The copyright © of this thesis belongs to its rightful author and/or other copyright owner. Copies can be accessed and downloaded for non-commercial or learning purposes without any charge and permission. The thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted as a whole without the permission from its rightful owner. No alteration or changes in format is allowed without permission from its rightful owner.



THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB-RELATED STRESS ON INTENTION TO LEAVE AMONGST EMPLOYEES IN THE SIME DARBY MOTORS GROUP

by

ZAHIDAH AKMAL GHAZALI



the Master of Human Resource Management

i

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation/project paper in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Post Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this dissertation/project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence, by the Dean of School of Business Management where I did my dissertation/project paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this dissertation/project paper parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the UUM in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation/project paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this dissertation/project paper in whole or in part should be addressed to:



Dean of School of Business Management Universiti Utara Malaysia 06010 UUM Sintok Kedah Darul Aman

ABSTRACT

This research explored the relationship between job satisfaction and job-related stress with turnover intention amongst the employees of Sime Darby Motor group of companies. It was conducted to achieve two main objectives: (i) to investigate the influence of job satisfaction on employees' intention to leave; and (ii) to investigate the influence of job-related stress on employees' intention to leave. This research involved the distribution of questionnaires to randomly-selected employees in the head office as well as seven other companies and their branches across Malaysia in the month of April 2016. The study used instruments based on Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) to measure job satisfaction, adaptation of Tate, Whatley and Clugston (1997) to measure job-related stress and adaptation of Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978) to measure intention to leave. All data have been processed using the SPSS v22. The results of factor analysis, correlation analysis and subsequent regression analysis show that selfactualisation, rewards and engagement factors of job satisfaction as well as role-clarity and work-family conflict factors of job-related stress have significant relationship to intention to leave. Thus the study recommends that both job satisfaction and job-related stress have significance influence on employee's intention to leave. For future research, it is suggested to compare the predictive validity of the model across wider population and different industries. The study can be improved by exploring moderating effects of generational cohorts in order to generalize a more reliable results.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, job-related stress, intention to leave, automotive industry

Universiti Utara Malaysia

iii

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini menerokai hubungan di antara kepuasan kerja dan tekanan berkaitan kerja dengan niat untuk berhenti kerja di kalangan kakitangan kumpulan syarikat di bawah Sime Darby Motor. Ia dilaksanakan dengan tujuan untuk mencapai dua objektif utama iaitu: (i) untuk mengkaji kesan kepuasan kerja terhadap niat pekerja untuk berhenti kerja; dan (ii) untuk mengkaji kesan tekanan berkaitan kerja terhadap niat pekerja untuk berhenti kerja. Kajian ini melibatkan pengedaran borang soal-selidik kepada kakitangan yang telah dipilih secara rawak di ibupejabat serta tujuh syarikat dan cawangancawangannya di seluruh Malaysia dalam bulan April 2016. Instrumen yang telah digunakan adalah berdasarkan Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) untuk mengukur kepuasan kerja, adaptasi Tate, Whatley and Clugston (1997) untuk mengukur tekanan berkaitan kerja serta adaptasi Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978) untuk mengukur niat berhenti kerja. Kesemua data telah diproses menggunakan SPSS v22. Keputusan-keputusan daripada analisa yang telah dijalankan menunjukkan bahawa faktor self-actualisation, rewards dan engagement dari kepuasan kerja serta faktor ketelusanperanan dan konflik kerja-keluarga dari tekanan berkaitan kerja mempunyai hubungan yang signifikan terhadap niat untuk berhenti kerja. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah merumuskan bahawa kedua-dua pembolehubah kepuasan kerja dan tekanan berkaitan kerja mempunyai kesan yang signifikan terhadap keputusan pekerja untuk berhenti kerja. Untuk kajian akan datang, adalah dicadangkan supaya model prediktif ini digunakan terhadap populasi yang lebih besar atau mengambilkira industri lain. Kajian juga dapat diperbaiki lagi dengan mengambilkira efek moderasi kohort generasi untuk aplikasi yang lebih menyeluruh.

Katakunci: kepuasan kerja, tekanan berkaitan kerja, niat berhenti kerja, industri automotif

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful

This dissertation was written not without the help and support of many and I would like to extend my sincere appreciation and thanks to those who made this a reality.

I would like to extend my gratitude to my project supervisor, Dr Zulkiflee Daud for his constant supervision, support and imparting his knowledge which helped me complete this research. Special thanks too to my fellow Human Resource Management students and lecturers in UUMKL, in particular, Dr Jasmani Mohd Yunus for her guidance at the inception of this research paper during those seemingly endless Organisational Behaviour and Research Methodology classes.

My sincere appreciation to the Managing Director of Sime Darby Motors' division and the Chief Human Resource Officer of Sime Darby Berhad for their consent on the study to be conducted. I am also truly indebted to the Human Resource managers and colleagues in the Sime Darby Motors division for their participation and part in the completion of the survey, without which the research would not have been possible.

Finally, my love and gratitude to my loving husband Zamri Shaari for his support and encouragement in my quest to complete this Master of Human Resource Management, and for tolerating my ensuing absence together with our sons Azri Ayman, Arif Aezuddin, Ahmad Azim and Adam Aidid during the past two years. I hope my success will be an inspiration to them to strive hard and do well in their own life's journey.

'Lest you lose heart and your power depart, and be patient and persevering; for God is with those who patiently persevere.' (Surah Anfal:46)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Background of the Study	4
1.2	Research Problem Statement	7
1.3	Research Questions	13
1.4	Research Objectives	13
1.5	Scope and Significance of the Study	14
	1.5.1 Scope of the Study	
	1.5.2 Significance of the Study	
1.6	Definition of Terms	15
	1.6.1 Intention to Leave	
	1.6.2 Job Satisfaction	
	1.6.3 Job-Related Stress	
1.7	Organisation of the Research	17
	CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
	Universiti Utara Malaysia	
2.0	Introduction	18
2.1	Intention to Leave	22
2.2	Job Satisfaction	24
2.3	Job-Related Stress	29
	CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.0	Introduction	33
3.1	Research Framework	33
3.2	Research Hypothesis	33
3.3	Research Design	34
3.4	Operational Definition	36
	3.4.1 Intention to Leave	
	3.4.2 Job Satisfaction	
	3.4.3 Job-Related Stress	
3.5	Measurement of Variables/ Instrumentation	37
	3.5.1 Measure for Job Satisfaction	
	3.5.2 Measure for Job-Related Stress	

3.5.3 Measure for Intention to Leave

			PAGE
3.6	Popula	ation and Sampling	41
	3.6.1	Population of the Study	
		Sample Size	
		Sampling Techniques	
3.7		Collection Procedures	43
	3.7.1	Data Collection Methods	
	3.7.2	Pilot Testing	
	3.6.3	Testing of Research Instrument	
3.8	Techn	iques of Data Analysis	45
		Descriptive Statistic	
		Validity Tests	
		Factor Analysis	
	3.8.4	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	
	3.8.5	Multiple Regression	
3.9	Concl		49
		CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	
1.0			50
4.0	Introd		50
4.1	+	ndents Profile	51
	4.1.1		
		Position, Level of employment and Years in Current Position	
1.0	4.1.3		- 1
4.2		pility Test	54
4.3		Screening	56
		Normality Test	
	4.3.2	Linearity Test	~0
4.4		val of Outliers	58
4.5		Analysis	60
		Factor Analysis for Intention to Leave	
	4.5.2	Factor Analysis for Job Satisfaction	
	4.5.3	Factor Analysis for Job-Related Stress	
4.6		ation Analysis	70
	4.6.1	Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave	
	4.6.2	Relationship between Job-Related Stress and Intention to Leave	
4.7		ple Regression Analysis	72
4.8	Concl	usions	74

CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.0	Introdu	iction	75
5.1		tisfaction and Intention to Leave	76
5.2		elated Stress and Intention to Leave	80
5.3	-	ation of the Study	83
5.4		tions of the Study	83
5.5	Recom	umendations	86
	5.5.1	Management	
	5.5.2	Future Research	
5.6	Conclu	isions	95
REFEF	RENCE	S	97
APPEN	NDIX: (Questionnaire	103
	OF TAB		
Table 4		Total Returned Questionnaire	51
Table 4		Demographic Analysis	53
Table 4		Reliability Test Results	54
Table 4		Cronbach Alpha Value for Each Variable	55
Table 4		Skewness and Kurtosis Value	56
Table 4		Scatter-Plot Graphs	57
Table 4		Mahalanobis Box Plot	59
Table 4		KMO and Bartletss' Test	61
Table 4		Anti-Image Correlation Results for Intention to Leave	61
Table 4		Eigenvalue for Intention to Leave	62
Table 4	4.5.1.3	Rotated Component Matrix for Intention to Leave	62
Table 4	4.5.2.1	Anti-Image Correlation Results for Job Satisfaction	64
Table 4	4.5.2.2	Eigenvalue for Job Satisfaction	65
Table 4	4.5.2.3	Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction	66
Table 4	4.5.2.4	Reliability Values for Job Satisfaction after Factor Analysis	67
Table 4	4.5.3.1	Anti-Image Correlation Results for Job-Related Stress	68
Table 4	4.5.3.2	Eigenvalue for Job-Related Stress	68
Table 4	4.5.3.3	Rotated Component Matrix for Job-Related Stress	69
Table 4	4.5.3.4	Reliability Values for Job-Related Stress after Factor Analysis	70
Table 4	1.6	Correlation Results between Job Satisfaction, Job-Related Stress	
		and Intention to Leave	70
Table 4	4.6.1	Correlation Result between Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave	e71
Table 4	4.6.2	Correlation Result between Job-Related Stress and Intention to	
		Leave	71
Table 4	4.7.1	Regression Results between Job Satisfaction and Job-Related	
		Stress towards Intention to Leave	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In the advent of the twenty-first century, managing employee turnover effectively continues to be a crucial issue for organisations. There are views that high turnover is reflective of an effective organization as it can benefit if disruptive or low performing employees leave the organization. In their research on employee turnover and firm performance, Glebbeek and Bax (2004) questioned whether a high employee turnover is really harmful. They contended that there has been little study done on the impact of turnover and theorized that much research on the causes of turnover has been undertaken on the idea that turnover is costly to organisations and should therefore be possibly prevented. However, the long-held view has been that not only the financial cost impact of employee turnover of staff strength disrupts social and interaction structure amongst those who stay (Mobley, 1977; Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney and Taylor, 2009). As such, high turnover can be harmful if it generates high economic costs and disrupts business performance.

Employees leaving their organizations can be clustered into functional and dysfunctional turnover. According to Abbasi and Hollman (2008) when good-performing employees leave and poor-performing employee stay, such dysfunctional turnover can damage an organization through reduced innovation, inefficient services, slow execution of improvement plans and decreased productivity. When a staff member leaves a company,

the ability of the remaining team member to perform their tasks that contributes to the achievement of organizational objectives, and its eventual productivity and profitability may be affected.

Whilst functional turnover, i.e. where poor-performing employees leave and the good ones stay, can contribute to sustain optimum business performance. Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi and Shadman (2013) suggested that uncontrolled employee exits can be harmful to the productivity of a firm and even jeopardize realization of firms' objectives. Employee turnover can generate cost that is connected to replacement of an employee, opportunity loss and experienced resources as well as lost revenues from services or relationship with clients. The cost of employee turnover entails all costs that are linked to training and development of leaving employees and expenses on recruiting, selecting and developing new employees.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

In order to predict the turnover, studies undertaken by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Igbaria and Greenhaus (1992) posits that employee's intent serves as the best predictor of consequential behaviour. Turnover intention is beneficial from a research point of view, as once employees eventually left the organisation, it is unlikely for the employer to have access to them to identify reasons for their decision. Sager in 1991 carried out a longitudinal study on sales resources which can lend support to intention to quit being an effective discriminant between those who leaves and those who stays. Notwithstanding the above, whilst it can be posited that an employee's intention is a good predictor of his eventual behaviour, the root of what causes such intention is still relatively unknown. As such, the antecedents of these intentions merit further investigation as different

researches conclude different constructs depending on population samples (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004).

Several factors that trigger or contribute to employee's turnover have been explored in various researches which includes monetary and non-monetary compensation, work enrichment, career development, training, job conditions and work-life balance (Horwitz, Heng and Quazi, 2003; Firth et al, 2004). Two of the recurring theme have been job satisfaction and job-related stress. Hence, this study assumes that job-related stress and job-satisfaction may influence employees' intention to quit.

Frederick Herzberg has long conducted research on job satisfaction since the late 1950s (Herzberg, 1959 as cited by Knight and Westbrook, 1999). The Two-Factor Theory propounded by Herzberg which addressed job-satisfaction in relation to motivators and hygiene suggested that aspects of job-content such as accomplishment, responsibility and work contents can influence satisfaction and that aspects of job-context such as compensation and work environment can lead to job dissatisfaction (Hanafiah Hj Hassin and Normah Hj Omar, 2007). Researchers have found that employee who experience satisfaction are more likely to have stronger allegiance to their workplace and will reduce their intent to leave (Moynihan, Boswell & Boudreau, 2000). As such, it has been widely accepted that job-satisfaction has a positive impact on continuance loyalty towards an organization (Clugston, 2000).

In the same token, some past researches have documented the negative impact of jobrelated stress on organizational performance and job performance (Arshadi and Damiri, 2013; Hanafiah Hj Hassin et al, 2007). Previous researchers have found that job-related stress experienced by employees can affect the employees' organizational commitment to the organization and influence their decision to stay (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004). Stressors directly exert a marked effect on feelings of stress and such experience of stress will impact the intention of quitting. Job-induced stress affects job-satisfaction which in turn influenced the propensity of employees to leave (Tate, Whatley and Clugston, 1997; Pang, Kucukusta and Chan, 2015).

1.1 Background of Study

The subject matter of this study, the Sime Darby Motors Group (SDMG) is the automotive arm of conglomerate giant Sime Darby Berhad and is involved in the distribution, retail and assembly of motor vehicles with operations spanning across 10 countries in the Southeast Asia and Pacific region. Headquartered in Shah Alam, Malaysia, it has over forty years of experience in motors industry and has grown to be one of the leading automotive players in Malaysia representing brands such as Porsche, BMW, MINI, Jaguar, Land Rover and Ford. Its Malaysian segment of the business, up until financial year 2014/2015, contributed the biggest share in terms of revenue and profits to SDMG. This Malaysian business segment consists of several companies involving in passenger and commercial vehicles related businesses:

a) Import and Distribution

SDMG imports and distributes major brands such as Porsche, BMW, Hyundai, Ford and Land Rover. It serves as a connection between the major automotive manufacturers and end customers through its extensive network in Malaysia.

b) Retail

SDMG retails thirty different brands of commercial and passenger vehicles in several Asia Pacific countries with its major operation in Malaysia. In Malaysia, the brands being retailed by SDMG include Porsche, BMW, Land Rover and Ford. This particular business segment focus mainly on the sale of vehicles and vehicle servicing or the after-sales business.

c) Assembly

SDMG has an assembly plant in Kulim, Kedah which had been assembling Hyundai vehicles since 2004. The assembly was under the INOKOM brand where the materials are sourced from the car manufacturers in overseas as well as local origins. The INOKOM assembly plant assembles a number of Hyundai commercial and passenger vehicles as well as Mazda and BMW passenger vehicles. The vehicles assembled in INOKOM are mainly destined for Malaysian market. The plant can assemble up to 30,000 units per year as its maximum capacity.

d) Other businesses

Apart from the import, distribution, assembly and retail businesses, SDMG is also a partner and representative of Hertz car rental business in Malaysia. The group boasts the exclusive Thrifty and Hertz car rental franchises in Malaysia operated by Sime Darby Rent-a-Car (SDRAC) which currently holds the position as the biggest car rental service provider in Malaysia.

For financial year 2013/2014, SDMG generated RM18.6 billion revenue and RM473.6 million profits of which two-third of this was contributed by the Malaysian operation. However, in the year 2014, the world saw a global phenomenon of declining price of crude oil affecting oil-exporting revenues of countries like Malaysia and the ringgit headed for its biggest plunge against the US dollar since 2009. The Malaysian central bank, Bank Negara Malaysia in its 1st Quarterly Bulletin 2015, reported that ringgit and other regional currencies continued to face volatility and ringgit depreciated by 6.0% against the US dollar within the first quarter of 2015. As the US dollar value continued to strengthen, the ringgit continued to decline.

Whilst the low price of world crude oil eventually reduced the price of petrol for consumption in Malaysia which should benefit vehicle users, the weakening ringgit meant goods and products, such that of cars and parts imported from external markets, have become increasingly more expensive. This prolonged soft economic condition took a toll on SDMG's business performance as the motors industry saw a downward trend in demands for cars, especially the luxury car segment. SDMG's Malaysian portion of the business which was generating Profit Before Tax (PBT) of RM146 million in Financial Year 2014/15, is expected to generate only RM47million operating profits in Financial Year 2015/16, a reduction of almost 80% from previous year's performance and a far cry from its hey-day of above RM300 million profit mark.

Naturally, one of the key considerations for SDMG was to curtail its fixed overheads including its manpower costs. The costs of its 3,655-strong employees in Malaysia has to be managed well. This included all expenditure in salary costs, benefits (such as

medical care, housing and car subsidy) as well as training and development spend. The manpower costs of the direct workers (mainly assembly line workers and after-sales service technicians) form slightly more than 60% part of the cost whilst the executive and non-executive employees (including retail salesmen) makes up the balance 40% of the costs.

For SDMG's assembly operation, retail and after-sales services, it is crucial to maintain productive and efficient workforce whilst keeping the costs as lean as possible. High turnover can disrupt work flow and negatively impact the provision of services to customers. At the same time, the costs of replacement including advertising, selection process and training costs can impact its bottom line. Keeping in perspective of employee turnover's costs, the management of SDMG views that creating a stable workforce and retaining good employees is very important. Therefore, the strategy in retaining employees has become a crucial part of the business' overall organizational strategies.

1.2 Research Problem Statement

As the demands for cars softened, the immediate action taken by SDMG was to reorganize its business to control its costs and increase efficiency. For example, in the period between July to December 2015 alone, the company had terminated 237 operative workers, 21 non-executive employees and 9 executive employees through its regular performance management process. This entails dismissing poor performing sales employees and other staff members. Terminating poor performing employees is a continuing exercise which had been implemented in effort to increase productivity and

sustain organizational performance. The number of employees who were terminated or dismissed from the organization in this manner is reflected as 'involuntary turnover' in **Figure 1.1** below.

	FY	2012/1:	3	FY2013/14			FY2014/15			YTD FY2015/16		
Employee Category	Strength	Voluntary	Involuntary	Strength	Voluntary	Involuntary	Strength	Voluntary	Involuntary	Strength	Voluntary	Involuntary
Executive	489	47	10	521	54	5	582	67	8	578	36	9
Non-Exec	975	163	64	1079	121	49	1145	196	26	1115	115	21
Workers	1591	94	210	2265	136	294	2313	229	327	1962	141	237
TOTAL	3055	304	284	3865	311	348	4040	492	361	3655	292	267

Figure 1.1: Voluntary and Involuntary Turnover between July 2012 to December 2015

*Data as of January 2016. Financial year (FY) commences in July and ends in June. (Source: Human Resource Department, Sime Darby Motors Group)

The total number of involuntary employee turnover in **Figure 1.1** above shows that the company had trimmed down 1,260 employees over the three and a half year period, averaging 360 employees a year. This number reflects the functional turnover through active actions taken by the organization to manage performance. However, the number of employee resigning from the organization on their own volition (which is reflected as 'voluntary turnover') was equally high or even higher. The corresponding data in **Figure 1.1** above shows that for the same period of three and a half years, 1,399 employees left the company and averaging 400 employees per year. This raises the concern that such number exceeds that of functional turnover where the company expected the poor performers to leave and the good ones to stay.

	I	=Y2012/	′13	F	Y2013	/14	F	- Y2014	/15	YTD FY2015/16		
Employee Category	Strength	Leavers	%	Strength	Leavers	%	Strength	Leavers	%	Strength	Leavers	%
Executive	489	47	9.61%	521	54	10.36%	582	67	11.51%	578	36	6.23%
Non-Exec	975	163	16.72%	1079	121	11.21%	1145	196	17.12%	1115	115	10.31%
Workers	1591	94	5.91%	2265	136	6.00%	2313	229	9.90%	1962	141	7.19%
TOTAL (%)	3055	304	9.95%	3865	311	8.05%	4040	492	12.18%	3655	292	7.99%

Figure 1.2: Voluntary Turnover Percentage between July 2012 to December 2015

*Data as of January 2016. Financial year (FY) commences in July and ends in June. (Source: Human Resource Department, Sime Darby Motors Group)

Further analysis of the voluntary turnover data as depicted in **Figure 1.2** above shows that whilst the voluntary turnover rate for the Malaysian operation ranges between 8% to just over 12%, the voluntary turnover percentage for executive and non-executive employees tends to be relatively much higher than that of workers i.e. ranging between

```
9.61% to 17.12%.
```

Universiti Utara Malaysia

The Malaysian Employers Federation (MEF)'s survey in year 2010 indicated that the annual employee turnover rates in Malaysia was circa 18% in 2009 and 19% in 2010. As the voluntary turnover rate for executive and non-executive employees in SDMG ranges between 9.61% to 17.12% and almost surpass the national turnover rate, the voluntary turnover trend in SDMG's Malaysian operation is alarming.

After the employees left the organization, some vacated positions in SDMG were not replaced. The remaining employees were expected not only to multi-task, but also to put more effort in their work, sometimes covering multiple roles. The high turnover raised the question of whether the lean structure generated overwhelming stress to the employees causing them to leave the business: Did the strong emphasis on performance, where poor performers are dismissed, motivate the employees to stay or drive them to leave the organization instead?

Poorer business performance also meant that the annual increment rate and bonus payout was lower than payment in previous years. Did the reduced rewards impact the employee's commitment to continue with the organization? Were the employees experiencing low job satisfaction which led them to leave? There was also a concern that unchecked turnover may impact the company's reputation amongst job seekers and eventually may cause difficulty for the company to recruit new employees.

In order to take the necessary interventions, SDMG would need to understand what triggered this voluntary turnover in the organisation. However, the data from exit interviews did not provide much clarity. Reasons given for leaving were typically 'better job opportunity' or 'better pay'. Without anonymity, the leavers were generally not forthcoming on the reasons for them to leave. They may feel that it would not make much difference as they had already decided to leave. The company was also not able to understand the reasons why employees of certain generation tends to have higher turnover rate than the other.

In January 2016, Sime Darby Berhad's Human Resource department carried out an algorithm analysis on the voluntary turnover data of 2,169 Malaysian-based executives

who had resigned from the company in the past five fiscal years. The findings are as follows:

- Leavers were 70% male and 30% female;
- Male and female employees were leaving at similar rate relative to their population;
- 65% of leavers are below 35 years old (highest frequency at 29 year-olds);
- 50% left having served less than 3 years with the company;
- 75% were experienced hire;
- 61% of leavers were married.
 (Source: Group Human Resource, Sime Darby Berhad, 'Flight-Risk Analysis on Executives FY2010/11-2014/15')

The algorithm seemed to suggest that younger employees was leaving the organization at higher rate and that half of the leavers left after having served less than three years with the company. This analysis was useful in that it profiled the age, gender, marital status and other data point of the employee who are deemed a 'flight-risk' or having the highest possibility of leaving the organization based on past historical data. However, the algorithm did not address the question as to why the employees left or reasons contributing to it. The analysis also does not help predict the extent of which the employees intend to leave the company sometime in the future and the possible areas where the gaps can be addressed.

Uncertain labour market associated with the economic downturn is commonly expected to hold down voluntary turnover rates in many organisations. However, the statistics in **Figure 1.2** above seem to contradict this assumption. For SDMG, its corporate image may be marred by rapid rate of employee turnover especially when it seeks to replace non-performing employees with those who are more productive. Prospective candidates will be apprehensive about approaching the organization for new work opportunity and other employees would be wondering on the possibility of quitting the company when they see their other colleagues leaving. The gaps created by leaving employees will be difficult to be quickly filled up (Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi and Shadman, 2012).

Many studies have tried to determine the major predictors of turnover intention and eventually introduce some managerial solutions to deal with the problem of high turnover rate. Studies which have been conducted indicated that job-stress and job-satisfaction correlates significantly with employee's commitment to continue and will affect their decision to stay or leave their jobs (Pregnolato, 2010; Applebaum et al, 2010; Arshad and Damiri, 2013).

The resulting impact of an employee leaving an organisation is psychologically painful to the organization itself and the other affected remaining workforce. It will not only be a setback to the business front but also create a dent to the cohesiveness of the team within a particular organisation. A working group will be disrupted and manager-staff relationship will be disturbed and informal group works will collapse (Ghosh et al, 2012). Not only the organisation will lose experienced and skilled workforce that leaves the business but it will also create a potential loss of good rapport and relationship with outside stakeholders such as existing or potential businesses and customers. For every time an employee quits an organisation, the productivity level of replacement employment will drop due to the learning curve to understand the job and its informal nuances

Notwithstanding the above, the financial impact of employee turnover is quite wellknown. Schlesinger and Heskett (1991) asserted that the expenditure involved for-profit organisations is 1.5 times the leaving employees' annual remuneration package. This cost of employee quitting is related to the interruption of the workflow and costs of advertising as well as sourcing and training the new recruits. It was, therefore imperative for the company to extract the root cause of this voluntary turnover.

Having the turnover costs in mind, the management of SDMG understood that creating a stable workforce and retaining them is important. The management would need to focus on the robustness of the strategy formulated and executed to reduce voluntary staff turnover. Therefore, strategy to retain employees will have to be an integral part of the business strategy and accordingly, based on the preceding discussion, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between employee's job satisfaction and job-related stress to turnover intention.

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the problem highlighted and discussed above, the research questions which will be addressed in this study are as follows:

- I. Does job satisfaction influence employees' intention to leave
- II. Does job related stress influence employees' intention to leave.

1.4 Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study will be as follows:

- I. To investigate the influence of job satisfaction on employees' intention to leave;
- II. To investigate the influence of job-related stress on employee's intention to leave.

1.5 Scope and Significance of the Study

1.5.1 Scope of the Study

This study intends to identify the predictors that determines intention to leave amongst the executives and non-executive employees in SDMG particularly in relation to jobsatisfaction and job-related stress. The study will cover 1,910 existing executive and non-executive employees of SDMG from all functions or departments in the Head Office as well as the following companies in Malaysia:

- a. Sime Darby Auto Bavaria Sdn Bhd
- b. Sime Darby Auto ConneXion Sdn Bhd
- c. Hyundai Sime Darby Sdn Bhd
- d. Sime Darby Rent-A-Car Sdn Bhd
- e. INOKOM Corporation Sdn Bhd
- f. Sime Darby Auto Performance Sdn Bhd
- g. Jaguar Land Rover Malaysia Sdn Bhd

This study did not take into account the bargainable employees in SDMG operation such as the production workers, technicians and mechanics as they are generally collectively organized by the union and their terms and conditions of employment are governed by collective agreement.

1.5.2 Significance of the Study

This research is significant in that through this specific study, the organization will be able to understand more about the employees' perception and views regarding their working conditions, monetary and non-monetary rewards as well as level of stress they are experiencing at work for the organisation to take appropriate intervention measures to address the gaps. This study will then assist the management and in particular, the human resource department of SDMG, to formulate human resource strategies and implement action plans on job satisfaction, stress and retention strategies suitable to the differences, if any, according to the respective employee generation.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

1.6.1 Intention to Leave

Up until now, several research work have investigated the hypotheses pertaining the relationship between job-satisfaction and intention to leave. The terminology of turnover intention was used instead of actual turnover as researchers such as Ajzen and Fishbein (1991) had suggested that behavioural intention is a credible determinant of exhibited behaviour. Previous studies have shown successfully that behavioural intention to leave is often correlated with turnover (Mobley et al., 1978; Sager, 1991). In fact, Mobley, Griffith, Hand and Meglino (1979) have suggested that behavioural intention offers much better explanation of turnover as they encapsulate the employee's perception and judgment.

Employee turnover can be voluntary or involuntary (Wiley, 1997). Whilst actual turnover may be of primary concerns for organisations, the antecedent intention to leave is arguably a strong predictor for the eventual or actual behaviour (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004). Intention to leave refers to employee's determination "to leave the organization at some point in the future" (Mobley et al, 1979).

1.6.2 Job Satisfaction

Job-satisfaction is fundamentally a coupling of psychological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to produce a statement "I am satisfied with my job" (Rhinehart and Short, 1993). Job-satisfaction can also be taken as the degree in which an individual gain pleasure from his job. Such satisfaction or pleasures are not confined to pay alone, but includes the way an employee is being treated and recognized by the managers and the extent to which their opinion and input are being taken into consideration. Job-satisfaction is generally defined as "the affective response by an employee concerning his or her particular job and results from the employee's comparison of actual outcomes with those of which are expected, needed, wanted or perceived to be fair or just" (Cranny, Smith and Stone, 1992).

1.6.3 Job-Related Stress

The word "stress" is derived from the physical science when and object has force being placed upon it causing it to damage, bend or break. When applied to a human being, stress can refer to the responses the body makes when demands are placed upon it, whether these demands can be unfavourable or favourable (Schuler, 1980; Robbins and Judge, 2015). Robbins and Judge also claim that stressors results from anything that can

generates stress. "Stress is a condition which happens when one realizes the pressure on them or requirements of situation are wider than they can handle, and if these requirements are huge and continue for a long period of time without any interval, mental, physical or behavioral problems may occur."

Stress experienced at work can be harmful physically and emotionally when there is a mismatch between the ability, resource and requirement of an employee with the demands of work (NIOSH, 1999). There are multitude of reasons which can contribute to job stress including overloading of work, lack of interaction, extended working hours, non-conducive work conditions, lack of autonomy, less than cordial working relationship with peers and superiors, workplace bullying or harassment and lack of promotion or career development (Thomas, Colligan and Higgins, 2006). Schaubroeck, Cotton and Jennings (1989) claimed that negative impact of stress in fact carries a financial toll to an organization.

1.7 Organisation of the Research

This research will be organized into five sections. Chapter one will provide an overview of turnover intention, jobs satisfaction and job-related stress. This chapter will also provide the problem statement, significance of the study, scope and limitations of the study, research objectives and research questions. The remainder of the dissertation is organised as follows. Chapter two reviews the literature that relates to this study which discusses the overview on intention to leave, job satisfaction and job-related stress. Chapter three will then explain the research framework, hypotheses, research design, operational definition, measurements and data collection procedures as well as techniques of data analysis used in this research. Chapter four will present the empirical results of the research based on data and findings and chapter five will provide a conclusion for this research and recommendations for future research.



CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

Theoretical literatures in the 1980s and 1990s indicated a balanced view on turnover in that it may actually generate some benefits to the organization (e.g. Staw, 1980). Such views have led to the widely-proposed differentiation between what is termed as dysfunctional turnover and functional turnover (Dalton, Krackhardt and Porter, 1981; Trevor, 2001) and even 'optimal turnover' (Abelson and Baysinger, 1984). Some researchers however indicated that whilst turnover itself, be it functional or dysfunctional does generate costs to the organisations, dysfunctional turnover where good performers leave and poor performers stay may jeopardize realization of organizational objectives (Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi and Shadman, 2013).

The direct economic costs associated with losing good-performing employees include the costs of replacing the employee, production or service downtime, recruiting and interviewing, on-boarding and training and development of new hire. The cost is estimated to be between half or one time an employee's annual salary for entry level position or vary between one and a half times and double the annual salary for an experienced hire (Cascio, 2006). When organisations are seeking to contain the expenditure during an economic downturn, the cost of losing an employee may not just be the direct expenses but includes the cost of lost opportunities which will hit the company's bottom line. Organizations found that focusing on employee retention to ensure continuity of organizational operations has become even more important now especially when recruiters are finding it difficult to replace employees even in high unemployment conditions (Throckmorton, 2013). In tough economic conditions, employer's expectations on employee performance has also increased. Whilst there may be more applicants for a vacancy, employers are still left with little options as the good candidates are still hard to find. Good candidates, on the other hands, have become even more discerning in such environment. As such, filling a vacancy with good candidates may not be that easy.

A 2013 study by global management consultancy Hay Group, conducted in association with the Centre for Economics and Business Research (CEBR) in 30 countries indicated that global companies will continue to face rising employee exodus when the current economic and labour market conditions improves. Based on an analysis of their employee opinion database, Hay Group has identified five key factors that discriminate "stayers" (those committed to the company for more than two years) from "leavers" (those planning to leave in two years or less):

- a) Confidence in the organizational leadership: Leaders in today's organization will face real challenge in presenting a positive view on business;
- b) Growth Opportunity: whilst there is growing awareness amongst employees that they are responsible to manage their own career, limited corporate growth and reduced development budgets may result in fewer opportunities for progression or promotion.
- c) Fair compensation: It is crucial that employees have confidence that they are valued as people, that their extra efforts are recognised. However, with compensation budgets

under pressure in recent years, the ability of organisations to reward employees who have been asked to accomplish more with less has been constrained.

- d) Conditions for success: As employees are being asked to do more with less, they need to feel that they have access to efficient work processes to allow them to perform at their best. As business conditions change, taken-for-granted ways of working may not work anymore.
- e) Authority and influence: In dynamic environments where business goals and objectives are frequently changing, employees increasingly want authority that matches their responsibilities and an opportunity to shape how work is done.

There are numerous factors that can trigger or contribute to employee's turnover which have been explored in various researches. These include monetary and non-monetary rewards, training and career progression, job enrichment and working conditions (Horwitz, Heng and Quazi, 2003; Firth et al, 2004). Two of the recurring theme have been job-related stress and job-satisfaction. Several studies indicated that job stress and job satisfaction is significantly correlated with continuous commitment and will affect the decision of employees whether to continue or quit from a job (Hanafiah Haji Hassin and Normah Haji Omar, 2007; Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney and Taylor, 2009; Pregnolato, 2010).

Actions to be taken to address these, however, require some creativity. A study by van Dam (2008) suggested that for a defined group of people, there are distinct interventions which may be suitable to be undertaken for such group. In the case of determined leavers, for example, actions directed at increasing satisfaction and organisational

commitment through reduction or elimination of push factors may be more effective for those who appeared to be low on satisfaction and commitment. Conversely, in the case of long-term leavers who were high on satisfaction and commitment, actions aimed at strengthening the pull factors may be more relevant especially in relation to career and development matters. Organizations might be able to retain long-term leavers by providing internal career perspectives and development opportunities, which these employees might otherwise seek elsewhere.

At the same time, whilst there are numerous studies done worldwide on the relationship between job-related stress and job satisfaction to turnover intention, there were also studies which found that those research findings on human resource management and motivational practices may not be transferable in the Malaysian context (Rafikul Islam and Ahmad Zaki Ismail, 2008). Ahmad and Bakar (2003) said in their findings that "Malaysians have different attitudes towards organizational commitment. The older they are and the longer they stay within an organization do not imply that they will be committed towards their organization. This can be mainly attributed to the uncertain business environment in Malaysia" (as cited by Rafikul Islam and Ahmad Zaki Ismail, 2008).

This means that specific research in the Malaysian context may be more appropriate to be applied locally. Therefore a research on determinants of turnover intention in a Malaysian industry can still contribute to the body of research on this subject matter.

2.1 Intention to Leave

Employee turnover is the movement of employees across the boundary of an organisation (Price, 1997). Turnover can also be defined as the ratio or percentage of workers quitting an organisation within a span of time against the total number of the workers still working within the company for the same time span. This denotes the difference in the headcount of workers in the organisation due to new hiring, resignation or separation (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004).

Turnover can be voluntary or involuntary (Wiley, 1997) but the main body of research focuses on voluntary turnover. Whilst actual turnover may be of primary concerns for organisations, employees' intent to leave is arguably a credible predictor of the eventual actual behaviours (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004). Tett and Meyer (1993) meanwhile defined turnover intention as a conscious decision to turnover intentions as conscious wilful decision to look for other opportunities in other organisations.

Dysfunctional turnover, where the good performers leave and poor performers stay, damages organization through reduced innovation, inefficient services, slow implementation of improvement programs and decreased productivity (Trevor, 2001; Abbasi and Hollman, 2008). As a member of an organization quits, the level of success and ability of those who remains to achieve the company objectives will be tested with possible impact on productivity and profitability of the organisation.

Whilst functional turnover (i.e. bad performers leave, good performers stay) can help sustain optimal organizational performance, researchers have suggested that excessive turnover can be detrimental to any firm's productivity and even jeopardize realization of firms' objectives (Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi and Shadman, 2013). Employee turnover creates cost that is associated with replacing a worker, lost productivity and experienced resources as well as lost revenues from services or relationship with clients. The cost of employee turnover entails all costs that are linked to training and development of leaving employees and amount spent on recruitment, selection and training of new employees.

In order to predict the turnover, studies have found that intentions are the most immediate determinants of actual behaviour (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Igbaria and Greenhaus; 1992). This is because, once employees have actually left the organisations, it would be very unlikely that the information before such action was taken can be obtained. Studying employee's intention to leave in the workplace can also be drawn from Sager's (1991) longitudinal study of salespeople where intention to quit was found to discriminate effectively between those who leave and stay. However, what would be more important to understand is what determines such intentions. Therefore, the antecedents of these intentions merit further investigation as different researchers conclude different constructs depending on population samples (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2004).

The term turnover intention is used instead of actual turnover because researchers such as Ajzen and Fishbein (1991) have suggested that behavioral intention is a good predictor of actual behavior. In particular, previous studies have successfully demonstrated that behavioral intention to leave is consistently correlated with turnover (Mobley, 1977). Mobley, Griffith, Hand and Meglino (1979) have suggested that intentions offer a better explanation of turnover because they encompass one's perception and judgment. Intention to leave refers to employee's determination to leave the organization at some point in the future. Firth, Mellor, Loquet and Moore (2004) suggested that intentions are the most immediate determinants of actual behaviour. However, intention, whilst is the best determinant of eventual turnover, carries different meaning to different individual who decides to stay and those who decides to leave.

Intentions to leave is negatively related to continuance commitment and is a widely agreed upon as a precursor to turnover (Mobley et.al., 1979). Souza-Poza and Sousa-Poza (2007) define 'intent to leave' as the indication of the probability that an individual will change his or job within a certain time period and is a direct sign of an actual turnover. Employees who have high degree of intention to leave will use subjective assessment of the organization when they eventually withdraw from their organisation at a later time (Mowday, Steers and Porter, 1982). Intention to leave is the final stage before the actual turnover takes place and has direct causal impact on actual turnover.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

In organizational behaviour studies, job satisfaction describes the positive feeling about a job resulting from evaluation of its characteristics. Monetary and non-monetary rewards such as training and development, variety, independence and control may contribute to job satisfaction (Barling, Kelloway and Iverson, 2003). Although job satisfaction is reportedly relevant across all cultures, there appears to be cultural differences in job satisfaction. (Robbins and Judge, 2015). In the late 1950s, Frederick Herzberg investigated job satisfaction based on two dimensions of motivators and hygiene. In his widely-referred Two-Factor Theory, Herzberg theorized that factors which lead to job-satisfaction are distinct and separate from factors which lead to job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959). According to this theory, job-content aspects such as accomplishment, responsibilities and work contents will bring about satisfaction whilst the job-context aspects such as compensation, work environment or the lack of it will lead to job dissatisfaction.

Traditionally, monetary factors in rewards were much superior when compared to the non-monetary elements. However, over the years non-financial factors such as training and development and flexi-time has increasingly become more important to employees (Schlechter, Thompson and Bussin, 2015). When considering total rewards, organization will commonly have to consider the traditional, quantifiable elements such as basic pay, variable compensation but also non-tangible benefits such as freedom to exercise own thoughts and judgment, career opportunities and development as well as all the intrinsic motivation inherent in the job itself (Armstrong and Murlis, 2004, p.11).

A research by Pregnolato (2010) investigated the preference of the studied population on the way in which total rewards can help retention of employees. These were classed into five broad categories which includes remuneration, benefits, work-life balance, performance and recognition, development and career opportunities.

These categories were defined as follows:

(1) Cash compensation: remuneration from the organization on the work performed.

(2) Benefits: programs that organization undertakes to supplement the cash compensation paid to the employees which provides protection of income generally not linked to performance.

(3) Work-life balance: the philosophy, policies, practice guidelines and programs that provides enhancement to the employee being successful in the workplace as well as their private environment.

(4) Performance and recognition: alludes to the alignment and eventual assessment by the organization on team or personal contribution towards accomplishing the set objectives whilst recognition refers to highlighting the desired effort, actions and behaviour exhibited by the employee.

(5) Development and career opportunities: consists of learning and development or skills enhancement to hone further employee's competencies. Individual career plan includes the identified opportunities to support the employee in reaching their higher personal goals and achievement. (Armstrong and Murlis, 2004 as cited in Pregnolato, 2010).

Rinehart and Short (1993) found that job-satisfaction is essentially a multitude of combination between psychological and environmental circumstances that causes an individual to state "I am satisfied with my job". Job satisfaction is also gathered from the extent an employee derives pleasure from his work or "the affective response by an employee concerning his or her particular job and results from the employee's comparison of actual outcomes with those of which are expected, needed, wanted or perceived to be fair or just" (Cranny, Smith and Stone, 1992).
Tett and Meyer (1993)'s meta-analysis findings suggested that executives reacted more strongly to their attachment to job rather than the organization, hence, job satisfaction is related more strongly to intention to leave than affective commitment. Job satisfaction has been an important part of human resource management and identification of factors influencing it can provide the management with the required and relevant information to support any intervention actions (Lambert, Hogan and Barton, 2001).

Most organisations try to boost employee engagement by incorporating various rewards in their compensation system. (Markova and Ford, 2011). The immediate objective of direct and indirect compensation or rewards is to improve and strengthen further employees' motivation and sense of belonging or attachment to the organisation. Both meta-analyses and empirical studies have shown an inverse relationship between employee turnover and pay satisfaction (Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney and Taylor, 2009). It is not surprising that high performers who receives appropriate compensation is less likely to leave the organisation as compared to those with lower levels of rewards and performance (Bergiel et al, 2009). It is common that when thinking about quitting a job, employees often consider tangible benefits i.e. compensation from the current organization that they have to sacrifice.

Since monetary rewards is the easiest to be replicated, employers are finding new ways to differentiate themselves from their market competitors. A recent study on attractiveness of non-financial rewards for prospective employees investigates effect of such in terms of work-life balance, learning and career advancement and found that if non-monetary compensation is offered as part of the work package, more employees will be attracted to the job than when the non-monetary rewards are not offered (Schlechter et al, 2015). It can be inferred from these that such non-monetary rewards does influence the decision of some employees on whether to move into, or out from, an organization.

Various researches have investigated the correlation between job satisfaction and intention to leave. A study by Hanafiah Haji Hassin and Normah Haji Omar (2007) has found that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave among auditors in Melaka. The study had found that the level of job satisfaction can influence the degree of likelihood of the employees to leave their jobs. Employees who experience relatively low job satisfaction tend to change work positions.

Nevertheless, some empirical studies have shown that the construct of attitudes such as job satisfaction only account for a fraction or less than five percent of the total variance in employee turnover (Hom and Griffeth as cited by Bergiel et al, 2009). Nevertheless, several researchers have concluded that satisfied employees has higher propensity to commit to their organization and that their intention to quit will be reduced (Tate, Whatley and Clugston, 1997; Pang, Kucukusta and Chan, 2015). As such, the positive impact of job satisfaction on commitment to continue in organization has been widely accepted (Clugston, 2000).

2.3 Job-Related Stress

The word "stress" is used in physical science to denote the force that is applied upon an object causing the same to damage, bend or break. When applied in work situations, stress can be described as the dynamic conditions such as opportunity, demands and

resources that confronts an employee to match to his or her desires for which the eventual outcome is yet undefined but crucial to the individual. The textbook definition of stress is that it is the consequential adaptive response moderated by individual distinctiveness of any action, situation or event that places special demands on such individual (Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson, 2014). In short, stress is an unpleasant psychological process that occurs in response to environmental pressures (Robbins and Judge, 2015).

The Malaysian National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) defines job stress as the physical and emotional response which is harmful when there is a mismatch between the capabilities, resource or needs of an employee against his or her job demands (NIOSH, 1999). A multitude of root cause can generate job-related stress such as work overload, lack of interaction with others, extended working hours, nonconducive work conditions, lack of freedom to exercise own thoughts and decisionmaking, complex relationship with peers and superiors, workplace bullying or harassment and uncertain progression or promotion opportunities (Thomas, Colligan and Higgins, 2006). Schaubroeck, Cotton and Jennings (1989) claimed that stress and the negative outcomes of stress have been recognized as financially costly to an organization.

Some studies have proposed that challenge stress, namely stress which is associated with workload, completion and deadline pressures - produces less strain than the hindrance stressors such as office politics, role conflict and bureaucracy which prevents an employee from achieving their goals or organizational targets (Podsakoff, LePine and LePine, 2007).

Unfortunately, stress at work has increasingly become a common feature of the twentyfirst century life. As a result there is an increase in the impact of job-related stress on employee's health and well-being which could lead to eventual economic loss to an organisation (Applebaum et al, 2010; Arshadi and Damiri, 2013). There has been rapid development of research in this area in recent times as workplace stress has become a common problem for human resource managers to deal with. A basic hypothesis in stress researches is that psychosocial stressors in the work environment include role stress, lack of control and lack of social support and interaction (Thomas, Colligan and Higgins, 2006).

It is very likely that employees who experience a high degree of work-related stress to be less healthy, less productive, poorly motivated, and less safe at work. This in turn can lead to an organisation being less likely to be successful in a competitive arena as jobrelated stress can be generated from a variety of sources and affect people in different ways (Arshadi and Damiri, 2013). A negative relationship between job stress and performance was conceived by those that viewed job stress as essential for the organization and its employees (Cranny, Smith, and Stone, 1992). For example, worklife balance as a stressor has been recognized to result in job stress prior to turnover intention (Deery, 2008). Managers have always view stress amongst employees and the turnover intention with importance. Numerous studies have attempted to address the conundrum of what are the drivers for employee's intention to quit and investigated the possible antecedents of such individual's intention to quit. Firth, Mellor, Moor and Loquet (2007) identified that the experience of a range of job-related stress factors or stressors can lead to employees to quit the organization. A work environment which is unstable or unsecured and unable to provide job security, continuity or procedural justice will alleviate the employees' turnover intention. Role stressors also lead to employees' turnover as they cause uncertainty about what the employee's role should be. It can be a result of misunderstanding on what is expected, how to meet the expectations, or that the employee thinking the job should be different (Glazer and Beehr, 2005).

Other factors such as lack of information in ways to perform work, unclear expectations of peers and supervisors, lack of consensus on duties and responsibilities, extensive job pressures and lack of sense of belonging or involvement will cause an employee to be disengaged with the organization and feel dissatisfied. They will experience feelings of stress and eventually show the tendency to quit the organisation (Glazer and Beehr, 2005). Furthermore, status dissimilarity and lack of job security amongst employees of same job grade or level too may cause stress which leads them to harbour intention to leave the organization (Silva, 2006; Chris Ryan, Hazrina Ghazali and Asad Mohsin, 2011).

In short, job stress influences an employee's level of job satisfaction. This can in turn result in poor performance and culminated in withdrawal from their work (Applebaum, Fowler, Fiedler, Osinubi, & Robson, 2010). In support of this, there are many researchers who too found that the greater the amount of stress, the higher will be the turnover intention of employees (Deery, 2008; Applebaum et al., 2010).



CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

Chapter 3 discusses the methods of research employed in the current study in order to meet the two research objectives stated in Chapter 1. It starts with the outline of research framework, hypotheses development, research design and operational definition followed by discussions on instrumentation, data collection, population, sampling and collection procedures as well as data analysis techniques.

3.1 Research Framework

In this study, two factors have been taken into consideration in determining the intention to leave amongst employees in Sime Darby Motors Group (SDMG) in Malaysia, namely, job-satisfaction and job-related stress.



Figure 3.1: Research Framework

The objective of this study is to determine the significance of relationship between the two variables of job-satisfaction and job-related stress with the dependent variable of intention to leave.

3.2 Research Hypothesis

Based on the above research framework, the tested hypothesis in this study followed the objectives stated earlier:

I. To investigate the influence of job satisfaction on employees' intention to leave.

II. To investigate the influence of job-related stress on employees' intention to leave.

As such, there are two hypothesis developed for this study as follows:

Hypotheses 1

H1: There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave.

Hypotheses 2

3.3

H2: There is a significant relationship between job-related stress and intention to leave.

Research Design

In a research framework, the research design denotes the blueprint that provides the guideline for collecting, measuring and analyzing data aimed at addressing the research questions (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). One of the research strategies that can be used is a survey research. A survey research includes a system that sets the objectives to collect data, research design, propping for valid and reliable research instrument, executing and monitoring the survey as well as conducting the eventual analysis of data obtained before reporting the findings (Fink, 2003).

This research adopts a descriptive study and was designed as a one-shot cross-sectional study that involved the collection of quantitative data including demographic data from the organization at a single point in time. A quantitative research is used for this purpose to determine the quantity or extent of the investigated phenomenon as the application of statistics and science will be able to provide better accuracy to the conclusions derived from the results (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013).

In this study, the independent variables are (i) job satisfaction and (ii) job-related stress. These two factors were tested and analyzed to determine whether they have an influence on the dependent variable, namely, the employees' intention to leave. In view of the targeted population is 1,910 employees from seven companies within the group, the strategy was to use a survey research to collect the information from the employees on factors influencing their intention to leave.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

A survey or questionnaire was deployed as a tool to obtain the primary data for this study, especially to determine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Here, the unit of analysis is the individual employee in SDMG. As such, the questionnaires were distributed to individual respondents who were selected randomly. This method was found to be convenient, characterized by its wide coverage in terms of reaching out to the intended respondents in a relatively shorter time and minimal costs.

The questionnaire included the demographic information of the participants. It consists of four (4) sections according to the main constructs developed in the initial research framework. In order to measure the variables, the survey form uses a Likert Scale requiring the respondents to indicate their degree of respond. Each item was assessed on a five-point scale which ranges from 'strongly disagree' at 1 to 'strongly agree' at 5. The method of distribution for the questionnaire was by hand and email. Valid responses received were then analysed using the Stayistical Package for Social Science v22 (SPSS).

3.4 Operational Definition

3.4.1 Intention to Leave

Mobley, Griffith, Hand and Meglino (1979) defines intention to leave as the determination of employee to leave an organisation at some point in time.

3.4.2 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction in this study describes the positive feeling an employee experience about their job which resulted from evaluating its characteristics (Robbins and Judge, 2015). Meanwhile, Rhinehart and Short (1993) had indicated that job-satisfaction is a combination of psychological and environmental circumstances that leads an employee to state "I am satisfied with my job". It can also be defined as the extent which an employee derives pleasure from a job. Such is not confined to pay or cash compensation but also include matters such as recognition and autonomy.

3.4.3 Job-Related Stress

Stress is a response adapted by an employee consequential to the myriad of situations, actions or occurrence that imposes or places demands on that individual (Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson, 2014). In short, stress denotes a psychological process which

is unpleasant to an individual that happened due to pressures he experiences (Robbins and Judge, 2015).

3.5 Measurement of Variables/ Instrumentation

In this study, two independent variables have been identified, namely, job-satisfaction and job-related stress. Intention to leave is the dependent variable being measured in relation to the two independent variables. The survey or questionnaire is designed in a manner that it requires a response from a five-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 'strongly disagree' at 1 to 'strongly agree' at 5 to measure each independent variable.

The questionnaire was prepared in English as it was anticipated that all the respondents within the company are able to comprehend English. In addition, personal guidance was given to those respondents to avoid any misunderstanding and confusion in filing up the questionnaires. The research instrument deployed in this study was developed through adapting questionnaires developed in previous studies. The questionnaire consisted of four (4) sections namely demographic profile, intention to leave, job-satisfaction and job-related stress. Table 3.5 depicts the measurement of the variables.

3.5.1 Job Satisfaction

The job-satisfaction variable was measured using a 20-item scale which was adapted from the shorter version of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). MSQ is a commonly-used measurement instrument to capture factors of job satisfaction and it consists of two subscales, namely the extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of job satisfaction. The reliability for internal consistency from past studies ranged from 0.77-0.82 for extrinsic subscale, 0.84-0.91 for intrinsic subscale and 0.87- 0.92 for general subscale. Such result suggests that typically for job satisfaction, the intrinsic elements are more strongly connected to job satisfaction as opposed to the extrinsic factors.

The twenty items in the survey include six items for extrinsic job satisfaction factors and twelve items for intrinsic factors along with two items denoting general satisfaction. The required response ranged between a five-point Likert-type scale which tops at 5= 'Strongly Agree' to 1= 'Strongly Disagree' where the possible maximum score was 100 and the minimum was 20.

3.5.2 Job-Related Stress

Job-related stress was measured using a twelve-item workplace scale developed by Tate, Whatley and Clugston (1997). Tate et al had reported an internal reliability rate Cronbach's alpha of 0.61 to 0.91 which was adequate for each factor in the measurement. The instrument measured factors of job-related stress as follows:

- Work-family conflict
- Role ambiguity or clarity
- Role conflict; and
- Work overload

The required response ranged between a five-point Likert-type scale which tops at 5= 'Strongly Agree' to 1= 'Strongly Disagree'.

3.5.3 Intention to leave

The dependent variable, intention to leave, refers to employee's determination to leave the organization at some point in the future (Mobley et. al, 1979). Employee's turnover intention was assessed by three-item measure on intention to leave developed based on Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth (1978) and supplemented by items on antecedent thoughts of quitting developed by Jackofsky and Slocum (1987).

The items on intention to leave are (1) I often think a lot about leaving the company; (2) I will probably look for a new job in the next year; and (3) as soon as possible I will leave the organization. The required response ranges over five- point Likert-type scale from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. -point Likert Scaling from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 5= "Strongly agree". Minimum score is 3 and the maximum score is 15 where the higher score indicated higher intention to quit from a job. The Cronbach's alpha value for this scale in the original study was 0.9.

The antecedent to turnover intention, namely thoughts of quitting, is also measured using a scale developed by Jackofsky and Slocum (1987) which contained four items measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly disagree' to " strongly agree". For the Jackofsky and Slocum scale, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient value is 0.83.

Variable	Operational	Items	Authors
	definition		
Job Satisfaction	The positive feeling an employee feels about a job, resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics (Robbins and Judge, 2015)	 I am satisfied with: 1. Being able to keep busy all the time. 2. The chance to work alone on the job. 3. The chance to do different things from time to time. 4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community. 5. The way my boss handles his/her workers. 6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions. 7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience. 8. The way my job provides for steady employment. 9. The chance to do things for other people. 10. The chance to do things for other people. 10. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities. 12. The way company policies are put into practice. 13. My pay and the amount of work I do. 14. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job. 17. The working conditions. 18. The way my co-workers get along with each other. 19. The praise or recognition I get for doing a good job. 20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from 	Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (1977)
Job-Related Stress	An adaptive response moderated by individual differences that is consequence of any	 the job. My job responsibilities are clear to me. My job objectives are well-defined. It is clear to me what others expect of me at my job. 	Tate, Whatley and Clugston (1997)
	action, situation or event that places special demands on a person (Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson, 2014)	 4. At my job, I cannot satisfy everybody at the same time. 5. To satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others. 6. At my job, I have to do things which should be done differently. 7. I am give enough time to do what is expected of me at my job. 	

Table 3.5: Measurement of Variables

		 8. It seems that I have more work at my job than I can handle. 9. My job requires that I work hard. 10. My job schedule interferes with my family or personal life. 11 My job makes me too tired to enjoy my family or personal life. 12. My job does not give me enough time for family or personal activities. 	
Intention to Leave	An employee's determination to leave the organization at some point in the future (Mobley, Griffith, Hand and Meglino, 1979)	Thoughts of Quitting 1. I often toy with the idea of leaving my current job 2. I often think about quitting my present job 3. I frequently feel like leaving my current job 4. I seldom give consideration to the idea of quitting my current job	Thoughts of Quitting: Jackofsky and Slocum (1987); Intention to Leave: Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth (1978)
		Intention to Leave:5. I often think a lot about leaving the company;6. I will probably look for a new job in the next year; and7. As soon as it is possible, I will leave the company.	
AINU .			

3.6 Population and Sampling

3.6.1 Population of the Study

In a research, population refers to the things of interest or a whole group of people of which the researcher is interested to investigate. In this particular study, population refers to the identified group of respondents upon whom the researcher intends to generalize the outcome of the study. This study involves employees from all departments in SDMG, hence, the unit of analysis for this study is individual.

This study intended to cover only 1,910 executive and non-executive employees of SDMG from all functions or departments in various locations in Malaysia. These

employees are from various levels of management i.e. the support function up to managerial positions and are generally in the front-line sales, customer service and support functions. This research did not take into account the production workers, technicians and mechanics in SDMG operation which are generally represented by the union and under the purview of collective agreement. However, due to issues in relation to time, costs and practicality, only a subset of the targeted population was taken as a sample for the study.

3.6.2 Sample Size

To determine the sample size, the researcher used the table suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) which provide guidance in determining a sample size. For a given population of 1,910, the appropriate sample size suggested is 320 elements. The questionnaire was then distributed to approximately 600 employees in SDMG in order to capture the sample size suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970).

3.6.3 Sampling Techniques

According to Sekaran and Bougie (2013), for a more viable and efficient alternative, a stratified random sampling may be used which involves the process of stratification or segregation. Since the number of population that was involved in this study was the 1,910 executives and non-executives employee in SDMG whom were working in the head office and six different companies in the Malaysia operation, the sample size was divided into proportionate sub-groups based on the actual population in each company.

This approach enabled the researcher to track the differences in the parameters of subgroups and ensure homogeneity of treatment within the stratum and variability between all the strata of the companies. The employees' data were extracted from the SAP system. Therefore, the number of questionnaires distributed to randomly-selected respondents for each company followed the sample size per **Table 3.6** below:

Company Name	Population	Proportionate	Sample Size
i. Head Office	79	(79/1910)x100 = 4.14%	4.14% X 320 = 13
ii. Sime Darby Auto Bavaria Sdn Bhd	370	(370/1910)X100 = 19.37%	19.37% X 320 = 62
iii. Sime Darby Auto ConneXion Sdn Bhd	198	(198/1910)X100 = 10.37%	10.37% X 320 = 33
iv. Hyundai Sime Darby Motors Sdn Bhd	3i0	(310/1910)X100 = 16.23%	16.23% X 320 = 52
v. Sime Darby Rent-A-Car Sdn Bhd	215	(215/1910)X100 = 11.26%	11.26% X 320 = 36
vi. INOKOM Corporation Sdn Bhd	568	(568/1910)X100 = 29.74%	29.74% X 320 = 95
vii. Sime Darby Auto Performance Sdn Bhd	68	(68/1910)X100 = 3.56%	3.89% X 310 = 11
viii. Jaguar Land Rover Malaysia Sdn Bhd	102	(102/1910)x100=5.34%	5.34% x 320 =17
TOTAL	1910	100%	320

 Table 3.6: Sampling Framework based on Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

3.7.1 Data Collection Methods

The main or primary data for this research was being collected through the distribution of survey forms to the employees in SDMG through their Human Resource department as the respondents in this research were dispersed across several companies in multiple branches and location throughout Malaysia. The employees were given one week to complete the questionnaire. The survey or questionnaire was administered using structured questions measured using Likert-scale type. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2013), mail questionnaires are advantageous when responses to many questions needed to be obtained from a sample that is geographically dispersed or when requirement of anonymity is high.

In this study, the respondent are required to respond to questions on job-related stress and job-satisfaction as well as on their turnover intention which they may view as too personal or too sensitive to respond directly to the administrator. Furthermore, the respondents are required to think carefully before they respond to the questions. As such, 600 questionnaires were distributed to all executives and non-executives employee in SDMG. The respondents were given a duration of one week to answer.

3.7.2 Pilot Testing

This study was carried out in two phases of data collection that consists of a pilot study in examining the instrument as a first phase. The second phase was the actual study on all randomly selected employees. All employee data was extracted from the SAP system and was obtained with the approval from the Head of Human Resource for SDMG.

The pilot test was conducted by using 30 questionnaires distributed to employees in the head office to test its validity and reliability. The actual study was only conducted after the researcher was satisfied with the pilot test result. Data collection procedure was carried after one week the respondents were given the questionnaires. A follow-up call was made to the Human Resource department of each company with the aim of keeping track on the survey completion progress.

The questionnaire was deployed as the principal instrument to source for data from the targeted respondents. The use of questionnaire is advantageous in that it was easier to distribute and incurred relatively lower cost. There was no prior arrangement had to be made and no issues of interview bias raised as the anonymity among respondents is assured (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). The basis for distribution was simple where all employees had equal chance or likelihood in participating in the survey.

3.7.3 Testing of Research Instrument

All the questionnaires were successfully returned after the pilot testing. The researcher was confident that the questionnaire of the study was able to measure the items been tested and able to collect data needed to answer the research questions through the reliability analysis depicted by the Cronbach's Alpha of above 0.70. The questionnaire was then distributed to 600 employees to capture the 320 sample size suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). In this distribution, the number of respondents who returned completed questionnaire to the researcher was 336 which is still acceptable according to Roscoe's rule of thumb. Roscoe (1975) proposes, amongst others, that a sample size which is larger than thirty but less than five hundred is appropriate for most research.

3.8 Techniques of Data Analysis

Upon obtaining the data from the sample population, the returned surveys were organized in a sequence or identification number. The questionnaire was edited to ensure completeness of the gathered information. This process of editing was to ensure that the primary data collected was correct and closely reflecting the given information. The researcher was using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences v22 (SPSS) program to

process the responses from the survey questionnaires. A frequency table was also used to analyse and depict the demographic spread of respondents based on age, gender, length of service, marital status as well as their function and current status in the organization. Multiple regression analysis was used to test the respective hypotheses and determine the relationship between independent variables and dependent variable.

3.8.1 Descriptive Statistic

In a research, descriptive statistics are used to provide a simple summary on the sample and observations made by describing the basic features of the subject data. It did not make any conclusions that extend beyond the data being analyzed but instead described what the data shows. By using the descriptive analysis, the researcher was able to present quantitative description in a better, manageable form. In this study, descriptive statistic has enabled the researcher to makes sense a large amount of data and simplify it. In addition to simple graphics analysis, the statistics formed the basis of the quantitative analysis of data where the normality test, missing values, frequency, mean and standard deviation too were used to manage the data in this study.

3.8.2 Validity Tests

Validity test was used to ensure that the instrument, technique or process utilized to measure a concept does indeed measure the intended concept (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). Researcher would perform face validity and construct validity for this purpose. Face validity would examine whether the item on the scale did in fact on the face of it measure what it was supposed to measure. In relation to face validity, the questionnaire was referred to a proficient human resource practitioner for endorsement. As for

construct validity which would testify to how well the results obtained from the use of the measure to fit the theories around which the test was designed, the researcher would rely on the results of factor analysis.

3.8.3 Factor Analysis

According to Sekaran and Bougie (2013), factor analysis is a multivariate technique that confirms the dimensions of the concept that have been operationally defined, as well as indicating which of the items are most appropriate for each dimension, hence establishing a construct validity. In this study, factor analysis was employed to measure a group of multiple indicators whether they tend to bunch together to form a distinguishable cluster referred to as factors. The purpose of factor analysis is to minimize the number of variables that the study had to reckon with.

Several pre-requisite tests were required to enable the factor analysis process which included the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's tests. The KMO test measured the adequacy of sampling as to whether the partial correlations among variables are small. The desired test result should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. Bartlett's test measures the sphericity of the correlation matrix as an identity matrix. This would indicate that the factor model is inappropriate. Bartlett factor score has a mean of 0.00. The sum of squares of the unique factors over the range of items is minimized. The anti-image correlation matrix consists of the negatives of the partial correlation coefficients, and the anti-image co-variance matrix contains the negatives of the partial covariance. Most of the off diagonal elements should be small in a good factor model. Another test is the measurement systems analysis (MSA) which is an experiment designed to identify the components of variation in the measurement. MSA would evaluate the test method, measuring instruments, and the entire process of obtaining measurements to ensure the integrity of data used for analysis.

To identify total of factors, the researcher would refer to Eigenvalues and cumulative Eigenvalues. Factors that involved in this study were required to have Eigenvalues of more than or equal to one (1) and the cumulative Eigenvalues must be more or equal to 0.6. For factor identification and labelling, this study would use 0.63 as the factor loading value to indicate the convergence in a particular factor. Items score above or equal to 0.63 will be converged in the same factor.

3.8.4 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Correlation analysis is a measure of the relationship between two (2) or more variables typically between the independents and dependent variables. The symbol of a correlation is r, and its range is from -1.00 to +1.00 (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while a value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.0 represents that no correlation exist. The closer the measure to 1.00, the more likely the relationship is statistically significant. According to "Guildford's Rule of Thumb" (Guildford, 1973) the strength of correlation is as shown in **Table 3.8** below.

Value of Coefficient (r)	Strength of Relationship
<0.20	Very Low Relationship (Negligible)
0.20-0.40	Low Relationship
0.41 – 0.70	Moderate Relationship
0.71 – 0.90	High Relationship
>0.90	Very High Relationship

Table 3.8 Pearson's Correlation Coefficient using Guildford's Rule of Thumb

3.8.5 Multiple Regression

Linear regression seeks to depict the relationship between two variables by fitting a linear equation to observed data. One variable is considered to be an explanatory variable, and the other is considered to be a dependent variable. In this study, linear regression has been used to analyse the relationship between two variables. For each subject (or experimental unit), the purpose is to find the best straight line through the data. In some situation, the slope and/or intercept have a scientific meaning. Should a researcher wants to perform a linear regression analysis, it is advisable to conduct a preliminary test for example a scatterplot, to determine whether there is a relationship in existence between the two variables of interest. Should there is no relationship, then fitting a linear regression model to the data probably will not provide a useful model.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the research methodology employed in the current research by outlining the research framework, hypotheses development, research design and operational definition followed by discussions on instrumentation, data collection, population, sampling and collection procedures as well as data analysis techniques. The results and findings of the study are reported in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyses the findings of this study. The first part deliberated on data reliability and screening. The second part depicts the demographic analysis whereas the final segment of this chapter reports the findings which responds to the research objectives.

Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows is used to analyse the data of this study. In order to analyse the respondents' demographic profile, percentage and frequency were used to denote proportions of race, gender, age, marital status, position level, length of service, years in current position and current function. The statistical method of Pearson correlation was employed to determine the existence of any relationship between intention to leave, job-satisfaction and job-related stress.

The questionnaire was distributed to approximately 600 randomly selected employees, of which a total of 359 responses were obtained. However, only 336 questionnaires were completed and used for the analysis of this study. As such the response rate was 60% and the completion rate was 94%. According to Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black (1995), response rate which is above 50% is generally regarded as acceptable whilst a response rate which is more than 80% would be greatly desired. In this study, the result rate of 60% was somewhat expected as the subject matter was sensitive and some

employees were concerned on the confidentiality of their frank response to the survey as the researcher was a senior officer of the company.

4.1 **Respondents' Profile**

For a population of 1,910 employees in Malaysia, the required sample size is 320. A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed to executive and non-executive employees in various companies and locations. A total of 336 completed questionnaires were received as depicted in **Table 4.1** below. The summary of the demographic analysis of the respondent who participated in this research study is shown in **Table 4.1.2**.

Description	Number
Total Population	1,910
Total Sampling	320
Total Questionnaire Distributed	600 ST a
Total Questionnaire Returned	359
Total Questionnaire Usable	336
Percentage Questionnaire Returned	60%

 Table 4.1
 Total of Returned Questionnaires

4.1.1 Gender, Race, Age and Marital Status

The sample consisted of 34% female and 66% male respondents. 51% of the respondents are Malay, 32% Chinese, 10% India and 7% are from other races. The majority of respondents (55%) are 34 years of age and below (Gen-Y and Millennials) whilst only 3% respondents are 55 years old and above. 26% are between the age of 35 and 44 years old whilst 16% are between 45 and 54 years old.

An overwhelming percentage of the employees (67%) are married and only 29% and 4% are single and divorced or widowed respectively.

4.1.2 Position, Level of Employment and Years in Current Position

The majority of respondents (49%) are non-executives. Next largest group is the executives at 35% followed by managers at 16%. Most of the respondents (42%) have been working in the organization for more than 5 years, while 37% of the respondents have been working between two to five years and 21% have been working for less than two years.

4.1.3 Current Functions

Finally, 31% of the respondents are from sales, customer services and marketing; 24% from Aftersales; 23% from Operations and 6% from Finance. The rest of the respondents (15%) are from other support functions such as Human Resource, Business Development and IT.

The respondents profile seems to reflect the SDMG demographic in that the number of male respondents far outweighs the female numbers and that the majority of them are Generation-Y or Millennials i.e. below 35 years old. Only 3% of the respondents are above 55 years of age. The majority of the respondents at 67% are married. **Table 4.2** presents detailed information on the respondents' demographic profile.

	Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
GENDER	Male	222	66
	Female	114	34
RACE	Malay	173	51
	Chinese	109	32
	Indian	32	10
	Other	22	7
AGE	Below 35 years old	184	55
	35 to 44 years old	88	26
	45 to 54 years old	53	16
	55 years old and above	10	3
MARITAL	Single	97	29
STATUS	Married	225	67
	Divorced / Widowed	14	4
CURRENT	Managers and above	54	16
POSITION	Executives	117	35
	Non-Executives	Ma ₁₆₅ ysia	49
LENGTH OF	Less than 2 years	97	29
EMPLOYMENT	2 to 5 years	96	29
	5 years or more	140	42
YEARS IN	Less than 2 years	140	42
CURRENT	2 to 5 years	126	37
POSITION	5 years or more	70	21
CURRENT	Sales, Customer Services, Marketing	105	31
FUNCTION	After Sales	81	24
	Operations	77	23
	Finance	21	6
	HR/ IT/ BD & Others	51	15

1 uble 4.1.2 Demographic Analysis $(n - 350)$	<i>Table 4.1.2</i>	Demographic Analysis	(n = 336)
--	--------------------	----------------------	-----------

4.2 Reliability Test

In order to test the reliability of the measurement used in this research, a pilot study was conducted. A reliability score of less than 0.60 is considered to be weak but a score of 0.80 range is considered as good whilst 0.70 is regarded as acceptable (Sekaran and Bougie, 2013), The closer the reliability coefficient to 1.0, the more the internal consistency reliability will be.

The reliability test is the extent to which a measure is free of errors (Zikmund, Babin, Carr and Griffin, 2010) and produce consistent results (Gay and Diehl, 1996). Table 4.2.1 showed that the summary of reliability test results for each variable in this research and Table 4.2.2 showed the reliability test results in relation to the items used.

Table 4.2.1 Reliability Test F	Result
Universiti No. Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
20	0.905
11	0.704
3	0.906
	20 11

In reliability test for Job Related Stress, the researcher discarded 1 item to get acceptable reliability value ($\alpha = 0.704$). In Intention to Leave measurement, the researcher also discarded 4 items to ensure the result is acceptable ($\alpha = 0.906$).

Variable	Items	α value
	JS1. Keep busy	
Job Satisfaction	JS2. Work alone	
	JS3. Different work	0.905
	JS4. Somebody in community.	
	JS5. Handling by superior.	
	JS6. Decision-making by superior	
	JS7. Conscience.	
	JS8. Steady job.	
	JS9. Do for others	
	JS10. Tell others	
	JS11. Use abilities	
	JS12. Policies.	
	JS13. Pay	
	JS14. Advancement and promotion.	
	JS15. Own judgment	
	JS16. Own method.	
	JS17. Working conditions	
	JS18. Colleagues	
	JS19. recognition	
(L)	JS20. Achievement	_
Job-Related	JRS1. responsibilities	0.704
Stress	JRS2. Job objectives	0.704
Suess	JRS3. Expectations	
	JRS4. Satisfy everyone JRS5. Upset others	
	JRS6. Do differently	
		Malaural
	JRS8. Cannot handle JRS9. Work hard	Malaysi
	JRS10. Interfere family life	
	JRS11 Too tired	
	JRS12. Not enough time.	
Intention to Leave	ITL1: often think of leaving;	0.905
	ITL2: will look for job next year	0.305
	ITL2: will leave ASAP	

Table 4.2.2Cronbach alpha value for each variable.

4.3 Data Screening

In order to guarantee that the collected data are normal, homogeneous and linear, a data screening was undertaken. The results included normality test and linearity test on this

research. For purposes of linearity test, the researcher had conducted scatter plotting as well as testing the normality by measuring values of skewness and kurtosis.

4.3.1 Normality Test

To test normality of data, the researcher examined Skewness and Kurtosis values of variables. In using these tests, should the Skewness and Kurtosis value exceed a certain critical value, then the distribution is non-normal in terms of its characteristics (Hair Jr, et al., 1998). The suggestion for the critical values for Skewness and Kurtosis values are ± 1.96 which corresponds to a 0.05 error level. Table 4.3.1 shows the Skewness and Kurtosis values for each variable dimension in this research.

Table 4.3.1 Skewness and Kurtosis Values					
Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis			
Intention to Leave (ITL)	Univers 0.137 tara M	lalaysia-0.365			
Job Satisfaction (JS)	-0.159	0.246			
Job-Related Stress (JRS)	-0.133	0.251			

4.3.2 Linearity Test

To examine the linearity between independent variables and dependent variable, the researcher referred to the scatter plot graphs. The scatter dots represent the relationship between variables and must be in a straight line. Figure 4.3.2 below are the scatter plot graphs which show the linearity pattern between the different variables.



Figure 4.3.2 Scatter Plot Graphs

From the diagram above, it can be seen that all scatter plot graphs are linear. Although the overall point is not perfect, scattered dots appears to reflect a sufficient linearity in the relationship between the variables.

4.4 Removal of Outliers

Cases with extreme or unusual values on a single variable or a combination of variables are termed as outliers (Meyers, Gamst and Guarino, 2006). Outliers are extreme values that do not seem to fit with the majority of a data set. The outliers in this study were removed so that these extreme values cannot have a large effect on any conclusions of this study. The extreme samples or outliers were detected using Mahalanobis' distance process.

These process was conducted repeatedly, and out of 336 original samples, 52 outliers have been detected and removed from future analysis in this study. Therefore, the remaining respondents for further analysis are 284.

Figure 4.4 below which depicts the Mahalanobis Box Plot has shown that there are extreme values. It shows that all outliers have been removed using Mahalanobis' distance and the researcher has discarded 52 cases that identified as outliers and removed from future analysis in this study.



4.5 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is performed to summarise the construct of a set of variables. The general purpose of factor analysis is to summarize the information contained in a large number of variables into a smaller number of factors (Zikmund et al., 2010). This analysis is an additional means of determining whether items are tapping into the same construct (Coakes, Steed and Ong, 2010).

Factor analysis was performed separately for each set of independent and dependent variables based on the research instruments. The idea was to determine the discriminant factors and the convergent of items bunched in particular dimensions or factors.

To prepare for factor analysis, anti-image correlation, Bartlett's test of sphericity and KMO test are first examined. The anti-image correlation shows that all measures of sampling adequacy (MSA) values for all variables are well above the acceptable level of 0.5. In addition, partial correlations results show that all values are not exceeding 0.7. Hence, the variables are appropriate for factor analysis.

Other tests that were performed to ensure the appropriateness to conduct factor analysis were Bartlett test and KMO measurement. According to Meyers, Gamst and Guarino (2006), KMO measurement of sampling adequacy for every variable must be greater than 0.70 and Bartlett's test must be significant at a significant level of ρ <0.05. Table 4.5 below indicated the KMO and Bartlett's test values for each variable used in this study.

Variables	KMO Value	Barlett's Test Value
Intention to Leave (ITL)	0.745	0.00
Job Satisfaction (JS)	0.845	0.00
Job-Related Stress (JRS)	0.725	0.00

Table 4.5 KMO and Barlett's Test Value

Table 4.5 shows that the KMO value score for intention to leave, job satisfaction, and job-related stress is 0.745, 0.845 and 0.725. In addition, the Barlett's test value revealed that each variable in this study have significant level at p<0.05. Therefore, this score value has allowed the researcher conducted a factor analysis process.

4.5.1 Factor Analysis for Intention to Leave

Table 4.5.1.1 below revealed that the anti-image correlation which indicates the size of sampling adequacy (MSA) for all variables. MSA value must exceed the acceptance level of 0.5. Therefore, in measuring the intention to leave (ITL), no items were removed from the final three items because all items are at the level of acceptance and for partial correlation, all values are below 0.7.

Anti-Image Matrices				
		ITL1	ITL2	ITL3
Anti-image Correlation ITL1		.735 ^a	474	386
ITL2		474	.734 ^a	390
ITL3		386	390	.767 ^a

 Table 4.5.1.1 Anti-image Correlation Results for Intention to Leave

^a Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

To identify the number of intention to leave, the researcher examined total of factors extracted from the Eigenvalues table. In evaluating Eigenvalues, the researcher considered factors that scored Eigenvalues 1 or greater and total cumulative variance percentage more than or equal to 60%. Referring to **Table 4.5.1.2**, the researcher only obtained one factor score of Eigenvalue. Total intention to leave involved in this research are one. Total cumulative eigenvalues percentage for this one factor was 81%.

Table 4.5.1.2 Eigenvalue for Intention to Leave

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings				
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %		
1	2.430	81.005	81.005	2.430	81.005	81.005		
2	.305	10.177	91.181					
3	.265	8.819	100.000					

Total	Variance	Explained

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Factor loading was used to indicate items that were clustered in each factor. This research has applied ± 0.35 as the minimum value for factor loading. **Table 4.5.1.3** exhibits the rotated component matrix for intention to leave.

Table 4.5.1.3 Rotated Component Matrix for Intention to Leave

Rotated Compor	nent	Matrix ^a
-----------------------	------	---------------------

	Component
	1
ITL 1: Often think to leave	.905
ITL2: Look for job next year	.904
ITL3: ASAP	.891

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

^a 1 components extracted.
Based on Table 4.5.1.3 results, the researcher extracted Factor 1 by Rotated Component Matrix. Factor 1 consists of 3 items including "I often think about leaving my current job", "It is likely that I will look for a new job in the next year", and "I intend to leave the company as soon as possible". Factor 1 for intention to leave which consists of 3 items scored Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.883.

4.5.2 Factor Analysis for Job Satisfaction

Referring to **Table 4.5.2.1**, the results revealed that the anti-image correlation which indicates the size of sampling adequacy (MSA) for all variables. The MSA value must exceed acceptance level of 0.5. Therefore, in measuring job satisfaction, no items were removed because all items are in a level of acceptance and for partial correlation, all values are below 0.7.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

| | JS1 | JS2 | JS3 | JS4
 | JS5

 | JS6 | JS7 | JS8 | JS9 | JS10

 | JS11
 | JS12 | JS13 | JS14 | JS15
 | JS16 | JS17 | JS18 | JS19 |
|------|--|--|---
--
--
--
---|---|--|---

--

--
---|--|---|---|---
---|---|---|---|
| JS1 | .601ª | 063 | .032 | .063
 | 007

 | 064 | 143 | 092 | 040 | .016

 | 045
 | .016 | .100 | .034 | .037
 | 014 | .151 | .007 | .046 |
| JS2 | 063 | .648ª | 126 | .041
 | .039

 | 037 | 036 | 070 | 070 | 002

 | 004
 | 048 | 072 | .056 | 109
 | 023 | .072 | .176 | .083 |
| JS3 | | | | 337
 | .023

 | | | .063 | |

 |
 | 077 | | | |
 | 073 | | | 020 |
| JS4 | .063 | | 337 |
 | 166

 | | 037 | 152 | |

 | .040
 | .012 | 103 | 176 | |
 | 035 | 025 | | .082 |
| JS5 | 007 | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 | 064
 | | | |
 | | | | 047 |
| JS6 | 064 | 037 | 051 | TAR
 | 701

 | .756 ^a | 116 | 025 | 090 | .065

 | 016
 | .096 | 092 | .054 | 078
 | 059 | 067 | | 141 |
| JS7 | | 1 | 1 |
 | 131

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | .073 |
| JS8 | | | |
 | TIE

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | .105 |
| JS9 | | 17 | |
 | 0

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | |
 | | | | .017 |
| JS10 | | (-1 | | 3)
 | 1.15

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 028 |
| JS11 | | | |
 | 12/

 | 1000 | inco | we it | |

 | The second
 | Inv | al.a. | |
 | | | | .022 |
| JS12 | | | B | UDI B
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 138 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 034 |
| JS14 | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 207 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 186 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | .114 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | .009 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 050 |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | | |
 | | | | 050
.830 ^a |
| | | | |
 |

 | | | | |

 |
 | | | |
 | | | | |
| 1320 | 077 | 100 | .140 | 058
 | 023

 | .140 | 139 | 091 | 058 | .093

 | 060
 | 000 | 008 | 050 | .008
 | 201 | 090 | 123 | 472 |
| | S2
S3
S4
S5
S6
S7
S8
S9
S10
S11
S12
S13 | S1 .601 ^a S2 063 S3 .032 S4 .063 S5 007 S6 064 S7 143 S8 092 S9 040 S10 .016 S11 045 S12 .016 S13 .100 S14 .034 S15 .037 S16 014 S17 .151 S18 .007 S19 .046 | S1 .601 ^a 063 S2 063 .648 ^a S3 .032 126 S4 .063 .041 S5 007 .039 S6 064 037 S7 143 036 S8 092 070 S9 040 070 S10 .016 002 S11 045 004 S12 .016 048 S13 .100 072 S14 .034 .056 S15 .037 109 S16 014 023 S17 .151 .072 S18 .007 .176 S19 .046 .083 | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a S4 .063 .041 337 S5 007 .039 .023 S6 064 037 051 S7 143 036 045 S8 092 070 .063 S9 040 070 074 S10 .016 002 077 S11 045 004 111 S12 .016 048 077 S13 .100 072 .136 S14 .034 .056 041 S15 .037 109 033 S16 014 023 073 S17 .151 .072 .057 S18 .007 .176 028 S19 .046 .083 020 <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a S5 007 .039 .023 166 S6 064 037 051 .078 S7 143 036 045 037 S8 092 070 .063 152 S9 040 070 .063 152 S10 .016 002 077 .061 S11 045 .004 111 .040 S12 .016 048 077 .012 S13 .100 072 .136 103 S14 .034 .056 041 176 S15 .037 109 033 158 S16 014 023 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a S6 064 037 051 .078 701 S7 143 036 045 037 022 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 S12 .016 048 077 .012 040 S13 .100 072 .136 103 .028 S14 .034</td></td<><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 090 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 .016 S12 .016 048 077</td><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 S7 143 036 045 037 022 048 S9 040 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S9 .040 070 .061 112 .149 090 039 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 S11 .045 .004</td><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 025 S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 .865^a 048 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 158 S11 045</td><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 .149 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 .025 090 S7 143 036 045 037 022 018 .039 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 .034 S9 040 .090 039 034 .768^a <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 .149 112 S6 064 .037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 025 .090 .065 S7 .143 .036 045 037 .022 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 S8 .092 .070 .063 152 .010 .025 <t< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 002 004 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 111 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 .112 .061 .040 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* 701 022 .010 .149 112 064 S6 064 037 051 .078 .701 .756* 116 .025 090 .065 016 S7 143 036 037 022 .116 .865* 048 .039 .060 105
 S8 092<!--</td--><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<></td></td></t<><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .011 .070 .048 .072 .156 .104 .033 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 .158 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .756* .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .016 .024 .060 .054 .045 S8 .092 .070 .063 .122 <</td><td>sn .601* .033 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .055 .109 .023 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 .033 .073 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .071 .122 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .16 .18 .035 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .752 .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .096 .024 .060 .054 .078 .078 .025 .040 .148 .079</td><td>S1 .601* .0.63 .0.32 .0.63 .0.07 .0.64 .1.43 .0.92 .0.00 .0.16 .0.04 .0.16 .0.03 .0.03 .0.037 .0.04 .1.131 S2 .0.63 .648* .126 .041 .0.39 .0.37 .0.32 .0.70 .0.02 .0.04 .0.48 .0.72 .0.56 .1.09 .0.23 .0.72 S3 .0.32 .126 .793* .3.37 .0.23 .0.51 .0.45 .0.63 .0.77 .1.11 .0.77 .1.13 .0.41 .0.33 .0.73 .0.55 S4 .0.63 .0.41 .3.37 .881* .1.66 .0.78 .1.12 .1.12 .0.40 .0.40 .1.26 .0.55 .1.12 .0.64 .0.40 .0.28 .1.26 .0.50 .0.17 .0.27 S6 .0.037 .0.05 .0.16 .0.40 .0.40 .0.44 .0.60 .1.43 .0.59 .0.67 S7</td><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 .151 .007 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 .023 .072 .176 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .071 .116 .077 .111 .077 .113 .016 .014 .033 .073 .023 .025 .037 S5 .007 .039 .033 .166 .784 .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .066 .046 .032 .054 .032 .054 .049 .016 .024 .078 .051 .024 .050 .044 .047 .021 S6 .060</td></td></td></td> | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a S5 007 .039 .023 166 S6 064 037 051 .078 S7 143 036 045 037 S8 092 070 .063 152 S9 040 070 .063 152 S10 .016 002 077 .061 S11 045 .004 111 .040 S12 .016 048 077 .012 S13 .100 072 .136 103 S14 .034 .056 041 176 S15 .037 109 033 158 S16 014 023 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a S6 064 037 051 .078 701 S7 143 036 045 037 022 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 S12 .016 048 077 .012 040 S13 .100 072 .136 103 .028 S14 .034</td></td<> <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064
 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 090 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 .016 S12 .016 048 077</td> <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 S7 143 036 045 037 022 048 S9 040 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S9 .040 070 .061 112 .149 090 039 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 S11 .045 .004</td> <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 025 S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 .865^a 048 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 158 S11 045</td> <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 .149 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 .025 090 S7 143 036 045 037 022 018 .039 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 .034 S9 040 .090 039 034 .768^a <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 .149 112 S6 064 .037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 025 .090 .065 S7 .143 .036 045 037 .022 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 S8 .092 .070 .063 152 .010 .025 <t< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 002 004 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 111 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 .112 .061 .040 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* 701 022 .010 .149 112 064 S6 064 037 051 .078 .701 .756* 116 .025 090 .065 016 S7 143 036 037 022 .116 .865* 048 .039 .060 105 S8 092<!--</td--><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<></td></td></t<><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .011 .070 .048 .072 .156 .104 .033 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152
 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 .158 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .756* .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .016 .024 .060 .054 .045 S8 .092 .070 .063 .122 <</td><td>sn .601* .033 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .055 .109 .023 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 .033 .073 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .071 .122 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .16 .18 .035 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .752 .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .096 .024 .060 .054 .078 .078 .025 .040 .148 .079</td><td>S1 .601* .0.63 .0.32 .0.63 .0.07 .0.64 .1.43 .0.92 .0.00 .0.16 .0.04 .0.16 .0.03 .0.03 .0.037 .0.04 .1.131 S2 .0.63 .648* .126 .041 .0.39 .0.37 .0.32 .0.70 .0.02 .0.04 .0.48 .0.72 .0.56 .1.09 .0.23 .0.72 S3 .0.32 .126 .793* .3.37 .0.23 .0.51 .0.45 .0.63 .0.77 .1.11 .0.77 .1.13 .0.41 .0.33 .0.73 .0.55 S4 .0.63 .0.41 .3.37 .881* .1.66 .0.78 .1.12 .1.12 .0.40 .0.40 .1.26 .0.55 .1.12 .0.64 .0.40 .0.28 .1.26 .0.50 .0.17 .0.27 S6 .0.037 .0.05 .0.16 .0.40 .0.40 .0.44 .0.60 .1.43 .0.59 .0.67 S7</td><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 .151 .007 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 .023 .072 .176 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .071 .116 .077 .111 .077 .113 .016 .014 .033 .073 .023 .025 .037 S5 .007 .039 .033 .166 .784 .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .066 .046 .032 .054 .032 .054 .049 .016 .024 .078 .051 .024 .050 .044 .047 .021 S6 .060</td></td></td> | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a S6 064 037 051 .078 701 S7 143 036 045 037 022 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 S12 .016 048 077 .012 040 S13 .100 072 .136 103 .028 S14 .034 | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 701 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756 ^a S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 S9 040 070 074 112 .149 090 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 S11 045 004 111 .040 064 .016 S12 .016 048 077 | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 045 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 037 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 701 022 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756 ^a 116 S7 143 036 045 037 022 048 S9 040 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S9 .040 070 .061 112 .149 090 039 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 S11 .045 .004 | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 037 152 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 701 022 .010 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756 ^a 116 025 S7 143 036 045 037 022 116 .865 ^a 048 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 S10 .016 002 077 .061 112 .065 .060 158 S11 045 | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 037 152 112 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 701 022 .010 .149 S6 064 037 051 .078 701 .756 ^a 116 .025 090 S7 143 036 045 037 022 018 .039 S8 092 070 .063 152 .010 025 048 .034 S9 040 .090 039 034 .768 ^a <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 701 022 .010 .149 112 S6 064 .037 051 .078 701 .756^a 116 025 .090 .065 S7 .143 .036 045 037 .022 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 S8 .092 .070 .063 152 .010 .025 <t< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 002 004 S3 .032
126 .793* 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 111 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 .112 .061 .040 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* 701 022 .010 .149 112 064 S6 064 037 051 .078 .701 .756* 116 .025 090 .065 016 S7 143 036 037 022 .116 .865* 048 .039 .060 105 S8 092<!--</td--><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<></td></td></t<><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .011 .070 .048 .072 .156 .104 .033 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 .158 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .756* .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .016 .024 .060 .054 .045 S8 .092 .070 .063 .122 <</td><td>sn .601* .033 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .055 .109 .023 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 .033 .073 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .071 .122 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .16 .18 .035 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .752 .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .096 .024 .060 .054 .078 .078 .025 .040 .148 .079</td><td>S1 .601* .0.63 .0.32 .0.63 .0.07 .0.64 .1.43 .0.92 .0.00 .0.16 .0.04 .0.16 .0.03 .0.03 .0.037 .0.04 .1.131 S2 .0.63 .648* .126 .041 .0.39 .0.37 .0.32 .0.70 .0.02 .0.04 .0.48 .0.72 .0.56 .1.09 .0.23 .0.72 S3 .0.32 .126 .793* .3.37 .0.23 .0.51 .0.45 .0.63 .0.77 .1.11 .0.77 .1.13 .0.41 .0.33 .0.73 .0.55 S4 .0.63 .0.41 .3.37 .881* .1.66 .0.78 .1.12 .1.12 .0.40 .0.40 .1.26 .0.55 .1.12 .0.64 .0.40 .0.28 .1.26 .0.50 .0.17 .0.27 S6 .0.037 .0.05 .0.16 .0.40 .0.40 .0.44 .0.60 .1.43 .0.59 .0.67 S7</td><td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 .151 .007 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 .023 .072 .176 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .071 .116 .077 .111 .077 .113 .016 .014 .033 .073 .023 .025 .037 S5 .007 .039 .033 .166 .784 .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .066 .046 .032 .054 .032 .054 .049 .016 .024 .078 .051 .024 .050 .044 .047 .021 S6 .060</td></td> | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 070 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 701 022 .010 .149 112 S6 064 .037 051 .078 701 .756 ^a 116 025 .090 .065 S7 .143 .036 045 037 .022 116 .865 ^a .048 .039 .060 S8 .092 .070 .063 152 .010 .025 <t< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 002 004 S3 .032 126 .793*
 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 111 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 .112 .061 .040 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* 701 022 .010 .149 112 064 S6 064 037 051 .078 .701 .756* 116 .025 090 .065 016 S7 143 036 037 022 .116 .865* 048 .039 .060 105 S8 092<!--</td--><td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<></td></td></t<> <td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .011 .070 .048 .072 .156 .104 .033 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 .158 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .756* .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .016 .024 .060 .054 .045 S8 .092 .070 .063 .122 <</td> <td>sn .601* .033 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .055 .109 .023 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 .033 .073 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .071 .122 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .16 .18 .035 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .752 .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .096 .024 .060 .054 .078 .078 .025 .040 .148 .079</td> <td>S1 .601* .0.63 .0.32 .0.63 .0.07 .0.64 .1.43 .0.92 .0.00 .0.16 .0.04 .0.16 .0.03 .0.03 .0.037 .0.04 .1.131 S2 .0.63 .648* .126 .041 .0.39 .0.37 .0.32 .0.70 .0.02 .0.04 .0.48 .0.72 .0.56 .1.09 .0.23 .0.72 S3 .0.32 .126 .793* .3.37 .0.23 .0.51 .0.45 .0.63 .0.77 .1.11 .0.77 .1.13 .0.41 .0.33 .0.73 .0.55 S4 .0.63 .0.41 .3.37 .881* .1.66 .0.78 .1.12 .1.12 .0.40 .0.40 .1.26 .0.55 .1.12 .0.64 .0.40 .0.28 .1.26 .0.50 .0.17 .0.27 S6 .0.037 .0.05 .0.16 .0.40 .0.40 .0.44 .0.60 .1.43 .0.59 .0.67 S7</td> <td>S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 .151 .007 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 .023 .072 .176 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .071 .116 .077 .111 .077 .113 .016 .014 .033 .073 .023 .025 .037 S5 .007 .039 .033 .166 .784 .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .066 .046 .032 .054 .032 .054 .049 .016 .024 .078 .051 .024 .050 .044 .047 .021 S6 .060</td> | S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 070 070 002 004 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 045 .063 074 077 111 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 .112 .061 .040 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* 701 022 .010 .149 112 064 S6 064 037 051 .078 .701 .756* 116 .025 090 .065 016 S7 143 036 037 022 .116 .865* 048 .039 .060 105 S8 092 </td <td>S1 .601^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3
 .032 126 .793^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<></td> | S1 .601 ^a 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 S2 063 .648 ^a 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 .070 002 .004 048 S3 .032 126 .793 ^a 337 .023 051 .045 .063 .074 077 111 077 S4 .063 .041 337 .881 ^a 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 S5 .007 .039 .023 166 .784 ^a 017 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .061 .040 .061 .040 .040 .037 .051 .78 116 .865 ^a .048 .039 .060 .155 .016 .105 .016 .034 .158 .079 .191 .57 .291 <td< td=""><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061</td><td>S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024</td></td<> | S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 037 036 .070 070 002 004 048 .072 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 051 .045 .063 074 077 111 .077 .136 S4 .063 .041 337 .881* 166 .078 037 152 112 .061 .040 .012 103 S5 007 .039 .023 166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 112 .061 .040 .028 S6 064 037 .025 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .024 .060 S8 .092 .070 .061 | S1 .601* 063 .032 .063 007 064 143 092 040 .016 045 .016 .100 .034 S2 063 .648* 126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 S3 .032 126 .793* 337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .074 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 S5 007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .064 .040 .028 .126 S6 064 .037 .022 .116 .865* .048 .039 .060 .105 .049 .016 .024 | S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .011 .070 .048 .072 .156 .104 .033 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .037 .152 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .176 .158 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .756* .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .016 .024 .060 .054 .045 S8 .092 .070 .063 .122 < | sn .601* .033 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .055 .109 .023 S3 .032 .126 .793*
 .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .077 .111 .077 .136 .041 .033 .073 S4 .063 .041 .337 .881* .166 .078 .071 .122 .112 .061 .040 .012 .103 .16 .18 .035 S5 .007 .039 .023 .166 .784* .701 .752 .116 .025 .090 .065 .016 .096 .024 .060 .054 .078 .078 .025 .040 .148 .079 | S1 .601* .0.63 .0.32 .0.63 .0.07 .0.64 .1.43 .0.92 .0.00 .0.16 .0.04 .0.16 .0.03 .0.03 .0.037 .0.04 .1.131 S2 .0.63 .648* .126 .041 .0.39 .0.37 .0.32 .0.70 .0.02 .0.04 .0.48 .0.72 .0.56 .1.09 .0.23 .0.72 S3 .0.32 .126 .793* .3.37 .0.23 .0.51 .0.45 .0.63 .0.77 .1.11 .0.77 .1.13 .0.41 .0.33 .0.73 .0.55 S4 .0.63 .0.41 .3.37 .881* .1.66 .0.78 .1.12 .1.12 .0.40 .0.40 .1.26 .0.55 .1.12 .0.64 .0.40 .0.28 .1.26 .0.50 .0.17 .0.27 S6 .0.037 .0.05 .0.16 .0.40 .0.40 .0.44 .0.60 .1.43 .0.59 .0.67 S7 | S1 .601* .063 .032 .063 .007 .064 .143 .092 .040 .016 .045 .016 .100 .034 .037 .014 .151 .007 S2 .063 .648* .126 .041 .039 .037 .036 .070 .070 .002 .004 .048 .072 .056 .109 .023 .072 .176 S3 .032 .126 .793* .337 .023 .051 .045 .063 .071 .116 .077 .111 .077 .113 .016 .014 .033 .073 .023 .025 .037 S5 .007 .039 .033 .166 .784 .701 .022 .010 .149 .112 .066 .046 .032 .054 .032 .054 .049 .016 .024 .078 .051 .024 .050 .044 .047 .021 S6 .060 |

 Table 4.5.2.1
 Anti-image Correlation Results

Referring to **Table 4.5.2.2**, factor analysis for job satisfaction extracted 6 factors in this study. The factors have extracts score of 62.68% from cumulative variance Eigenvalues.

				Extract	ion Sums of	Squared	Rotati	ion Sums of	Squared	
	Ini	tial Eigen	alues		Loadings		Loadings			
		% of	Cumulative		% of	Cumulative		% of	Cumulative	
Component	Total	Variance	%	Total	Variance	%	Total	Variance	%	
1	5.930	29.650	29.650	5.930	29.650	29.650	2.727	13.637	13.637	
2	1.816	9.078	38.728	1.816	9.078	38.728	2.465	12.325	25.963	
3	1.305	6.527	45.256	1.305	6.527	45.256	2.462	12.308	38.270	
4	1.236	6.178	51.433	1.236	6.178	51.433	2.183	10.914	49.184	
5	1.203	6.013	57.446	1.203	6.013	57.446	1.426	7.132	56.316	
6	1.047	5.236	62.682	1.047	5.236	62.682	1.273	6.366	62.682	

Table 4.5.2.2Eigenvalues for Job SatisfactionTotal Variance Explained

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Table 4.5.2.3 below showed that Factor 1 consist of 4 items including "I feel satisfied with the freedom to use my own judgment", "I am satisfied with the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job", "I feel satisfied with the chance to try my own methods of doing the job", and "I feel satisfied with the praise or recognition I get for doing a good job". Factor 2 consist of 5 items including "I feel satisfied with my pay and the amount of work I do", "I am satisfied with the way company policies are put into practice", "I feel satisfied with chances for advancement or promotion on this job", "I feel satisfied with the way my job provides for steady employment", and "I feel satisfied with the extent my job provides me the opportunity to be "somebody" in the community". Factor 3 consist of 4 items including "I have the chance to do things for

other people", "I have the chance to tell people what to do", "I have the opportunity to do something that makes use of my abilities", and "I have the opportunity to do different things from time to time". While factor 4, factor 5 and factor 6 have been removed from the analysis because they did not achieve sufficient level of reliability.

Rotat	ed Component	Matrix	a				
			(Compoi	nent		
		1	2	3	4	5	6
JS15 Freedom		.770	.091	.184	.235	117	156
JS16 Own method		.710	.075	.337	.191	.003	040
JS20 Accomplishment		.689	.356	.062	035	.200	.285
JS19 Recognition		.634	.350	094	.209	.215	.055
JS13 Pay		.085	.811	047	.014	.001	057
JS12 policies		.231	.656	.148	.196	.163	.000
JS14.Promotion		.470	.553	.080	.298	.005	147
JS8 Steady employment		.154	.520	.406	.089	037	.173
JS4 Community		.267	.412	.346	.386	131	264
JS9 Other people	Univers	077	.200	.761	039	.048	.151
JS10 Tell others		.169	034	.738	.113	.148	035
JS11 Use abilities		.306	.041	.663	.182	054	.137
JS3. Different		.086	.112	.454	.344	379	343
JS6. Decision-making of superior		.198	.099	.114	.854	.100	.160
JS5. HandIng by superior		.229	.172	.091	.847	.135	.081
JS2. Work alone		.169	.166	.162	075	647	.229
JS18.Co-workers		.265	.215	.238	.083	.602	044
JS17 Workingg conditions.		.230	.371	.245	.170	.498	.015
JS1. Able to keep busy all the time.		010	160	.042	.037	229	.706
JS7. Able to do things that don't go agains	t conscience.	.009	.192	.226	.327	.028	.541

 Table 4.5.2.3
 Rotated Component Matrix for Job Satisfaction

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.^a

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Table 4.5.2.4 depicts that Cronbach's Alpha value (α) for job satisfaction after factor analysis process. Factor 1 for job satisfaction consists of 4 items of which the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.774. The researcher had renamed this factor as "Self-Actualization". Factor 2 consists of 5 items of which the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.756 and renamed as "Rewards". Factor 3 consists of 4 items of which the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.679. Based on previous researches related to this study, the researcher decided to rename this factor as "Engagement". Therefore, Factor 1, Factor 2 and Factor 3 continued to be used for further analysis.

 Table 4.5.2.4 Reliability Values for Job Satisfaction after Factor Analysis

Job Satisfaction	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
	after factor analysis
Factor 1 Self-Actualization	0.774
Factor 2 Rewards	0.756
Factor 3 Engagement	0.679

Universiti Utara Malaysia

4.5.3 Factor Analysis for Job-Related Stress

Referring to **Table 4.5.3.1**, the results revealed the anti-image correlation which indicates the size of sampling adequacy (MSA) for all variables. MSA value must exceed acceptance level is 0.5. Therefore, in measuring job related stress, no items were removed because all items are in a level of acceptance and for partial correlation, all values are below 0.7.

									-	-	-	
		JRS1	JRS2	JRS3	JRS4	JRS5	JRS6	JRS8	JRS9	JRS10	JRS11	JRS12
Anti-image	JRS1	.686 ^a	622	152	120	.169	.109	127	.109	.049	049	.027
Correlation	JRS2	622	.682ª	344	.043	027	080	.150	164	.003	.083	042
	JRS3	152	344	.860 ^a	033	.032	059	.066	077	.020	.082	.019
	JRS4	120	.043	033	.593ª	318	262	.042	201	010	.046	104
	JRS5	.169	027	.032	318	.634 ^a	113	118	.078	.050	141	.133
	JRS6	.109	080	059	262	113	.591ª	194	.097	098	023	.100
	JRS8	127	.150	.066	.042	118	194	.643 ^a	375	058	098	.085
	JRS9	.109	164	077	201	.078	.097	375	.592ª	011	045	065
	JRS10	.049	.003	.020	010	.050	098	058	011	.858ª	320	339
	JRS11	049	.083	.082	.046	141	023	098	045	320	.759 ^a	605
	JRS12	.027	042	.019	104	.133	.100	.085	065	339	605	.734 ^a

Anti-image Matrices

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Referring to **Table 4.5.3.2**, factor analysis for job satisfaction was extracted to 4 factors in this study.

Table 4.5.3.2Eigenvalues for Job Related Stress

				Extract	tion Sums of	Squared	Rotation Sums of Squared			
	Ini	itial Eigenv	/alues		Loadings			Loadings		
		% of	Cumulative		% of	Cumulative		% of	Cumulative	
Component	Total	Variance	%	Total	Variance	%	Total	Variance	%	
1	3.397	30.886	30.886	3.397	30.886	30.886	2.555	23.227	23.227	
2	1.955	17.772	48.657	1.955	17.772	48.657	2.417	21.976	45.202	
3	1.624	14.761	63.418	1.624	14.761	63.418	1.638	14.888	60.090	
4	1.010	9.182	72.600	1.010	9.182	72.600	1.376	12.510	72.600	

Total Variance Explained

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Referring to the table above, the factors have extracts score of 72.60% from cumulative variance Eigenvalues.

Table 4.5.3.3 shows that Factor 1 consists of 3 items including "My job schedule interferes with my family or personal life", "My job makes me too tired to enjoy my family or personal life", and "My job does not give me enough time for family or personal activities". Factor 2 consists of 3 items including "My job objectives are well-defined", "My job responsibilities are clear to me", and "It is clear to me what others expect of me at my job". Factor 3 consists of 3 items including "At my job, I cannot satisfy everybody at the same time", "To satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others", and "At my job, I have to do things which should be done differently". While Factor 4 was discarded from further analysis because it did not achieve sufficient level of reliability.

 Table 4.5.3.3
 Rotated Component Matrix

 Rotated Component Matrix^a

	SIA			Comp	onent	
. 0	1		1	2	3	4
JRS12 Enough personal time JRS11 Enjoy personal time		Universiti		096		.087
JRS10 Interfere personal life			.893	198	.075	.139
•			.873	153	.071	.110
JRS2 Work objectives			127	.899	026	008
JRS1. Work responsibilities.			093	.866	080	.004
JRS3. Expectation of others			206	.794	.023	017
JRS4. Satisfy everyone.			.159	.161	.741	.125
JRS6. Do differently			.003	.002	.720	.078
JRS5. Upset others						
JRS9. Working hard.			032	267	.716	.025
U			.186	.163	.033	.818
JRS8. Cannot handle.			.081	185	.193	.804

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.^a

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 4.5.3.4 shows the Cronbach's Alpha value (α) for job-related stress after factor analysis process. Factor 1 of stress consists of 3 items of which Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.913. The researcher had renamed this factor as "Work-Family Conflict". Factor 2 consists of 3 items which Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.848 and renamed as "Role-Clarity". Factor 3 consist of 3 items of which Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.562. Based on previous study related to this study, the researcher decided to rename this factor as "Role-Conflict". Only Factor 1 and Factor 2 were continued to be used for further analysis.

Job-Related Stress	Cronbach's Alpha (α) after factor
	analysis
Factor 1 Work-Family Conflict	0.913
Factor 2 Role Clarity	0.848
Factor 3 Role Conflict	0.562

Table 4.5.3.4 Reliability Values for Job Related Stress after Factor Analysis

4.6 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.6 shows that the relationship between intention to leave, job satisfaction and jobrelated stress. Relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave showed a negative direction of -0.495. The relationship between job-related stress and intention to leave shows a positive direction at 0.167. Therefore, job satisfaction and job related stress have significant relationship at level p>0.01.

Universiti Utara Malavsia

Table 4.6Correlation Results between Job Satisfaction, Job Related Stress and
Intention to Leave

Intention to Leave
-0.495**
0.167**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.6.1 Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave

Table 4.6.1 shows that relationship between job satisfaction dimensions and intention to leave. Result correlation test revealed that job satisfaction dimensions of self-actualization, rewards and engagement have significant relationship with the intention to leave with $r = -0.426^{**}$, $r = -0.504^{**}$ and $r = -0.249^{**}$. These three relationship have negative direction.

 Table 4.6.1 Correlation Results between Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave

Job Satisfaction	Intention to Leave
Self-Actualization	-0.426**
Rewards	-0.504**
Engagement	-0.249**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

4.6.2 Relationship between Job-Related Stress and Intention to Leave

Table 4.6.2 shows that relationship between job-related stress dimensions and intention to leave. Results of the correlation test revealed that work-family conflict, role clarity (as against of role ambiguity) and role conflict have significant relationship with intention to leave where $r = 0.413^{**}$, $r = -0.412^{**}$ and $r = 0.134^{*}$ respectively. Based on the correlation results, work-family conflict and role-conflict seemed to show positive direction relationship with intention to leave; whilst the relationship between role clarity and intention to leave has a negative direction.

Table 4.6.2 Correlation Results between Stress and Intention to Leave

Job Related Stress	Intention to Leave
Work-Family Conflict	0.413**
Role Clarity	-0.412**
Role Conflict	0.134*

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

4.7 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was performed in order to identify which independent variables predict the intention to leave. Before pursuing regression analysis, researcher had ensured that there was no violation of regression assumptions occurred. Tests such as normality, linearity and multivariate outliers have been discussed earlier.

In testing residual violation, the researcher had performed Casewise diagnostic and Durbin-Watson test. For Casewise diagnostic, any standardized residual value that is greater than \pm 3 will portray a residual violation. Another test to identify residual violation is Durbin-Watson test. According to Montgomery, Peck and Vining (2001) if Durbin-Watson value is in the range of 1.5 to 2.5, no residual violation exists.

In Casewise test, one case is discarded from the sample. Durbin-Watson value was 2.132 which is in a range to deny the existence of residual violation. r^2 value represents the coefficient of determination between predicted values of the dependent variable and the actual values of the dependent variable. **Table 4.7.1** shows that the value for r^2 is 0.299. This indicates that 29.90% of variance of the intention to leave was accounted by job satisfaction and job related stress. The F value, F (2, 260, 262) = 55.569 is significant at significance level of ρ < 0.05. This result indicated that a significant relationship exists between the weighted linear composite of the independent variables and the dependent variable.

From below multiple regression analysis, only Self-Actualisation, Rewards and Engagement factors of Job Sastisfaction and Work-Family Conflict and Role Clarity factors of Job-Related Stress concluded 29.9% variance towards Intention to Leave factors while the remaining 70.1% is concluded by other factors which are not included in this research. Furthermore, from the regression analysis it is found that only Self-Actualisation, Rewards and Role Clarity significantly affect dependent variable of Intention to Leave (F = 55.569, p< 0.05). It can be derived from the negative Beta correlation with Self-Actualisation (β = -0.319), Rewards (β = -0.287) and Role Clarity (β = 0.102), significance level of p<0.05 while all p-values (Self-Actualisation, Rewards and Role Clarity) are less than 0.05. The complete multiple regression results is as per table below.

Table 4.7.1 Regression Results between Job Satisfactionand Job-Related Stress towards Intention to Leave

Independent Variables	Beta Value (β)
Self-Actualization	-0.319*
Rewards	-0.287*
Engagement	-0.133*
Work-Family Conflict	0.079*
Role Clarity	0.102*
DF	2, 260, 262
F Value	55.569
r^2	0.299

Note: * Significant at the p<0.05 level

The *t* test and significance levels allow the researcher to assess each variable's unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable. Job satisfaction and job related stress have significant prediction to intention to leave based on significant level at ρ <0.05. The regression result indicated that job satisfaction affected negatively towards employees' intention to leave while job related stress directly affected employees' intention to leave.

4.8 Conclusions

This chapter predicates the data analysis results after the data screening process using the normality and linearity tests. The researcher had also removed some of the outliers. This process is followed by factor analysis and reliability test where the researcher examined the value of Cronbach's alpha. The researcher then executed correlation analysis as a final analysis. The researcher will use the findings in this chapter to discuss and make conclusions in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This final chapter interpreted and deliberated the data findings in Chapter 4. The chapter is divided into three segments: firstly, summary of key findings and practical implications of the research; and secondly, the limitations of this study and the third and final segment will be the recommendations and conclusion derived from this research.

This research studied two independent variables which consists of five dimensions or factors. Job Satisfaction encompasses self-actualisation, rewards and engagement. For Job-Related Stress, two factors were closely examined, namely, work-family conflict and role clarity or ambiguity.



The aim of this study was to examine the influence of job satisfaction and job-related stress towards employees' intention to leave the organisation. The material interaction effects of job satisfaction indicates that when job satisfaction is present, it is very impactful in reducing the employees' intention to leave. Conversely, the higher the jobrelated stress experienced by the employees, the higher is their intention to leave. These results indicate that there is support for the specific combination of increase in job satisfaction or reduction of job-related stress in effectively influencing the employee's intention to stay.

This result is not surprising as numerous literature has indicated that intention to leave is to a large extent is influenced by job dissatisfaction (Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet, 2003). Numerous researches have indicated that in order for the employees to realise their full potential, the managers has to create a conducive climate for them. If they are unable to do so, this could result in reduced job satisfaction and increase the withdrawal of these employees from the organisation (Tate, Whatley and Clugston, 1997; Pang, Kucukusta and Chan, 2015). It has been widely accepted that job satisfaction has a positive impact on continuance commitment (Clugston, 2000). In addition to job dissatisfaction, Firth, Mellor, Moor and Loquet (2007) identified that the experience of stressors or the range factors that lead to job-related stress make employees quit the organization. Discussion on the key findings of this research is as follows.

5.1 Job Satisfaction and Intention to Leave

Based on the correlation analysis results, there was a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave where the correlation coefficient was r = -0.495. This suggests that the lesser job satisfaction is experienced by the worker, the higher their intention to leave the organization. The result of the multiple regressions, meanwhile, has shown a significant relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave. The regression analysis on job satisfaction factors shows $\beta = -0.319$ (p<0.05) for Self-Actualisation which is the highest significance amongst the three Job Satisfaction factors. Self-actualization, which encompasses the sense of freedom, achievement and recognition that an employee experience, significantly contributes towards job satisfaction. This suggests that Self-Actualisation is the best factor in Job Satisfaction to predict employee's intention to leave. This result, therefore, supports the first hypothesis (H1) of this study that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and employees' intention to leave.

Even though almost half (49%) of the respondents are non-executives, it is inferred that the need for autonomy and recognition permeates the organization at all levels of position. At the same time, the majority of the respondents (55%) are 34 years of age and below i.e. those born in years 1981-2000 classed as Generation-Y (Gen-Y) or millennials (Raines, 2003). Previous research (Gordon 2010; Queiri, Wan Yusoff and Dwaikat, 2015) emphasized providing Gen-Y employees with freedom work values including autonomy and independence from supervision in order to retain them. This suggests that the freedom to manage their own work, sense of achievement and recognition are important to the employees' overall job satisfaction which correlaes to their decision to stay with the organization.

Not surprisingly, Rewards, which is taken to cover all aspects of pay, benefits, promotion or work progression and job security within the organization, shows the most highly significant negative correlation to intention to leave. The regression analysis on Rewards shows $\beta = -0.287$, the next highest variable amongst the three factors to predict employee's intention to leave. This means that the less of the rewards element that the employees receive, be it in compensation and benefits, career progression or job security, the more likely they will leave the organization.

Herzberg's two-factor theory lends support that the hygiene elements, have potential to cause high level of dissatisfaction which may reduce employee's continuance intention. Other research has indicated that the purpose of direct and indirect compensation is to enhance employee's motivation and attachment to the organization and both metaanalyses and empirical studies have shown an inverse relationship between pay satisfaction and employee turnover (Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney and Taylor, 2009).

Unfortunately, recent poor business performance in SDMG has led to the company dispensing smaller annual increment rate and lower bonus payout. Promotion exercise too was carried out sparingly. This impacted the employees' job satisfaction substantially and evident from the overwhelming response where 90 out of 336 surveyed employees (27%) indicated that they intent to leave the company within the next one year and of which 57 out of 336 (17%) indicated that they want to leave immediately.

SDMG has been diligently managing its employees' performance and terminating poor performers. Typically, high performing individuals who are well-compensated are less likely to quit than those with lower levels of rewards and performance (Bergiel et al., 2009). It is quite clear that when thinking about quitting a job, an employee often considers tangible benefits i.e. compensation from the current organization that he or she has to sacrifice. The current research seemed to suggest that the reduced rewards undertaken by SDMG in recent years did impact the employee's commitment to continue with the organization leading them to experience low job satisfaction and eventually will drive them to leave.

Finally, the correlation tests on job satisfaction factors shows r=-0.249 for Engagement which also present a significant negative relationship with intention to leave. The regression analysis on Engagement shows a smaller value of β = -0.133. This may be low in terms of predictive value on employee's intention to leave but still has some significance. It can be inferred that the ability to engage with other people in the job coupled with ability to engage with the job itself by making use of own ability and doing different things does influence the employee's decision to stay with the organization. The more that the employees are able to do the aforementioned, the less will be their propensity to leave the organization.

These factors of self-actualization, rewards and engagement significantly influence job satisfaction of the employees and in turn influence on their decision to stay with the organisation. These factors appear to have a direct impact on job-satisfaction where the self-actualisation factor denoted by autonomy and recognition in this study is the most significant and followed by the rewards factor. The other significant factor is engagement and ability to make use of employee's own ability and job-variety. This can lead to the conclusion that the increase in motivators may lead to better job satisfaction.

The result of this research is consistent with other previous reported researches that the higher the level of jobs satisfaction, the lower the tendency of employees wanting to leave the company (Firth et al., 2004; Hanafiah Haji Hassin et al, 2007; Ghosh et al.,

2011). It is trite to mention that many past researches had indicated that employees who experience higher level of satisfaction are more likely to commit themselves to their organization and that their intention to leave will be assuaged (Moynihan, Boswell and Boudreau, 2000). As such, it is generally accepted that continuity of commitment to an organization is positively impacted by job-satisfaction (Clugston, 2000).

5.2 Job-Related Stress and Intention to Leave

Based on the results of correlation analysis, it was found that there is a significant positive relationship between job-related stress and intention to leave with the correlation coefficient at r = 0.167. Similar to the first independent variable, the result of the multiple regressions has also shown a significant relationship between job-related stress and intention to leave. The regression analysis shows $\beta = 0.079$ (p<0.05) for Work-Family Conflict and $\beta = 0.102$ (p<0.05) for Role Clarity factors of Job-Related Stress. This supports the second hypothesis (H2) of this study that there is a significant relationship between job-related stress and employees' intention to leave.

The regression analysis result shows $\beta = 0.079$ (p<0.05) for Work-Family Conflict. Work-family conflict encompasses the stress experienced by employees due to work schedule conflict, the physical and mental toll work has on the employee and lack of time for them to enjoy their personal life. It is also possible that the strong emphasis on performance in SDMG, where poor performers are dismissed may contribute to stress which drives the employees to leave the organization. A recent employee engagement survey revealed some comments that some employee felt the structure was too lean.

The majority of the respondents (55%) are in customer facing roles such as sales, marketing and after sales services whom often work beyond normal hours to meet their targets or sales quota. This is also valid for support functions where employees may experience work pressure, for example, in finance department working late in order to close accounts, or procurement department ordering urgent parts, or customer service officers attending to complaints and service bookings. Furthermore, 55% of the respondents are Gen-Y employees. Research has indicated that this group of employees values work and life balancing (Queiri et al., 2015). It can be concluded that lack of work-life balance has a direct impact on the stress experience by employee. The significant correlation suggests that the more the employee experience work-family conflict, the more likely they will quit their job.

The multiple regression result shows $\beta = 0.102$ (p<0.05) for Role Clarity or Ambiguity. This factor seems to give prediction than other factors as to the employee's intention to leave. Role clarity correlates negatively to intention to leave, which means clear job objectives and responsibilities coupled with clear expectations of the job positively reduce the employee's intention to leave and supports the employees' continuance with the organization.

In light of its recent poor business performance, restructuring exercises in various companies within SDMG had taken place where numerous employees were separated.

After the employees left the organization, some vacated positions in the respective companies were not replaced. The remaining employees were expected not only to multi-task, but also to put more effort in their work, sometimes covering multiple roles.

Higher emphasis on performance and more stringent performance indicators and sales targets were put in place. It is very likely that the companies' effort to keep a lean structure could generate overwhelming stress to the employees in that they are covering multiple roles or performing more tasks in addition to their core responsibilities causing them to leave the business.

In the course of their work, employees also find themselves having to do things differently and facing difficulty to satisfy everyone or having to upset a party in order to serve another. This is especially pertinent in customer-facing roles where at times the corporate objectives may conflict with keeping the customer happy (e.g. request for higher discount on car price or better accessories at no cost; or request for fast car servicing or repairs during high waiting list) may mean inability to satisfy all parties concerned or having to keep one party satisfied at the expense of another. As earlier mentioned, the majority of the respondents (55%) are in customer-facing role where this element of conflict may be inherent. As such, this factor may carry a significant impact on their overall experience of job-related stress.

From the analysis, the result shows that generally job-related stress relates positively to turnover intention and that the relationship is highly significant. A study by Hanafiah Haji Hasin and Normah Haji Omar (2007) also found that there is a strong significant relationship between job stress and turnover intention and that stress is a factor which is frequently associated with employee's intent to quit their job. The feelings of stress which was a direct impact from stressors' exertion, contributed to an intention to quit. Job-induced stress affected job satisfaction which in turn influenced the propensity to leave (Tate, Whatley and Clugston, 1997; Pang, Kucukusta and Chan, 2015).

5.3 Implication of the Study

This study has successfully achieved its objectives and the research findings have supported the hypotheses constructed in this study. The research findings could benefit both the organization and the general body of knowledge on turnover intention. The organization will be able to tackle aspects of job satisfaction and work-related stress to alleviate the intention to leave amongst the employee. Whilst there are many studies executed in the area of intention to leave in Malaysia, this particular study provides insights into the correlation between job satisfaction and job-related stress within the automotive industry. Hence, it extended the body of knowledge of the study on intention to leave and contributed to the knowledge of factors behind employee retention that have emerged as unique to the employees in such industry in the Malaysian context.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

Firstly, the study was conducted in the context of a Malaysian company in the automotive industry. The findings of this study is limited to the populations of approximately 1,910 executive and non-executive employees of Sime Darby Motors group (SDMG). The number of employees and sample size is also comparatively small to allow generalisation

to be made on the Malaysian motors industry. Furthermore, the companies involved in this survey were primarily automotive retail companies, one car rental company and one assembly plant within Sime Darby group and did not include other retailers, distributors or automotive manufacturers. Replicating this study across other different organisations may provide better insight into such issues prevailing in automotive industries in general in Malaysia. Making use of random sample across different industries and size of organisations can also provide for more convincing generalisation of the results.

Secondly, this study did not make the differentiation between different generations of employees in the company. Other studies have found that certain factors, which are not considered in the current study, such as generational cohort also plays a role in influencing employees in their job satisfaction, workplace behaviour as well as their turnover intention (Solnet and Kralj, 2011). It was suggested by researchers that people of same generation generally share some common characteristics derived from historical experiences (Schumann and Scott, 1989). These commonly shared characteristics of respective generation generates a certain uniqueness in the way this group of people perceive and value their jobs. Such distinction may too affect their job-related behaviour and outcome such as turnover intention, job satisfaction and the way they perceive job-related stress.

According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), the impact of stressors on individual's wellbeing depends on how the individual perceives the stressors. A study by Lu and Gursoy (2014) further suggested that unique interpretation of stressors between three

different generations of baby boomer, generation X and Gen-Y will likely result in distinct level of job satisfaction and turnover intention across the three generational cohorts.

Thirdly, whilst the two main variables of job satisfaction and job-related stress encompasses various aspects of an employee's working life such as role clarity or conflict, relationship with superior and co-workers, workload, pay satisfaction, promotion and recognition, the fact that these two variables indicate weak co-relation between some of the factors to the employee's intention to leave suggests that there are other factors that influences such intention which are not covered in this study. Factors such as leadership style or competencies of the management, perceived organisational or supervisory support or non-monetary rewards such as learning and development opportunity could well play major influences on an employee's intention to leave or stay with the company. Moreover, a further refined analysis into elements of monetary rewards e.g. basic pay, benefits, bonus, commission, incentive or retention scheme may give better insight into what keeps or drives out employees especially in the customer-facing roles.

Fourthly, there are limitation in this study regarding to the accuracy of data from the respondents as they dealt with a very sensitive subject-matter. There is possibility that the responses from the employees did not reflect their real intention as they may perceive that their negative responses to questions on job satisfaction, how they handle job-related stress and their intention to leave may somehow adversely affect their standing in the company. Despite the researcher's assurance that the respondents remain anonymous and

that their responses remain confidential as the data was to be analysed collectively rather than individually, they might still be uncomfortable to be frank in their responses.

Lastly, the hypotheses did not consider some of the possible mediating factors such as company's business performance or explore the extent of which job satisfaction and job-related stress affects the level of customer service and operational performance which is a critical metric in the retail and service sector. Other factors such as organisational citizenship or loyalty were also not taken into account in this study. Thus, whilst there are approximately 27% of the sampled employees indicated that they have the intention to leave either immediately or within the coming year, the driver for such reason may lie within those factors outside the realm of this research.

5.5 **Recommendations**

The result of the research suggests that both job satisfaction and job-related stress has a significant linear relationship with intention to leave. This is based on its negative β values which indicates that if the organization do not promote practices that increases job satisfaction, such will lead to higher intention to leave amongst the employees. Rewards, recognition and promotion dissatisfaction have higher correlation which it is not surprising as monetary rewards and related rewards is one of the important factors that keeps employees to stay. This certainly could be due to increasing cost of living, demands of prevailing lifestyle and social responsibility. The positive β values on job-related stress also indicates that if the organization does not promote practices that reduce

job-related stress effectively, such will contribute directly to the intention to leave amongst the employees.

The researcher found that both of the independent variables constitute only 29.9% variance towards intention to leave whilst the remaining 70.1% was concluded by other factors not included in this research. This shows that there are other variables to the intention to leave that can explain the gaps of the model and which can provide better predictive utility in understanding the current sample with respect to leaving the organisation. In any case, this study has identified a strong relationship between the Job Satisfaction and Job-Related Stress with intention to leave in Sime Darby Motors group of companies (SDMG). The outcome of this study is essential to the management of SDMG to understand the drivers behind the high voluntary turnover rate experienced by the various companies in the group.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

5.5.1 Management

As retaining good employees is key to ensure continuity of business and is the differentiating strength an organisation can have in a very competitive business environment, it is crucial for high employee turnover not to be left unchecked. It is pertinent to the business and human resource policies undertaken by the companies in order to propel generation of profits whilst providing job fulfilment to the employees.

The multiple regression analysis has indicated that self-actualisation dimension of job satisfaction best predicts employee's intention to leave. This suggests that the employees value independence in thought and action or a sense of autonomy in performing their work. Having their superior watching them like a hawk over their shoulders and lack of tolerance for mistakes would deny them the natural education of being good in their work. In order to provide environment of self-actualisation, the management has to ensure and allow empowerment of employees to thrive as a work culture. More so, to attract Gen-Y employees who forms the majority (55%) in the company to stay, the organisation must look at providing informal working environment that appeals to them (Queiri et al, 2015).

Recognition also emerged as one of the important factors that leads to the employee's job satisfaction. The management that consists of older generation with typical Asian values of modesty and reservation will have to change their ways to give more credits to deserving employee from a simple gesture of a pat on the back or even accord formal monetary recognition to them beyond the formal "Employee of the Month" or "Salesperson of the Year" awards. Implementing a simple recognition card or online recognition message when an employee does something right may help the management encourage the right behaviour whilst boosting the employee's job satisfaction.

From the analysis, it is also apparent that it is important for the employees to be able to control the pace of their work. Research has found that motivation at work can be improved through skill variety, task identity and task significance (Ghosh et al, 2011). Job variety will allow the seemingly routine and mundane task to be more enjoyable and provide different challenges to the employees at different times. The employees would also not leave their jobs if they have the opportunity to excel in their work. If they know there are others, be it subordinate, peers, superior or other third parties, who are dependent on them, they would be more involved and engaged in their job. The management must therefore ensure that jobs are designed in a way that an employee has line of sight on their role in the big picture and that they feel their job is important.

The multiple regression analysis shows a significant β value of -0.287 for rewards or compensation and benefits. It is important for the organization to ensure that the employees perceive they are fairly compensated for the work they perform. This is especially when a recent employee engagement survey, the annual Global Employee Engagement Survey (GEES) undertaken by SDMG, shows that the employee felt their pay or rewards did not commensurate the level of expertise or delivery expected from them and the verbatim comments indicated that they felt so when compared to their peers externally or in other business divisions in Sime Darby. The organization must undertake compensation benchmarking and design its fixed and variable pay components including bonus and commission to ensure their competitiveness, not only to attract new employees but more importantly to retain the existing good ones.

To address the third factor of job satisfaction, namely, Engagement, jobs must be designed in order to allow the employee the ability to engage with other people in the job coupled with the ability to engage with the job itself. The ability to make use of their own ability and to do different things does influence the employee's decision to stay with the organization.

Role ambiguity seems to have contributed to the stress experienced by the employees in their job. When jobs are merged and responsibilities expanded, the employees ended up doing multiple tasks and may find them in the same grade and pay with their peers in other companies or Sime Darby division but commanding bigger breadth and depth of responsibilities. They may even be reporting to multiple functional managers. The organization need to review the impact that restructuring exercise has on the remaining employees in order to reduce role ambiguity. The management and Human Resource department must indicate clearly to the employees what their core key performance indicators are which affects their performance bonus and increment. Continuation of matrix reporting may still be possible but their principal manager must be defined where input of their work performance in non-core roles is obtained from the other matrix managers.

The human resource department must also review the size of each expanded jobs to determine whether the current compensation level commensurate the resized jobs. For example, does paying existing rate of pay for enlarged role and responsibilities is fair and competitive compared to similar job elsewhere. Team size and allocation of tasks must also be reviewed to reduce elements of role conflict and role ambiguity. Interestingly work overload did not appear to post significant relationship to intention to leave in this study. This perhaps allude to the receptiveness of the employees to challenging assignments or that the majority of the employees (71% who has worked for more than 2

years in the organization) have gotten used to or expected that level of workload in SDMG.

Finally, the management needs to address work-life balance as the analysis has shown this as another compelling factor for employee's decision to leave. Interviews with random Gen-Y employees in the company suggested that work commitment has deprived them of time to enjoy their personal life ("I had to quit my gym because I didn't have time to go" "Sometimes I came back to work over weekends"). The management and Human Resource department may want to consider proposals of flexible hours, working from home and shift-working to allow time for employees to take leave or break from work which would help alleviate the stress they experience.

In summary, it may not be possible for the management to immediately look at increasing the remuneration level of all employees at the same time nor to increase its headcount to address role clarity and work-life balance as these will increase its fixed costs substantially. Such will surely affect its thin margin and eventual bottom line. However, the management may consider certain segments of the workforce which is pivotal to its business continuity (e.g. sales and aftersales or customer service employees) and address the remuneration as well as job allocation of this group first.

5.5.2 Future Researchers

In the furtherance of future researches, the predictive validity of the model should be compared and further enhanced by increasing the sample size to more companies within the automotive industry. For a much more reliable generalization of the result, future studies may also adopt probability sampling across the automotive industry.

Furthermore, job embeddedness perspective may provide an alternative approach to tackle employee retention issues by directing the research to why the employees are staying as opposed to why they are leaving. It would also contribute to the body of research in this subject matter if the influence of organizational commitment continuation as the third factor in employee retention to be studied.

Some studies have explored into factors such as generation cohort as determinant which influences employee's workplace attitude and behaviour and in turn would impact jobs satisfaction and eventually the employee's intention to leave (Solnet and Kralj, 2011). It was suggested by researchers that the commonly shared traits and characteristics of individual belonging to the same generation or sharing historical experiences will be distinct from another (Schuman & Scott, 1989). These distinctive characteristics shared by respective generational cohort may impact the different way of them seeing and experiencing stress and satisfaction at work. A study by Lu and Gursoy (2014) suggested that distinct interpretation of stressors between the three different generations will inevitably culminate in distinct levels of job satisfaction and turnover intention across different cohorts of Gen-Y, Gen X and baby boomer employees. Accordingly, future research may explore how generational differences can affect the relationship between employee's job-related stress and intention to leave. At the same time, future research

may seek to examine the moderating effects of generation cohorts on the relationship between job satisfaction and employees' intention to leave.

The mediating effect of generational cohort, leadership styles, career development opportunities and other dimensions such as relationships between supervisor and subordinate may also become the possible factors to contribute to the employee intention to leave in the automotive industry.

5.6 Conclusions

The aim of the current research is to expound further the factors that are discouraging the employees in SDMG from retaining their employment in the company and what drivers there are in their decision to quit their jobs. It is intended to identify a strong correlation between job-related stress, job-satisfaction with the leaving intention of employee in SDMG. The result and data analysis from the research questionnaire indicates that both job satisfaction and job-related stress have significant relationship with employee's intention to leave. Ten dimensions or factors of these variables were analysed, namely, self-actualisation, rewards, engagement, supervisor, work conditions and personal values, work-family conflict, role clarity or ambiguity, role conflict and work overload. The results show that the material interaction effects of self-actualisation, rewards and engagement is present and that they are very impactful in reducing the employees' intention to leave. Conversely, the higher the work-family conflict, lack of role clarity or work role conflict experienced by the employees, the higher is their intention to leave.

The study has helped the organisation to understand better the underlying elements that has contributed to job satisfaction and job-related stress experienced by the employees as an input to design human resource policies aimed at minimising the voluntary turnover rate in the organisation. This is crucial because when an employee leaves, they take with them the knowledge, skills, relationships and whatever investments the company had made in them. Voluntary turnover can be disruptive to work continuity and performing team's stability. The organisation should then explore various monetary and nonmonetary motivators in its overall strategic exercise which can attract, engage and retain its employees.

In summary, this study has shown that job satisfaction and job-related stress has a significant relationship towards employees' retention. Rewards, self-actualisation, engagement, work-family conflict, role clarity and role conflict has emerged as some of the factors influencing the employee's decision to leave. Although these findings are foundational at best, it has strategic contribution towards the organisation's human resource management policies.

REFERENCES

- Abbasi, S.M. and Hollman, K.W. (2000). Turnover: the real Bottom line, *Public Personal Management*, Vol.29 No.3 pp.333-342.
- Abelson, M.A. and Baysinger, B.D. (1984) Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organisational level model, *Academy of Management Review*, 9
- Ahmad and Bakar (2003) as cited by Rafikul Islam and Ahmad Zaki Hj Ismail (2008) Employee Motivation: a Malaysian Perspective, International Journal of Commerce and Management, Vol.18 Iss 4 pp.344-362
- Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1980), Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Armstrong, M. and Murlis, H. (2004) *Reward Management: A Handbook of Remuneration Strategy and Practice*, 5th ed. Kogan Page Limkted, London
- Applebaum, D., Fowler, S., Fiedler, N., Osinubi, O., & Robson, M. (2010). The impact of environmental factors on nursing stress, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 40,323-3
- Arshadi, N and Damiri, H. (2013) The Relationship of Job Stress with Turnover Intention and Job *Performance: Moderating Role of OBSE, Procedia* - Social and Behavioral Sciences 84, 706 – 710
- Bank Negara Malaysia, Quarterly Bulletin, 1st Quarter 2015, <u>http://www.bnm.gov.my</u> /files/publication/qb/2015/Q1/1Q2015_fullbook_en.pdf)
- Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K. and Iverson, R.D. (2003) High Quality Work, Job Satisfaction and Occupational Injuries, Journal of Applied Psychology 88, No.2
- Bergiel, E.B., Nguyen, V.Q., Clenney, B.F. and Taylor G.S. (2009) Human resource pretices, job embeddedness and intention to quit, *Management Research News*, Vol.32 Iss 3 pp.205-219
- Cascio, W.F. (2006) The economic impact of employee behaviours on organisational performance, California Management Review, Vol.48 No.4, pp.41-59
- Chris Ryan, Hazrina Ghazali & Asad Mohsin, (2011) Determinants of intention to leave a non-managerial job in the fast-food industry of West Malaysia, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 23 Iss 3 pp. 344 - 360

- Clugston, M. (2000) The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on job satisfaction and intent to leave. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Jun., 2000), pp. 477-486
- Coakes, S.J., Steed, L. and Ong, C. (2010) SPSS Analysis without Anguish, Milton Qld, Wiley
- Cranny, C.J., Smith, P.C. & Stone, E.F. (1992) Job Satisfaction: How people Feel about their Jobs and How it Affects their Performance, New York; Lexington Books
- Dalton, Krackhardt and Porter, L.M. (1981) Functional turnover: an empirical assessment, Journal of Applied Psychology, 66
- Deery, M (2008) Talent Management, work-life balance and retention strategies, International Hournal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20 (7)
- Fink, A. (2003) Classification of Designs for Survey Studies, 2nd Ed. SAGE
- Firth, L., Mellor, D. J., Moore, K. A., and Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 19(2): 170 – 187
- Gay, L.R. and Diehl, P.L. (1996) Research Methods for Business and Management, Prentice Hall
- Ghosh, P., Satyawadi, R., Joshi, J.P. and Shadman, M (2013) Who Stays With You? Factors predicting employees' intention to stay, *International Journal of Organisational Analysis* Vol. 21 No. 3 pp.288-312
- Glazer, S. and Beehr, T.A. (2005) Consistency of Implications of Three Role Stressors across Four Countries, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 26, No. 5 (Aug., 2005), pp. 467-487
- Glebbeek, A.C and Bax, E.H. (2004) Is High employee Turnover Really Harmful? An Empirical Test Using Company Records. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Apr 2004) pp.227-286
- Guildford, J. P. (1973) Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. 5th Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York
- Hair, J.F. Jr, Anderson, R.F., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1998) *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Englewood Cliff, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Hanafiah Haji Hassin and Normah Haji Omar (2007) An Empirical Study on Job Satisfaction, Job-Related Stress and Intention to Leave Among Audit Staff in

Public Accounting Firms in Melaka, Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting, Vol.5 Iss 1 pp.21-39

- Hay Group (2012) Global talent exodus on the horizon as economic growth returns, Center for Economics and Business Research (CEBR) (http://www.haygroup.com/vn/press/details.aspx?id=37702)
- Herzberg, F,. Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. (1959) The Motivation to Work, Wiley, New York
- Hom, P. and Griffeth, R. (1994) *Employee Turnover*, South Western Series in Human Resource Management
- Horwitz, F. M., Heng, C. T., & Quazi, H. A. (2003) Finders, Keepers? Attracting, Motivating, and Retaining Knowledge Workers, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Volume 13:4: 23-44
- Igbaria, M. and Greenhaus, J.H. (1992), Determinants of MIS employees' turnover intentions: a structural equation model, *Communications of the ACM*, Vol.35 No.2
- Ivancevich, J.M., Konopaske, R. & Matteson, M. T. (2014) Organisational Behaviour and Management, 10th Edition, McGraw-Hill Education
- Jackofsky, E.F. & Slocum, J. W. (1987) A causal analysis of the impact of job performance on the voluntary turnover process, *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, Vol. 8 263-270
- Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970) Determining sample size for research activities, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., and Barton, S. B. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal*, 38(2), 233–250.
- Lu, A.C.C. and Gursoy, D. (2014), Impact of Job Burnout on Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: Do Generational Differences Matter? *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 40, No. 2, February 2016, 210–235
- Markova, G. and Ford, C. (2011) Is money the panacea? Rewards for knowledge workers, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, Vol.60 Iss 8 pp.813-823

- Meyers, L.S., Gamst, G. and Guarino, A.J. (2006) Applied Multivariate Research, 2nd Edition, SAGE Publications
- Mobley, W.H., Griffith, R.W., Hand, H.H. and Meglino, B.M. (1979), "Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 493-522.
- Mobley, W. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 62, pp.238.
- Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. A. and Vining, G. G. (2001) *Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis*. 3rd Edition, New York, New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. 1979. The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 14: 224-247
- Moynihan, L.M., Boswell, W.R and Boudreau, J.W. (2000) The Influence of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Executive Withdrawal and Performance, *Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies*, Cornell University
- Pang, L., Kucukusta, D. & Chan, X. (2015) Employee Turnover Intention in Travel Agencies: Analysis of Controllable and Uncontrollable Factors International *Journal of Tourism Research*, Int. J. Tourism Res., 17: 577–590
- Price, J.L.(1997), The Study of Turnover, 1st Edition Iowa State, University Press
- Pregnolato, M. (2010) *Total Rewards that Retain: A Study of Demographic Preferences*, University of Cape Town, Cape Town
- Podsakoff N.P., LePine J.A. and LePine MA. (2007) Differential Challenge-Hindrance Stressors Relationship with Job Attitudes, Turnover intentions and Withdrawal Behaviour: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology 92 No. 2*
- Queiri, A., Wan Yusoff, W.F. and Dwaikat, N. (2015) Explaining Generation-Y Employees' Turnover in Malaysian Context, *Asian Social Science* Vol.11, No.10
- Rafikul Islam and Ahmad Zaki Hj Ismail (2008) *Employee Motivation: a Malaysian Perspective*, International Journal of Commerce and Management, Vol.18 Iss 4 pp.344-362
- Rinehart, J.S. and Short, P.M. (1993) Job Satisfaction and Empowerment Among Teachers, *Questia Academic Journal*, Document found in ERIC, ED3622940

- Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2015) *Organisational Behaviour*, 16th Ed. Harlow, England, Pearson Education Limited
- Roscoe, J.T. (1975) Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences, 2nd Ed. New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Sager, J.K. (1991) The longitudinal assessment of change in sales force turnover, *Journal* of Academy of Market Sciences, 19: 25-36. DOI: 10.1007/BF02723421
- Schaubroeck, J. Cotton, J.L. & Jennings, K.R. (1989) Antecedents and consequences of role stress: A covariance structure analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 35-58.
- Schlechter, A., Thompson, N.C. and Bussin, M. (2015) Attractiveness of non-financial rewards for prospective knowledge workers, Employee Relations, Vol.37 Iss.3 pp.274-295
- Schlesinger, L & Heskett, J (1991) The New American Workplace, Cornell University Press
- Schuler, R.S. (1980) Definition and Conceptualisation of Stress in Organisations, Thousand Oaks
- Schuman, H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. American Sociological Review, 54, 359-381.
- Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2013) Research Methods for Business: A skill building approach. 6th ed., John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Silva, P. (2006), "Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and commitment", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 317-28.
- Solnet, D., & Kralj, A. (2011). Generational differences in work attitudes: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *FIU Hospitality Review*, 29, 37-54.
- Staw, B.M. (1980) The consequences of turnover, Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 1:253
- Souza-Poza, A., Souza-Poza, A., 2007. The effect of job satisfaction on labour turnover by gender: an analysis for Switzerland. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36, 895-913.

- Tate, U., Whatley, A. and Clugston, M. (1997) Sources and outcomes of job tension: a three-nation study, *International Journal of Management*, Vol.3 pp350-8
- Tett, R.P., & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Thomas, W. Colligan, M.S.W. & Higgins, M (2006) Workplace Stress, *Journal of Workplace Behavior Health*, 89-97
- Throckmorton, R (2013) Are You Worrying about Retention During the Recession? You Better Be! (<u>http://strategichrinc.com/article/</u>are-you-worrying-about-retentionduring-the-recession?-you-better-be!)
- Trevor, C.O. (2001) Interactions among actual ease of movement determinants and job satisfaction in the prediction of voluntary turnover, Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 44, pp. 621-638
- Wiley, C., (1997) What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys? *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), pp. 263-280.
- Van Dam, K. (2008) *Time frames for leaving*, Career Development International, Vo.13 Iss 6 pp.560-571.
- Zikmund, W.G., Babin, B.J., Carr, J.C. and Griffin, M. (2010) Business Research Methods, 8th edition. Australia: South-Western Cengage Learning



RESEARCH ON

JOB SATISFACTION, JOB-RELATED STRESS AND INTENTION TO LEAVE AMONGST EMPLOYEES OF THE MOTORS INDUSTRY IN MALAYSIA

Dear colleagues,

This survey is done to identify the relationship between job satisfaction and job-related stress with the employee's intention to leave Sime Darby Motors and to narrow down the factors influencing their decision to stay or leave.

Your response will be kept STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. We greatly appreciate your cooperation in the furtherance of this study.

Thank you.

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Kind regards, Zahidah Akmal Ghazali Head, Human Resources, Motors Division

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Please tick ' \checkmark ' on the relevant information about yourself.

1.1	Gender	Male	Female			
1.2	Race	Malay	Chinese	Indiar	n 🗌 Ot	hers
1.3	Age Below 25 year 35 to 44 years 55 years old 8	old	25 to 34 years old 45 to 54 years old			
1.4	Marital Status Single		Married		Divorced/ Widow	'ed
1.5	Length of Emp Less than 2 ye		Sime Darby Motors 2 to 5 years		More than 5 year	s
1.6	Years in Curre Less than 2 ye		niversiti U 2 to 5 years	ltara M	More than 5 years	s
1.7	Current Positic Managers and		Executives		Non-Executives	
1.8	Current Functi Sales/ Custom Service/Marke	ner	After sales		Operation / Tech Engineering/ SQM	
	Finance		HR /IT/Legal/ BD Others			

How to complete this survey:

Please answer the statements below by placing a circle around the number which most closely matches your opinion or to the best of your knowledge.

Example of how to use the rating scale:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q00: Every human being has five senses.	1	2	3	4	5

By circling rating 5, you would be saying that you strongly agree with the given statement.

SURVEY SECTION B: JOB SATISFACTION	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q01: The work in this organization keep me busy all the time.	1	2	3	4	5
Q02: I have the opportunity to work alone on my job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q03: I have the opportunity to do different things from time to time.	1	2	3	4	5
Q04: I feel satisfied with the extent my job provides me the opportunity to be "somebody" in the community.	1	2	3	4	5
Q05: I am satisfied with the way my manager handles his/her staff.	1	2	3	4	5
Q06: I feel satisfied with the competence of my manager in making decisions.	niversi	ti Utar	a Mal	ay\$ia	5
Q07: I have the ability to do things that do not go against my conscience or values I believe in.	1	2	3	4	5
Q08: I feel satisfied with the way my job provides for steady employment.	1	2	3	4	5
Q09: I have the chance to do things for other people.	1	2	3	4	5
Q10: I have the chance to tell people what to do.	1	2	3	4	5
Q11: I have the opportunity to do something that makes use of my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
Q12: I feel satisfied with my pay and the amount of work I do.	1	2	3	4	5
Q13: I am satisfied with the way company policies are put into practice.	1	2	3	4	5

Q14: I feel satisfied with chances for advancement or promotion on this job.	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Q15: I feel satisfied with the freedom to use my own judgment.	1	2	3	4	5
Q16: I feel satisfied with the chance to try my own methods of doing the job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q17: I feel satisfied with the working conditions.	1	2	3	4	5
Q18: I am satisfied with my co-workers get along with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
Q19: I feel satisfied with the praise or recognition I get for doing a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q20: I am satisfied with the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.	1	2	3	4	5
SECTION C: JOB-RELATED STRESS					
Q21: My job responsibilities are clear.	1	2	3	4	5
Q22: My job objectives are well- defined.	1	2	3	4	5
Q23: It is clear to me what others expect of me at my job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q24: At my job, I cannot satisfy everybody at the same time	iversi	ti l ₂ taı	a ₃ 1al	ayşia	5
Q25: To satisfy some people at my job, I have to upset others.	1	2	3	4	5
Q26: At my job, I have to do things which should be done differently.	1	2	3	4	5
Q27: I am given enough time to do what is expected of me at my job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q28: It seems that I have more work at my job than I can handle.	1	2	3	4	5
Q29: My job requires that I work hard.	1	2	3	4	5
Q30: My job schedule interferes with my family or personal life.	1	2	3	4	5
Q31: My job makes me too tired to enjoy my family or personal life.	1	2	3	4	5
Q32: My job does not give me enough time for family or personal activities.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION D: INTENTION TO LEAVE	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q33. I sometimes toy with the idea of changing my current job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q34. I frequently feel like leavng my current job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q35. I often think about leaving my current job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q36. I seldom think about leaving my current job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q37: I often think about leaving my current job.	1	2	3	4	5
Q38: It is likely that I will look for a new job in the next year.	1	2	3	4	5
Q39: I intend to leave the company as soon as possible.	1	2	3	4	5

This is the end of the survey.



THANK YOU

Universiti Utara Malaysia