized, while job enrichment beta direction contradicted the hypotheses.

Discussion and Conclusion

Some job behavioral factors are important in determining turnover intention among employees. This study has furnish a couple of answers to fill the voids found in human resource management studies. The results suggest that job satisfaction and job stress are now supposed to be the main issues to be handled in Sime Darby Property Limited. Indeed, the findings are consistent with Shah [34], Hsu [68], Lee et al. [38], Price [25], Hom and Griffeth [16] and Rasch and Harrell [37]. In other word, Sime Darby Property senior management should give serious attention in ensuring factors of job satisfaction properly delivered to their employees. Spector [36] suggested that job satisfaction factors, such as pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of the work, and communication are pertinent factors to reduce turnover among employees.

The results of this study suggest that the extent to which Sime Darby Property employees receive intrinsic and extrinsic rewards related to their jobs [47] will affect their intent to leave the organization. Indeed, the empirical evidence of this study provides a better understanding of the factors contributing to the development of positive or negative work attitudes. This information may help managers monitor employees' attitudes on an ongoing basis. Hence, HRD practitioners should consider implementing organizational learning and establishing learning organizations that encourage job satisfaction and reduce the influence of external factors, thus increasing retention of R&D professionals.

On the other hand, positive relationship between job stress and turnover intention is consistent with numbers of previous studies [31,42-46].The

results then suggest that more stressors experience at job will induce higher intention for employees to leave their jobs.

Furthermore, in this study we attempt to evaluate the impact of role stressors on various individual work outcomes in a non-Western corporate setting. In a US study of the linkages between work stress and turnover intentions, Boyar et al. [69] found that role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload increased work-family conflict, which in turn led to high turnover intentions. Similar to their study, we found positive effects of stressors on intentions to leave Sime Darby Property. It is plausible that some of the relationships among the study variables also hold in different parts of the world. The negative impacts of work stress on job satisfaction and psychological well-being have been confirmed in the current literature, including studies that used Western and Asian samples [70-72]. Perrewe et al. [73] also found that the consequences of role stressors on burnout were consistent across nine regions. To be sure, more cross-cultural research on this topic should be conducted in the future. We hope that our study will be the impetus for researchers to conduct research in non-Western settings using samples often neglected in the literature.

The practical implications of our study, however, are affected to some extent in its limitations. First, the relationships among the job behavioral factors and outcome variable included common method variance because our data were obtained from a self administered questionnaire. Second, our study utilized a cross-sectional design and thus it cannot confirm the direction of causality as implied. Third, the reliability of our measures of job satisfaction and job stress were lower than expected. Lastly, we have not considered the possible impact of some organization-level variables such as job demographic, work culture, organizational structure and climate, and work arrangements that may affect an individual's perception of stress and its consequences. Questions about the generalizability of our findings include whether the findings (a) are generalizable to other corporate bodies other than Sime Darby Property Limited in Malaysia, (b) are generalizable to other similar organization, and (c) can be applied to non-professionals as well as professional jobs. Even though our data came from a relatively restrictive population of a single company, we are confident that the general model would also apply to other groups of professionals

and non-professionals. The relationships between [23,64,68,71,74,75,76,77].job behavioral factors and individual work outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, job stress and turnover intention) have been found in other organizational settings [78-102]

References

1. Khatri N, Budhwar P, Fern CT (1999) Employee turnover: Bad attitude or poor management. *J. Management*, 12-99.
2. Cotton J, Tuttle J (1986) Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implication for research. *J. Academy of Management Review*, 11(1):55-70.
3. Tse HH M, Lam W (2008) Transformational leadership and turnover: The roles of LMX and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Proceeding*, 1-6.
4. French NK, Chopra RV (1999) Parent perspectives on the roles of paraprofessionals. *J. the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 24:259-272.
5. Giangreco MF, Broer SM, Edelman SW (2002) That was then, this is now! Paraprofessional supports for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. *J. Exceptionality*, 10(1):47-64.
6. Richer SF, Blanchard C, Vallerandi RJ (2002) A motivational model of work turnover. *J. Applied Social Psychology*, 32(10):2089-113.
7. Gomez-Mejia L, Balkin D (1992) The determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *J. Academy of Management*, 35:921-955.
8. Reichheld FF (1993) Loyalty-based management. *J. Harvard Business Review*. 71:64-73.
9. Ongori H (2007) A Review of the literature on employee turnover. *African J. Business Management*, 1(3):49-54.
10. Hom PW, Griffeth RW (1991) Labor-turnover-mathematical-models: Structural-equation-models: Factor-analysis. *J. Applied Psychology*, 76:350-660.
11. Mobley WH (1982) *Employee Turnover: Causes, Consequences, and Control*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
12. Elangovan AR (2001) Causal ordering of stress, satisfaction and commitment, and intention to quit: A structural equations analysis. *J. Leadership & Organization Development*, 22(4):159-165.
13. Abbasi SM, Hollman KW (2000) Turnover: The real bottom line. *J. Public Personnel Management*, 29(3):333.
14. Watrous K M et al (2006) When coworkers and managers quit: The effects of turnover and shared values on performance. *J. Business and Psychology*, 21:(103-26).
15. Kaye B, Jordan-Evans S (2001) Retaining key employees. *J. Public Management*, 83:6-11.
16. Hom PW, Griffeth RW (1995) *Employee Turnover*. Cincinnati: South Western College Publishing.
17. Pfeffer J (2007) CEO Turnover: The High Cost of Free Agency (Online) Available at http://blogs.hbr.org/cs/2007/05/ceo_turnover_the_high_cost_of.html.
18. Hom PW, Roberson L, Ellis AD (2008) Challenging conventional wisdom about who quits: Revelations from corporate America. *J. Applied Psychology*, 93:1-34.
19. Randolph DS (2005) Predicting the effect of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction factors on recruitment and retention of rehabilitation professionals. *J. Health Management*, 50(1):49-60.
20. Linnehan F, Blau G (2003) Testing the impact of job search and recruitment source on new hire turnover in Maquiladora. *J. Applied Psychology*, 52(2):253-269.
21. Jasper M (2005) Editorial. Keeping our staff—the links between job satisfaction, recruitment and retention. *J. Nursing Management*, 13:279-281.
22. George JM, Jones GR (1996) *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior* Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
23. Ab Rahman R (2012) A study on turnover intention trend in commercial banks in Penang, Malaysia. Unpublished Masters Thesis: Universiti Sains Malaysia.
24. Meyer JP, Stanley DJ, Herscovitch L, Topolnytsky L (2002) Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *J. Vocational Behavior*, 61:20-52.
25. Price JL (2001) Reflections on the determinants of voluntary turnover. *Int. J. Manpower*, 22(7):660-24.
26. Aneil KM, Gretchen MS (2002) To stay or go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *J. Organizational Behavior*, 23:707-29.
27. Mitchell TR, Holtom BC, Lee TW, Sablinski CJ, Erez M (2001) Why people stay: using job

Acknowledgement

I want to express my appreciation to my undergraduate student, Miss Wirda Osman in converting his final year project paper into this paper. Knowing that there are rooms of improvement in this paper but his first attempt in publication should be given supports and encourages.

- embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *J. Academy of Management*, 44:1102-1121.
28. Fishbein MA (1967) *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
 29. Parnell JA, Crandell WR (2003) Propensity for participative decision-making, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizen behavior, and intentions to leave among Egyptian managers. *J. Multinational Business Review*, 11(1):45-65.
 30. Mor Barak ME, Nissly JA, Levin A (2001) Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and meta analysis. *J. Social Service*, 75(4):625-661.
 31. Tett RP, Meyer JP (1993) Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *J. Personnel Psychology*, 46:259-94.
 32. Parasuraman S (1989) Nursing turnover: An integrated model. *J. Nursing and Health*, 12:267-277.
 33. Rinehart JS, Short PM (1994) Job satisfaction and empowerment among teacher leaders, reading recovery teachers and regular classroom teachers. *J. Education*, 114(4):570-80.
 34. Shah N (2011) Investigating employee career commitment factors in a public sector organization of a developing country. *J. Enterprise Information Management*, 24(6):534-46.
 35. Park JS, Kim TH (2009) Do types of organizational culture matter in nurse job satisfaction and turnover intention? *J. Leadership in Health Services*, 22(1):20-38.
 36. Spector PE (1997) *Job satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
 37. Rasch RH, Harrell AM (1990) The impact of personal characteristics on the turnover behavior of accounting professionals. *J. Practice and Theory*, 9(2):201-15.
 38. Lee TH, Gerhart B, Weller I, Trevor CO (2008) Understanding voluntary turnover: Path-specific job satisfaction effects and the importance of unsolicited job offers. *J. Academy of Management*, 51:651-671.
 39. Caplan RD, Cobbs S, French JRP, Jr Van Harrison R, Pinneau SR (1975) *Job Demands and Worker Health*. Washington, DC: DHHS (NIOSH) Publication.
 40. Health Advocate Inc. (2009) *Stress in the Workplace Meeting the Challenge*. Retrieved from: <http://www.healthadvocate.com/downloads/webinars/stress-workplace.pdf>
 41. Chuang TH, Lee, HC (2011) The impact of leadership styles on job stress and turnover intention-Taiwan insurance industry as an example. Retrieved from <http://academicpapers.org/ocs2/session/Papers/E1/619.doc>
 42. Chiu CK, Chien CS, Lin CP, Hsiao CY (2005) Understanding hospital employee job stress and turnover intentions in a practical setting: The moderating role of locus of control. *J. Management Development*. 24(10):837-855.
 43. Heydarian M, Abhar S (2011) Factors contributing to employee turnover intention. *Journal of Education*, 4(2):31-41.
 44. Fisher RT (2001) Role stress, The type A behavior pattern, and external auditor job satisfaction and performance. *J. Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 13:143-169.
 45. Collins KM (1993) Stress and departures from the public accounting profession: A study of gender differences. *J. Accounting Horizons*, 29-38.
 46. Sanders JC (1995) Stress and stress management in public accounting. *Journal of CPA*, 46-49.
 47. Herzber, F, Mausner B, Snyderman B (1959) *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
 48. King-Taylor L (1977) Job enrichment and motivation. *Journal of Education & Training*, 19(10):295-300.
 49. Parker SK (1998) Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *J. Applied Psychology*, 83(6):835-52.
 50. James JK, Downey B, Duckett S, Woody C (2000) Name your career development intervention. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(5):205-217.
 51. Whittington J (1998) The same motivational style cannot be used for all employees. *Business Press*, 10(50):27-8.
 52. Bill W (1974) A practical approach to job enrichment. *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 6(4):185-187. Brinda Mani. (2010). *Job Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Adopted from <http://www.citehr.com/309682-job-satisfaction-questionnaire.html#ixzz281MyyrBV>
 53. Perryer C, Jordan J, Firms I, Travaglione A (2010) Predicting turnover intentions: The interactive effects of organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. *J. Management Research Review*, 33(9): 911-923.
 54. Helena MA, Praveen Parboteeah, K, Evyan ED (2006) Organizational commitment and intentions to quit: An examination of the moderating effects of psychological contract breach in Trinidad and Tobago. *Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 14(3):225-238.
 55. Annelies EM, Van Vianen, Irene E, De Pater, Floor Van Dijk (2007) Work value fit and turnover intention: Same-source or different-source fit. *J. Managerial Psychology*. 22(2):188-202.

56. Kristof AL (1996) Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *J. Personnel Psychology*, 49:1-49.
57. Piasentin KA, Chapman DS (2006) Subjective person-organisation fit: Bridging the gap between conceptualization and measurement. *J. Vocational Behaviour*, 69:202-21.
58. Gilbert RG, Ravipreet SS, Adriana GM (2008) Measuring work preferences: A multidimensional tool to enhance career self-management. *J. Career Development International*, 13(1):56-78.
59. Liu BC, Liu J, Hu J (2010) Person-organization fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intention: An empirical study in the Chinese public sector. *J. Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(5):615-625.
60. Michael JM (2007) Person-organization fit. *J. Managerial Psychology*, 22(2):109-117.
61. Hoffman BJ, Woehr DJ (2006) A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *J. Vocational Behavior*, 68(3):389-99.
62. Kristof-Brown AL, Zimmerman RD, Johnson EC (2005) Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *J. Personnel Psychology*, 58:281-342.
63. Elfenbein H, O'Reilly C (2007) Fitting in: The effects of relational demography and person-culture fit on group process and performance. *Journal of Group & Organization Management*, 32(1):109-142.
64. Ismail A, Yao A, Yunus NKY (2009) Relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction: An empirical study in Malaysia. *The Romanian Economic Journal*, 34(4):3-29.
65. Hackman JR, Lawler EE (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics'. *J. Applied Psychology*, 55(3): 259-286.
66. Nederhof AJ (1985) Methods of coping with social desirability bias: A review. *European J. Social Psychology*, 15:263-280.
67. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE, Tatham RL (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
68. Hsu HY (2009) Organizational learning culture's influence on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention among R&D professionals in Taiwan during an economic downturn. Unpublished PhD Dissertation: University of Minnesota.
69. Boyar SL, Maertz CP Jr, Pearson AW, Keough S (2003) Work-family conflict: A model of linkages between work and family domain variables and turnover intentions. *J. Managerial Issues*, 15:175-90.
70. Almer ED, Kaplan SE (2002) The effects of flexible work arrangements on stressors, burnout and behavioral job outcomes in public accounting. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 14:3-34.
71. Firth L, Mellor DJ, Moore, KA, Loquet C (2004) How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *J. Managerial Psychology*, 19:170-87.
72. Siu OL, Spector PE, Cooper GL, Lu L, Yu S (2002) Managerial stress in greater China: The direct and moderator effects of coping strategies and work locus of control. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51:608-32.
73. Perrewe PL, Hochwarter WA, Rossi AM (2002) Are work stress relationships universal? A nine-region examination of role stressors, general self-efficacy, and burnout. *Journal of International Management*, 8, 163-87.
74. Fogarty TJ, Singh J, Rhoads GK, Moore RK (2000) Antecedents and consequences of burnout in accounting: Beyond the role stress model. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 12:31-67.
75. Hasin H, Omar N (2007) An empirical study on job satisfaction, job-related stress and intention to leave among audit staff in public accounting firms in Melaka. *J. Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 5(1):21-39.
76. Hemingway MA, Smith CS (1999) Organizational climate and occupational stressors as predictors of withdrawal behaviours and injuries in nurses. *J. Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72:285-99.
77. Moore JE (2000) One road to turnover: An examination of work exhaustion in technology professionals. *MIS Quarterly*, 24:141-68.
78. Anthony RW, Gallagher VC, Robyn LB, Chris JS (2007) When person-organization (mis) fit and (dis) satisfaction lead to turnover: The moderating role of perceived job mobility. *J. Managerial Psychology*, 22(2):203-19.
79. Ayree S, Wyatt T, Min MK (2001) Antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intentions among professional accountants in different settings in Singapore. *J. Social Psychology*, 141(4):545-56.
80. Ayub SMI (2008) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Adopted from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/11696257/Impact-of-Organizational-Commitment-on-Turnover-Intentions>
81. Balkin D, Gomez-Mejia L (1990) Matching compensation and organizational strategies. *J. Strategic Management*, 11:153-169.
82. Bingham J (1977) Sour edge to job enrichment. *Journal of Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 77(6):7-35.
83. Cho V, Huang X (2012) Leave for professional advancement: An empirical study on IT professionals. *J. Information Technology & People*, 25(1):31-54.

84. Hackman JR, Lawler EE (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics'. *J. Applied Psychology*, 55(3): 259-286.
85. Hassan IB (2007) Career success: The effects of human capital, person-environment fit and organizational support. *J. Managerial Psychology*, 22(8):741-765.
86. Indiana State University. (2005) Analyzing Data in SPSS 13.0 using Scale Procedures. Retrieved from: http://www.indstate.edu/cirt/ittrain/resources/tutorials/research/spss/spss13_scale.pdf
87. Kothari CR (2007) Research Methodology. Retrieved from: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/55061539/Research-Methodology>
88. Lynn Stallworth H (2003) Mentoring, organizational commitment and intentions to leave public accounting. *Journal of Managerial Auditing*, 18(5):405-418.
89. McLean AJ, Sims, DBP (1978) Job enrichment from theoretical poverty: The state of the art and directions for further work. *J. Personnel Review*, 7(2):5-10.
90. My3q (2000) Turnover Intention Questionnaire. (Employee turnover questionnaire-survey of turnover intention). Adopted from: <http://www.my3q.com/research/viewSummary.phtml?intStart=0&questid=448941>
91. Nunnally JC (1978) Psychometric theory (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.
92. Pizam A, Thornburg SW (2000) Absenteeism and voluntary turnover in Central Florida hotels: A pilot study. *J. Hospitality Management*, 19:211-17.
93. Price JL, Mueller CW (1986) Absenteeism and Turnover among Hospital Employees. New York: JAI Press.
94. Price JL, Mueller CW (1981) A causal model of turnover for nurses. *J. Academy of Management*, 24:543-65.
95. Sarah AR, Stanley HK, Robert HS (1994) Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions of United States accountants: The impact of locus of control and gender. *J. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability*, 7(1):31-58.
96. Schlesinger L, Heskett J (1991) Breaking the cycle of failure in services. *Sloan Management Review*, 32:17-28.
97. Sekaran U (2003) Research Method for Business: A Skill Building Approach. India: Wiley.
98. Stone E (1976) The moderating effect of work-related values on the job scope-job satisfaction relationship. *J. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15(2):147-67.
99. Tepper P (2011) Work-related stress questionnaire. Adopted from: <http://www.ourunion.org.uk/news/archives/Stress%20Questionnaire.pdf>
100. University of Southampton (2012) Person Organization Fit and Job Choice Decision Questionnaire. Adopted from: <https://www.isurvey.soton.ac.uk/2962>
101. Vijayan H (2012) Job enrichment questionnaire (A study on Employees Job Enrichment). Adopted from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/85347939/A-Study-on-Job-Enrichment-Questionnaire>.
102. Walters RM (1975) Assuring a successful job enrichment programme. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 7(6):240-45.