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Summary

High turnover rate has always been a problem to many companies. Both direct and indirect costs for turnover can troublesome as they can hinder the companies’ productivity and reduce the knowledge. Even though turnover intentions might not mean that employees will immediately quit an organization, but intentions have always been a strong predictor for turnover. This study tries to explore factors that are strongly related to turnover intentions. Based on an extensive review of the literatures on turnover intentions, I identified eleven factors, which are selected and divided into four
factor levels: i.e., organizational, group, individual, and external levels. At organizational level, I include learning culture and collectivistic culture. For group level, team-member exchange, leader-member exchange, and group safety climate are chosen. Affective organizational commitment and organizational justice (including distributive, procedural, and interactional sub-dimensions) are selected for individual level factors. Lastly, at external level, I chose expectation of finding job alternatives and family’s expectation of the job.

Following the literature reviews, I attempted to empirically examine whether (and if so, how) these factors mentioned above are statistically related to turnover intentions. I used a questionnaire survey method to collect quantitative data from workers in a corrugated box manufacturing company operating in Thailand. Using the data of 83 Thai workers, I executed a hierarchical linear regression analysis to examine the hypothesized positive or negative effects of said-factors on the workers’ turnover intentions. The result of the analysis showed significant positive relationship of learning culture and significant negative relationships of collectivistic culture and family’s expectation with turnover intentions. This suggests that workers tend to show less turnover intentions when they perceive that they work under the low learning and high collectivistic culture within the organization and their family members have greater expectations for the organization.

Based on these findings, I tried to offer several implications for Thai corrugated box manufacturers to reduce turnover intentions. First, given the importance of workers’ perceptions of organizational culture in the reduction of their turnover intentions, organizations should carefully pre-screen new hires and choose ones whose personality fit well with organizational culture. Second, considering that collectivistic
rather than individualistic culture was found to reduce turnover intentions in the Thai manufacturing company, organization of this industry in Thailand should be encouraged to create visions and missions that would foster collectivistic values in order to increase the perception of collectivistic culture to the employees. Third, since the family’s expectation for the job had played a significant role in reducing the worker’s turnover intentions, I further performed a regression analysis to see what factors promote family’s expectation. The analysis showed that affective commitment and procedural were positively and significantly related to family’s expectation. This additional analysis combined with the main findings seems to imply that training can be used on managers to improve their skills for increasing their subordinates’ affective organizational commitment and procedural justice. Enhancing the employees’ affective organizational commitment and procedural should increase the family’s expectation of the job, and in turn, the positive family’s expectation will reduce turnover intentions.
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Introduction

High turnover rate has plagued the manufacturing companies in Thailand for many years. High turnover intentions usually mean that employees are dissatisfied with their job, especially if alternate job opportunities are very high (Carsten & Spector, 1987). Turnover intentions can be defined as employees’ intentions to leave the current organization or the potential movement by the workforce out of an organization (Mobley, 1982). Even though the turnover intentions do not necessarily mean that the employees will actually quit the organization, but however, intention has been a strong predictor of future behavior (Mobley, 1982). Research has found that the turnover can lead to a decrease in organizational performance and an increase in costs associated with losses of firm and job specific knowledge, hiring and retraining of replacement employees (Ulrich, Halbrook, Meder, Stuchlik, and Thorpe, 1991). As the employees quit the company, the number of workload is increased. People quitting the job can happen in an instant, but this does not apply to the recruiting process. Sometimes this would result in increasing indirect cost such as lower productivity, additional time required by managers in order to support new employees and diminished productivity of senior employees as they are required to teach and train their new employees (Cascio, 2000). According to the interview by Buckley (1998), the reasons for leaving the organization include “ineffective supervision,” “better job opportunities,” and “the difficult nature of the working conditions and the job.” To avoid such problems, it is recommended to decrease the turnover intentions of the employees. This can be done by finding the factors that is strongly related to the turnover.

This study will examine the factors that potentially influence the turnover intentions of employees and based of these factors, find the appropriate implication to reduce the turnover intentions. To find the factors that could be related to the turnover intentions, first I explore the idea
of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. I try to come up with factors that could fit with each needs in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is divided into five fundamental levels of needs.

At the bottom of the level are physiological needs. The factors involving physiological needs include pay and benefits. However, most workers receive the same amount of wage, so I decide not include pay as one of the factor that can influence the turnover intentions.

After the physiological needs are security needs. The manufacturing job involves a lot of machines in order to finish products. If employees do not handle the machines with care, this could lead to accidents and at worst fatalities (Gillen et al., 2002). Some accidents can be fatal, so safety must be taken in a serious manner. I assume that if the safety is not fulfilled in the company, there is a chance that the employees will intend to leave the company. This is why I decide to include a group safety climate as one of the factor that could affect the turnover intentions. Another factor involving in security needs is an expectation of finding job alternatives. If the employees perceive that there is a strong expectation of finding a new job and that the costs of leaving is less than the benefits of leaving, they will likely try to quit their current job by looking for another job opportunities elsewhere (Peters, Jackosky, & Salter, 1981). Thus, I decide to include the expectation of finding job alternatives as one of the factors that could possibly affect the turnover intentions.

In the middle of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs are belongingness needs. This third level of needs is involving interpersonal relationship in the organization. On the culture level, collectivistic culture fits well into the belongingness needs as people tend to depend on others in the collectivistic culture, so I include the collectivistic culture as one of the factors that could potentially influence the turnover intentions. However, I also should look at the interpersonal relationship in a small group as well and not just the organization as whole. This brings up team-member exchange as it deals with the relationship between team members of the same team, thus I include the team-member exchange
as a potential factor that is related to the turnover intentions. As the team-member exchange is a horizontal relation, I should also be considered looking at the vertical relation as well. Leader-member exchange can be considered a vertical relation among supervisors and their subordinates. This is why I decide to use the leader-member exchange as one of the factors that can affect the turnover intentions. Family also should be considered as one of the factors as well. Family actually plays a role outside of the organization and has a strong influence on employees’ self-determination (Wolfe & Hall, 2011). It is possible that if the family’s expectation of the job is not met, this could lead to the employees’ decision to leave the company. Thus I include the family’s expectation of the job as one of the factors that is related to the turnover intentions.

The next level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is a level of esteem needs. The esteem needs can include self-confidence as well as the respect of and from others. Maslow mentioned that there are actually two versions of esteem needs, which are a “lower” version and a “higher” version. The need for respect from others is considered the “lower” version while the need for self-respect is considered the “higher” version. Organizational justice seems to fit the “lower” version in this case. If the employees perceive that they are being treated or rewarded fairly, they feel that they are being respected by others, which can increase their self-worth (Brockner et al., 1992). The organizational justice can be divided into distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Thus I include the distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice as the factors that presumably influence the turnover intentions.

The top level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is a level of self-actualization needs. According to Jenkins (2008), self-actualization needs are related to affective commitment. As the employees commit to the organization, they begin to realize the desire to continue working with an organization. Thus I include affective organizational commitment as a part of the factors that could potentially be related to the turnover intentions. Another form of self-realization is a pursuit of
knowledge. By providing the opportunities to learn within an organization, individuals can pursue and increase their knowledge. Learning culture fits this perfectly as the learning culture allows the employees to continuously learn. Therefore I include the learning culture as one of the potential factors that affect the turnover intentions.

As I gather all the factors that I need to test whether these factors are significantly related to turnovers, I must divide these factors into separate levels. In an organization level, I can summarize each level as the following levels: organizational level, group level, and individual level. Factors at the organizational level affect the whole population of employees in the organization. Factors at the team level affect only the team members in a team or group. Lastly, factors at the individual level affect each employee separately. However, I must not forget that these levels are only internal, thus another level to be included in this study is an external level. Factors at the external level come from the outside factor that can influence an individual in the organization. This can include things such as events outside of the organization or the change in the environment. Learning culture and collectivistic culture can be grouped as organizational level factors. Team-member exchange, leader-member exchange, and group safety climate deal with a group of people, so they can be grouped as group level factors. Affective organizational commitment, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice deal with an individual, so they can be grouped as individual level factors. On the other hand, expectation of finding job alternatives and family’s expectation of the job are the factor outside of the organization, so they can be grouped as external level factors.
Literature review and hypothesis

Organizational level

Learning culture

Learning culture can be defined as the culture that learns continuously and transforms itself. At organizational level, learning is considered to be a collective experience and is the result of an interactive, interdependent process (Watkins & Marsick, 2003). Learning can be categorized in many methods. For the learning culture, adaptive learning and generative learning must be combined together in order to enhance employees ability to create (Senge, 1990). Adaptive learning is an educational method that makes use of the past successes to develop future strategies and successes. Generative learning, on the other hand, is an educational method that makes use of the current existing knowledge to develop new ideas. By adapting both adaptive learning and generative learning in the organization, an organization will become more flexible and can continuously transform itself to adapt the current environment. Learning at the organizational level does not equal to the sum of individuals’ learning, but the individuals carry a microcosmic portrait of the organization within them (Argyris & Schö, 1996). From these portraits, change in the organization’s models, shared values, and memory can be observed. When these individuals start to learn, they can foster the overall capacity of the organizational learning culture as long as organization is supportive of their efforts. In other word, one can say that individual learning is related to organizational learning (Watkins & Marsick, 2003). Research has found that organizations that have prioritized learning and development to increase their employees’ job satisfaction, productivity, and profitability (Watkins & Marsick, 2003). Research has also found that the organizational learning culture is negatively related to the turnover intentions (Egan, T. M., Yang, B.
and Bartlett, K. R., 2004). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the learning culture.

**Hypothesis 1a:** Learning culture is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

Collectivistic culture

Collectivist values emphasize on goals of in-groups and tend to give the goals of in-group to be prioritized more than personal goals (Triandis, 1990; Triandis, McCusker and Hui, 1990; Tung, 1991). These values are expected to affect the interaction with in the organization as well as the outcomes. These values are thought to lead to employees valuing harmony and relationships in the organization (Morris et al., 1998). The polar opposite of the collectivistic culture would be the individualistic culture.

The collectivists are thought to prefer peaceful way of interacting with other employees in order to strengthen their interpersonal relationships (Triandis, 1990; Triandis et al., 1990). On the other hand, individualists are expected to interact in an aggressive and focus on personal interests and outcomes instead of interpersonal relationships (Leung, 1997). This reasoning is supported by many studies. Thailand is considered to be a collectivistic nation (Hofstede et al., 2010). This also means that majority of Thai people is considered to be collectivists, and these Thai people have been found to prefer avoiding in dealing with their conflicts more than American people with their individualistic culture (Boonsathorn, 2007). Another research found that Chinese managers and employees tend to avoid the conflicts while the west tends to discuss the conflicts openly (Kirkbride et al., 1991; Tse et al., 1994). Regarding to individuals’ personality and organizational culture, research has shown that person-organization fit can be used to predict the turnover intentions of the employees (Charles A. et al., 1991). This means that if a person does not fit with the organizational culture, they may decide to quit the organization. As I mentioned before, majority of Thai people is
considered to be collectivists, which mean that the organizational culture that fit with Thai collectivistic people would be the collectivistic culture as opposed to individualistic culture. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the collectivistic culture.

*Hypothesis 1b:* Collectivistic culture is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

Group level

Team-member exchange

Team-member exchange can be defined as the quality of interpersonal relationship between an individual employee and another employee in the same team. Team-member exchange was actually adapted from leader-member exchange (Seers, 1989). Research indicates that high-quality working relationship improve employees’ performance as well as their satisfaction and organizational commitment. Having a low level of the team-member exchange could be implied that there is a problem with the relationship between the team members, and vice versa, having a high level of the team-member exchange could mean that there is a reliable relationship between coworkers. Having a good relationship could make the employees more enjoyable at work. As a result, they would improve their job satisfaction (Banker et al., 2014). Tse and Dasborough (2008) supported the idea that positive emotions in team would increase team member satisfaction. When employees work well together, their desire to leave the company decreases (Banks et al., 2013). With a high-equality working relationship in the team, team members are more likely to exchange information and resources, thus increasing the team members’ individual skills through collaboration (Hoegl & Wagner, 2005). The team members, through a strongly positive working relation, are more likely to develop affective bond between other team members. Increasing in affective commitment
of the team members should increase the overall organizational commitment of the individuals as affective commitment is strongly tied to overall organizational commitment (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). However, if the employees expect a high-equality working relationship, but the expectations are not met, the result could potentially increase their turnover intentions (Major et al., 1995; Wanous, Poland, Premack, & Davis, 1992). Research has found that there is a negative relation between the team-member exchange and the turnover intentions (Banker et al., 2014). Research from Han and Jekel (2011) also supported the negative relationship between the leader-member exchange and the turnover intentions. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the team member exchange:

**Hypothesis 2a:** Team-member exchange is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Leader-member exchange**

Leader-member exchange can be defined as the goodness of interpersonal relationship between a supervisor and an individual employee (Graen and Scandura, 1987). Employees with high leader-member exchange tend to have a trust-based relationship with their supervisors (Graen & Uhl-Bien 1995). The high leader-member exchange employees also receive a preferential support from their supervisors such as being included in their supervisors’ network (Sparrow & Liden, 2005). This results in these employees feeling more accepted and valued than those with low leader-member exchange relationship. Banks (2014) suggested that while both leader-member exchange and team-member exchange measure the quality of interpersonal relationship, there is unique aspect of leader-member exchange in that the supervisors actually have access to specific resources, information, and opportunities necessary for effective job performance as opposed to team
members. The supervisors also have an authority to be able to reward or punish their subordinates. This means that high-quality leader-member exchange relationships are likely to be more beneficial for employees’ job performance as well as performance evaluations compared to team-member exchange relationships. For the same reasons as above, leader-member exchange is likely to carry greater relative weight than team-member exchange when used for explaining job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Research has also found that there is a positive relation between the leader-member exchange and job satisfaction (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). Another similar found that there is a positive relation between leader-member exchange and perceived organizational support, which contributes to job satisfaction (Wayne et al., 1997). Other positive outcomes of the high leader-member exchange include improving work motivation (Lagace et al., 1993) and the employees’ well-being at work (Sparr & Sonnentag, 2008). The leader-member exchange also seems to be negatively related to the commitment as one research has found that the leader-member exchange can predict nurses’ organizational commitment (Laschinger et Al, 2009) and another research has found that the supervisor-subordinate relationship was positively related to the nurses’ affective commitment (Brunetto et al., 2010). Positive commitments tend to indicate low turnover intentions. One study has found that the leader-member exchange is negatively related to new executive turnover intentions as well as actual turnover (Bauer et al., 2006). Thus, I proposed the following hypothesis for the leader-member exchange:

**Hypothesis 2b:** Leader-member exchange is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.
Group safety climate

Safety climate can be defined as a perception of employees about the safety over production that is handled by their employers. Management commitment is a key component in order to achieve the safety climate (Flin et al., 1996; Marsh et al., 1998). Cohen's (1977) findings also supported the idea that management commitment is important factor in successful programs. Other factors include management/supervisor/worker interactions, workforce stability and industrial relations, housekeeping and environmental control, training, and conventional safety practices. Management commitment is achieved by having manager heavily involve in safe activities. Management/supervisor/worker interactions are done by open communication and keeping in touch with each other. Workforce stability and industrial relation is achieved by having more married, older workers with longer service. Housekeeping and environmental control is done by more openly plant operations. Training is completed by arranging safety training for new workers. Conventional safety practices are achieved by creating safety committees, safety rules, and accident investigation. By achieving these six factors, more employees should be able to perceive that there is a safety climate in the organization.

In construction work, safety climate has been found to be related to work pressure demand as well as to the frequency of injuries and fatalities (Gillen et al., 2002). Menzel and Gutierrez (2010) note that the reasons that Latino construction workers to accept their job despite the fact that the job is unsafe, are that they fear job loss as they need money to support their families, that they fear they would be sent back should they interact with government and were found to be undocumented, and that they believe men are expected to accept danger. However, should these conditions not exist, perhaps they would quit their job. A positive safety climate in which the employees perceive that the organization prioritize their safety and managers commit to the safety, was shown to increase the commitment and job satisfaction of the employees (Morrow & Crum,
According to job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), the high-quality working environment is predicted that it would allow a better experience of responsibility and usage skills and knowledge from the employees, which result in a better job satisfaction and performance. According to the theory of work adjust (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984), the employee’s perception that they have met their expectation on the safety needs from the organization, is predicted to increase in positive work attitudes. The research also found a moderate positive effect of safety climate on intentions to stay of Jordanian hospital nurses (AbuAlRub, Gharaibeh, & Bashayreh, 2012). In another word, a positive safety climate would decrease the intention to leave from the employees. Thus I propose the following hypothesis for the group safety climate.

*Hypothesis 2c*: Group safety climate is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

Individual level

**Affective organizational commitment**

Affective commitment is defined as a reflection of one’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in one’s organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affective commitment is a part of organizational commitment. The other two commitments are continuance and normative commitment. According to Meyer, Becker, and Vandenberghe (2004), affective commitment is said to bind employees to their organization and has been found to be a good predictor for turnover intentions. The affective organizational committed employees are willing to spend more effort for the organization. Their care for the organization also help increased the desire to stay in the organization (Simon & Roberson, 2003). Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; Eisenberger et al., 1986) and signaling theory (Casper & Harris, 2008; Ostroff & Bowen, 2000)
supported the idea that high commitment human resource practices affect work-related attitudes through the perception of the employees. These theories proposed that high commitment human resource practices have an effect on the employees by supporting them. To be more specific, affective commitment comes from the perceived organizational support. One research has found that there are high correlations between affective commitment and turnover intentions (Yousef, 2002). Thus I propose the following hypothesis for my affective organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 3a:** Affective organizational commitment is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Distributive justice**

Distributive justice can be defined as the fairness associated with outcomes and distribution of resources. There are three rules of distributive justice, which are equity, equality, and need (Deutsch, 1985). Which rule is being used will be depended on an allocator of outcomes. If the allocator wants to increase productivity, equity rule is preferred. If the allocator wants to maintain harmony, equality rule is preferred. Lastly if the allocator wants to satisfy the need of less fortunate employees, need rule is preferred. The distributive justice is predicted to be related to organizational citizenship behavior such as altruism, counterproductive work behavior such as destroying equipment, cognitive reactions, satisfaction, and affective commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). According to equity theory (Adams, 1965), when employees perceive their outcomes to be unfair compared to others, they act accordingly in order to restore the perceived inequity. Their actions include withdrawing from the job to end the inequity or obtaining fairer outcomes in another organization. Other behaviors include resentment and other forms of negative behaviors (Adam, 1965; Greenberg, 1990b; Greenberg, 1993b). Those employees who experience distributive injustice
have a higher chance of committing thievery than those who perceive that they fairly receive their rewards (Greenberg, 1990b; Greenberg, 1993b). However, some employees have limited options, which sometimes do not include immediately resignation as an option, thus leading to turnover intentions instead of immediate turnover (Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999). This means that if the employees perceive that there is an unfair outcome among people, their immediate reaction may include resignation (if the option is available) or turnover intentions. According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), people tend to reciprocate their received outcome. This means that individual who perceive that they are being rewarded fairly, are more likely to feel obligated to reciprocate by continuing to work for the organization. On the opposite end, the employees who perceive that they are being reward unfairly compared to other employees, are more likely to view this as a violation of their psychological contract (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). The violation of the employees’ psychological contract leads to decrease in the employees’ faith regarding to the benefits staying in the exchange relationship, which leads to the employees’ turnover (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Many researches had shown that the distributive justice is negatively related to the turnover intentions (Griffeth et al., 2000; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Brashear, Manolis, & Brooks, 2005; Poon, 2012). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the distributive justice:

*Hypothesis 3b:* Distributive justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Procedural justice**

Procedural justice can be defined as the fairness of the process in which the outcome is determined (Lind & Tyler, 1988). The procedural justice is predicted to be related to organizational citizenship behavior such as altruism, counterproductive work behavior such as destroying
equipment, cognitive reactions, personality such as negative affectivity, work performance, satisfaction, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and turnover intentions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). When employees perceive that the procedure is fair, they perceive themselves to have more investment in the organizations. Since this investment makes the employees obliged to stay and unable to quit the company, they are experiencing continuance commitment. An opposite applies when they feel the processes are unfair, the employees feel like there is little to lose by moving to a different organization. It is important that the organizations and their managers treat the employees in a way that is procedurally fair because this gives a sign that the employees are being valued equally as members of the organization (Posthuma, Maertz, & Dworkin, 2007; Sier, 2007). According to Leventhal’s (1980) conceptualization, there are six rules in which if applied to the organization, create procedures that are considered to be fair compared to when these six rules are not applied: (a) the consistency rule, stating that allocation processes should be consistent across people and over time; (b) the bias-suppression rule, stating that no self-interest of decision makers should be involved during the allocation processes; (c) the accuracy rule, stating that factual information should be used in the allocation processes; (d) the correctability rule, stating that unfair decisions should always be corrected whenever the opportunities to correct them arise; (e) the representativeness rule, stating the needs, goals, and values of all people affected by the allocation processes should be considered in the process; (f) the ethicality rule, stating that the allocation process must be compatible with the fundamental moral and ethical values of the perceiver.

It is important to maintain all these rules in a fair decision making process. Another important thing to note is that the procedural justice has a strong effect on attitudes that involve organizations or decision makers and not the attitude that involve the outcomes (Lind and Tyler, 1988; Folger and Konosky, 1989). Folger and Konosky (1989) found that the employees’ perceptions of the procedures that involve pay raises, appear to increase the organizational commitment and the trust in
their supervisors. On the other hand, the employees’ perception of distributive justice has a strong effect on the employees’ satisfaction. Many researches had shown that the procedural justice is negatively related to the turnover intentions (Aquino, Griffeth, Allen, & Hom, 1997; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller, & Summers, 1998; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Bal, P. M. et al. 2011). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the procedural justice:

**Hypothesis 3c:** Procedural justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

**Interactional justice**

Interactional justice can be defined as the fairness of the way the management is behaving toward the employees. An example of interactional justice includes treating employees with respect and dignity (Cropanzano, & Greenberg, 1997). There are three types of interactional fairness judgment: casual accountings, ideological accountings, and referential accountings (Bies, 1987). For casual accountings, the decision make tries to reduce the responsibilities of the employees that create problems. The employees realize what damage that they have caused, but do not take any responsibility for it. For ideological accountings, the decision maker tries to change the outcomes to match that of the employees’ goals and values. For referential accountings, the decision maker tries to focus on an alternative situation. The interactional justice is predicted to be related to cognitive reactions, personality such as negative affectivity, satisfaction, affective commitment, and continuance commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). When employees perceive that they are being respected, they perceive themselves to have more investment in the organizations. Since this investment makes the employees obliged to stay and unable to quit the company, they are experiencing continuance commitment. An opposite is true if the employees perceive that they do not receive the respect they deserve, they will feel that moving to a different company cost them less
than staying. However, should the employees decide to remain in the company, they will be predicted to be less committed to and display negative attitudes toward their supervisor instead of the company (Cropanzano & Prehar, 1999; Masterson et al., 2000). Unbiased treatment from the supervisors can imply to the employees that they are being treated with a dignified and respectful way, thus increasing their sense of self-identity and self-worth (Brockner et al., 1992). Many researches had shown that the interactional justice is negatively related to the turnover intentions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Bryne, 2005; Karatepe & Shahriari, 2014). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the interactional justice:

*Hypothesis 3d: Interactional justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.*

External level

**Expectation of finding job alternatives**

Expectation of finding job alternatives can potentially be an important factor that leads to turnover intentions. According to Peters, Jackosky, & Salter (1981), there are two important dimensions that can be looked at when employees want to search for job alternatives. The first one is the employees’ belief of the chance of finding actual job alternatives. The second one is whether the cost of giving up the current job and the cost of search for the future job are actually cheaper than the benefit of getting a new job. If the employees believe that the probability of finding job alternatives is high and that the cost of leaving the current organization is cheap, the intention to search and actual job search will occur. The job search is considered to be the first behavioral stage in the withdraw process. In another word, this means that the employees have intentions to quit the company. Then if the job search turns in a possible job alternative, then the employees will begin to evaluate and compare both benefits and costs of the alternative job and the current job. Should the
comparison turns out to be favorable to the job alternative, then the employees develop an intention to leave, which follow by actual turnover. There are many evidences that support the significant relationship between turnover intentions and expectation of finding the job alternatives (Dansereau, Cashman, & Graen, 1974; Miller et al., 1979; Peters, Jackosky, & Salter, 1981). Thus, I propose the following hypothesis for the expectation of finding the job alternatives.

Hypothesis 4a: Expectation of finding job alternatives is significantly and positively related to turnover intentions.

Family’s expectation of the job

The relation between family’s expectation of the job and turnover intentions is relatively left unexplored as most of the researches were done on the employee’s expectation of the job himself/herself rather than the family’s expectation. The situation in which the expectations of the employees are not met is labeled as reality shock by Dugoni and Ilgen (1981). When reality shock happened, the employees are faced with dissatisfaction, which can lead to employees leaving the organization. Research has shown that there is a negative relation between the employee’s expectation of the job and turnover intentions (Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese, & Carraher., 1998). However, family also plays an important in the decision making of the employees. It has been shown that family can, one way or another, influence the career decision of people. For example, family conflict can have an impact on people’s career decision making. Dodge (2001) contends that less family conflicts help individuals to make decisions while assertively managing parental feedback. The family can also have big influence on the employee’s self-determination (Wolfe & Hall, 2011). This also means that the decision making of the employee is influenced by the family. Since it is possible that the family can have influence on the decision making of the employees, by meeting the
expectation of the family, the employees will be more likely to stay in the company. On the other hand, if the family had a bad impression on the company and that the expectations are not met by the family, it is possible that the family will influence the employees to quit the company leading to turnover. Their expectations may include whether the job has any future ahead or whether the job can help the employees improved. Thus, I propose the following hypothesis on the family’s expectation of the job:

Hypothesis 4b: Family’s expectation of the job is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions.

Figure 1 shows the analytical framework of all hypotheses in graphical form.

Figure 1. Factors affecting turnover intentions in this study: An analytical framework.

Note: indicates the positive effect and indicates the negative effect.
Methodology

Population and sample

To test the sets of hypotheses, I used a questionnaire survey method to collect individual employee data. The population of this study consists of employees in one Thai corrugated box manufacturing company. The questionnaire was distributed directly to the participants. All the participants’ job position is below manager level. I were able to collect a total number of responses from 83 participants, and the total number of usable responses was 83, which make the response rate I achieved for this survey to be 100%. The average age of the participants was 29.7 with a standard deviation of 6.5 years. The gender of my participants was composed of 56.6% male employees and 43.4% female employees. For the employees’ education background, 15.7% of the participants achieved their highest level of education at below middle school, 27.7% middle school, 43.4% high school, and 13% were university undergraduates. In terms of their length of service in their current company, 12% of the participants worked for less than 4 months, 41% worked between 4 months and 1 year, 22.9% worked between 1 year and 3 years, 19.3% worked between 3 years and 10 years, and 4.8% worked for more than 10 years in the company.

Measurement instruments

Organizational level

Learning culture was measured with seven items that were developed by Watkins, K., & Marsick, V. J. (2003) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘almost never (1)’ to ‘almost always (6)’. Sample items are ‘in my organization, people are rewarded for learning’ and ‘in my organization, people spend time building trust with each other.’ Reliability coefficients of learning culture were
Collectivistic culture was measured with five items that were adapted from Guoquan Chen, Dean Tjosvold, Nan Li, Yue Fu, & Dawei Liu (2011) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘employees often share things with each other’ and ‘the well-being of each employee is important to this organization.’ Reliability coefficients of collectivistic culture were found to be .674.

Group level

Team-member exchange was measured with ten items that were developed by Seers, A., Petty, M.M. & Cashman, J.F. (1995) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘how often do you make suggestions about better work methods to other team members?’ and ‘how often do you let other team members know when they have done something that makes your job easier (or harder)?’ Reliability coefficients of tem-member exchange were found to be .750.

Leader-member exchange was measured with seven items that were developed by Graen, G.B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘I have enough confidence in my leader that I would defend and justify his/her decision if he/she were not present to do so’ and ‘regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances that your leader would use his/her power to help you solve problems in your work.’ Reliability coefficients of leader-member exchange were found to be .879.

Group-level safety climate was measured with sixteen items that were developed by Zohar, D., & Luria, G. (2005) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘my direct supervisor makes sure I receive all the equipment needed to
do the job safely’ and ‘my direct supervisor refuses to ignore safety rules when work falls behind schedule.’ Reliability coefficients of group-level safety climate were found to be .911.

Individual level

Affective organizational commitment was measured with six items that were developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (7)’. Sample items are ‘I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization’ and ‘this organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.’ Reliability coefficients of affective organizational commitment were found to be .749.

Distributive justice was measured with three items that were developed by Jones, D. A. and Skarlicki, D. P. (2003) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘I believe that I am being rewarded fairly here at work’ and ‘I believe that the overall pay I receive is fair.’ Reliability coefficients of distributive justice were found to be .911.

Procedural justice was measured with four items that were developed by Jones, D. A. and Skarlicki, D. P. (2003) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘do you believe there are processes currently in place that make sure that information used for decisions is accurate and complete?’ and ‘do you believe there are processes currently in place that make sure all parties affected by a company decision are represented in the decision?’ Reliability coefficients of procedural justice were found to be .831.

Interactional justice was measured with four items that were developed by Jones, D. A. and Skarlicki, D. P. (2003) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘do you believe that your supervisor consider your point of view, needs, and concerns when making decisions?’ and ‘do you believe that your supervisor provides you with
timely feedback about issues that concern you?’ Reliability coefficients of interactional justice were found to be .881.

External level

Expectation of finding alternative employment was measured with three items that were developed by Peters, L. H., Jackofsky, E. F. and Salter, J. R. (1981) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. Sample items are ‘it is possible for me to find a better job than the one I have now’ and ‘there is no doubt in my mind that I can find a job that is at least as good as the one I have now.’ Reliability coefficients of expectation of finding alternative employment were found to be .886.

Family’s perception of the job was measured with five items that were adapted from Buckley MR, Fedor DB, Veres JG, Wiese DS, & Carraher SM. (1998) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree (1)’ to ‘strongly agree (5)’. It is important to note that there is no study that has researched on this factor before, so the items was actually adapted from employee’s expectation of the job. The items were by adding “My family thinks” in front of the original items to make them into the family’s expectation. Sample items are ‘my family thinks I will have opportunities to get ahead in this job’ and ‘my family thinks I will be satisfied with this job.’ Reliability coefficients of family’s perception of the job were found to be .740.

Turnover intention

Turnover intention was measured with two items that were developed by Irving P. G., & Meyer, J. P. (1995) using a Likert-type scale ranging from ‘very unlikely (1)’ to ‘very likely (6)’. A sample item is ‘how likely is it that you will actively look for work in a different organization within the next year?’ Reliability coefficients of turnover intention were found to be .933.
Control variables

The following background variables were being controlled when running a hierarchical regression analysis to test my hypotheses: (1) gender (1 = ‘male’ and 2 = ‘female’); (2) education (1 = ‘below middle school’, 2 = ‘middle school’, 3 = ‘high school’, 4 = ‘bachelor’s degree’, and 5 = ‘above bachelor’s degree’); (3) age; (4) length of service (1 = ‘less than 4 months’, 2 = ‘4 months to 1 year’, 3 = ‘1 year to 3 years’, 4 = ‘3 years to 10 years’, and 5 = ‘more than 10 years’). The mean, standard deviation, and correlations of all variables used in the study is shown in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of service</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learning culture</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collectivistic culture</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TMX</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LMX</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Safety climate</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Affective commitment</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Distributive justice</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Procedural justice</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interactional justice</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Job alternatives</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Family's expectation</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Turnover intentions</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 83; * p < .05, ** p < .01
**Results**

Hierarchical linear regression was used to test hypotheses since hierarchical linear regression can simultaneously provide the estimation of the influence of factors at different levels on a dependent variable (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002; Raudenbush et al., 2004).

Table 2 shows the results of hierarchical linear regression analyses with control variables, organizational level variables, group level variables, individual level variables, and external level variables as independent variables and turnover intentions as a dependent variable. Figure 2 is used to show a graphical version of the above regression result based on the model presented in Figure 1. The standardized beta coefficients shown in Figure 2 all have achieved a level of statistical significance at \( p < 0.5 \). The summary of the results will be discussed below.

![Organizational level and turnover intentions](image)

**Figure 2.** The path diagram on the relations between organizational level factors, external level factors, and turnover intentions.

Note: \( \rightarrow \) indicates the positive effect and \( \rightarrow \rightarrow \) indicates the negative effect.

**Organizational level and turnover intentions**

Hypothesis 1a stated that a learning culture is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. However as can be seen in Figure 2, even though the learning culture is significantly related to turnover intentions, but the standardized beta coefficients are actually...
positive instead of negative (Beta = .24, p < 0.05). This means that Hypothesis 1a is unsupported by the analysis. The positive relation between a learning culture and turnover intentions means that as workers perceive that the culture in the organization is a learning culture, they are more likely to show an intention to leave the organization.

Hypothesis 1b stated that a collectivistic culture is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. As shown in Figure 2, analysis supports the hypothesis, which shows a significant and negative standardized beta coefficients between a collectivistic culture and turnover intentions (Beta = -.30, p < 0.05). This means if workers perceive that an organization that they are currently working at, has a collectivistic culture, they are more likely to stay in the organization.

Group level and turnover intentions

Hypothesis 2a proposed that a team-member exchange is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. This hypothesis is proved to be unsupported by the analysis as shown in Table 2 where its significant are shown to be higher than 0.05 (Beta = .146, p > 0.05). This means that the team-member exchange does not have significant influences over turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2b proposed that a leader-member exchange is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. However, as shown in Table 2, the standardized beta coefficients for the leader-member exchange and turnover intentions is not significant (Beta = .12, p > 0.05), which means that Hypothesis 2b was unsupported. This implies that the leader-member exchange fails to show any significant influences over turnover intentions.
Table 2. Results of the hierarchical regression analyses on turnover as a dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.265</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>-.324 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Organizational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning culture</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.241 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic culture</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-.317</td>
<td>-.298 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Group level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMX</td>
<td></td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMX</td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5: External level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of finding job alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family's expectation of job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.256 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.229 ***</td>
<td>.286 *</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.362 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R² denote the adjusted R squares; * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Hypothesis 2c proposed that a group safety climate is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. However, from the result of the analysis, this proves to be false as the standardized coefficients for the group safety climate and turnover intentions is not at a significant level (Beta = .15, p > 0.05), which indicates that Hypothesis 2c was unsupported. This means that the group safety level does not have any significant effect on the turnover intentions of workers.

Individual level and turnover intentions

Hypothesis 3a stated that an affective organizational commitment is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. This, however, is not true as shown in Table 2, where the result of the analysis shows that the standardized beta coefficients between the affective organizational commitment and the turnover intentions is not significant (Beta = -.01, p > 0.05), thus failing to support Hypothesis 3a. This implies that the affective organizational commitment did not have any significant influences on the turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 3b stated that a distributive justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. Judging from the result of the hierarchical linear regression analysis, the hypothesis appears to be false as the significant level for the relation between the distributive justice and the turnover intentions is higher than 0.05 (Beta = -.15, p > 0.05). This indicates that Hypothesis 3b was unsupported. This means that the distributive justice did not have any significant effect on the turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 3c stated that a procedural justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. However, the evidence shown in Table 2 shows that the standardized beta coefficients between the procedural justice and the turnover intentions are not significant (Beta = 0.09, p > 0.05), thus failing to support Hypothesis 3c. This concludes that the procedural justice did not affect the turnover intentions in any significant ways.
Hypothesis 3d stated that an interactional justice is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. But as shown in Table 2, the result shows that the standardized beta coefficients between the interactional justice and the turnover intentions had a significant level higher than 0.05 (Beta = -.08, p > 0.05). This shows that Hypothesis 3d was unsupported. This shows that the interactional justice did not have any significant effects on the turnover intentions of workers.

External level and turnover intentions

Hypothesis 4a proposed that an expectation of finding job alternatives is significantly and positively related to turnover intentions. As can be seen on Table 2, the standardized beta coefficients between the expectation of finding job alternatives and turnover intentions were not significant enough (Beta = .15, p > 0.05), which means that the Hypothesis 4a was not supported. This implies that the expectation of finding job alternatives did not show any sign of significant effects on the turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 4b proposed that a family’s expectation of a worker’s current job is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. The result of the analysis actually showed a strong support as the standardized beta coefficients were both negative and significant (Beta = -.26, p > 0.05). This means that Hypothesis 4b was supported and that if the expectation from the family is not met, this will increase the likelihood that the workers will intend to leave the organization.
Discussion

The present study shows some interesting findings about the factors that influence turnover intentions of workers in a Thai manufacturing company. The study provides some insights that can be used to explain the turnover of many manufacturing workers. The summary of all hypotheses and findings of the present study can be found on Table 3. Since the regression results did not mostly support my hypotheses, I decide to include the hypotheses judgment based on the correlation results in Table 1 together with the summary of all hypotheses based on the regression results on Table 3. It is interesting to note that Hypothesis 4b was supported in both the correlation and regression results. However, Hypothesis 1b was not supported in the correlation results and instead Hypothesis 3a and 4a were supported. These findings from the regression results can be evaluated and discussed as follows.

First, I found that cultures actually play an important role in turnover intentions of manufacturing workers. Even though the result of the relation between a learning culture and the turnover intentions was actually displayed as a positive relation instead of a negative relation, the result still showed that there is a significant relation between the learning culture and the turnover intentions. This means that the manufacturing companies that encourage learning culture would increase the likelihood that the workers will show intentions to quit the companies. On the other hand, the companies with a high collectivistic culture will likely be able to retain more of their workers. The result of the analysis strongly supported the relation between the collectivistic culture and the turnover intentions in Hypothesis 1b. With both factors in the organizational level showing a significant relation with the turnover intentions, I can deduce that the culture in the company have important effects on the likelihood that the workers will stay with the company. Creating the right kind of cultures can potentially improve the turnover rate of the manufacturing companies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesized directions of effects</th>
<th>Correlation Results</th>
<th>Regression Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. Relationship between organizational level and turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a Learning culture → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b Collectivistic culture → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Relationship between group level and turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a Team-member exchange → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b Leader-member exchange → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c Group safety climate → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Relationship between individual level and turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a Affective organizational commitment → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b Distributive justice → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c Procedural justice → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3d Interactional justice → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Relationship between external level and turnover intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a Expectation of finding job alternatives → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b Family’s expectation of the job → Turnover intentions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second, it seems that group level factors did not play any major role in turnover intentions. All of the hypotheses (Hypothesis 2a, 2b, and 2c) at the group level were not supported by the result of my analysis. This means that there is no significant effects of the group level factors on the turnover intentions. The team-member exchange, leader-member exchange, and the group safety climate play no important role in influencing the employees’ intentions to leave. One possible reason for this result is that as job in a manufacturing does not require a team or a group in order to complete one task. Works done is generally required individual skills and not team/group skills. This also means that the organizations do not need to emphasize on the team-member exchange, leader-member exchange, and the group safety climate in order to reduce the turnover intentions of their employees. However this does not necessary mean that the organizations should not practice these at all as they also have their own benefits.

Third, similar to group level factors, individual factors also appear to play no major role in turnover intentions of employees. All of the hypotheses (Hypothesis 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d) at the individual level were not supported by the result of the analysis. In another word, affective organizational commitment, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice do not have any significant influence on the turnover intentions. Our findings are inconsistent with some of the prior reports provided by Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001) and Poon (2012). However, since my result shows that there is no significant relation between the affective organizational commitment, distributive justice, procedural justice, interaction justice and the turnover intentions, I have no choice, but to accept this as a fact. This means that in order to decrease the turnover intentions of the employees, the organizations do not need to emphasize on the affective organizational commitment, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice in order to do so.

Fourth, I found that family’s expectation of the job is significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions. The result strongly supported my Hypothesis 4b. This means that in order to
decrease the turnover intentions of the employees, improving the family’s expectation is important. This finding also supports the fact that the family can have an influence over the decision making of the employees, and in this case, the decision making is the intention to leave the organization. However, despite my Hypothesis 4b being supported by the result, my Hypothesis 4a was unsupported. There is no significant effect of an expectation of finding job alternatives on the turnover intentions. This means that whether there is a strong or weak expectation for the employees to find another job, it will not affect their turnover intentions. Our assumption is that based on the education level of many employees, which is average between middle school and high school, many employees do not think of a consequence for quitting the job. Whether there is a strong or weak expectation for finding job alternatives will not matter in their decision of exiting the job as they do not presumably think of the cost of leaving the company.

Implications

Our findings has contributed to the deepening the understanding of how important the culture is on the turnover intentions of the manufacturing workers. Both learning culture and collectivistic culture had significant effects on the turnover intentions even though learning culture appeared to be positively related to the turnover intentions, which was not what I expected from the hypothesis. One way to keep the turnover intentions role is by focusing on selection – the desire in which the companies improve pre-screening to find newcomers that can fit well with the companies’ culture to prevent them from exiting (Smith, Daskalaki, Elger & Brown, 2007). Since the culture plays an important role that significantly influence the turnover intentions based on my analysis, by selecting newcomers that can fit the organizational culture, the chance that these newcomers will quit in the future, will be further reduced. Since the result of the analysis supported Hypothesis 1b that the collectivistic culture is significantly and negatively related to the turnover intentions, I can
try to retain the employees by shifting the culture toward the collectivistic culture. It is also interesting to note that my questionnaire respondents came from only one company. This showed that each employee have a different perception of the organizational culture. In order to corporate the collectivistic culture in the organization and shifting employees’ perception of the organizational culture toward the collectivistic culture, one way I can do is to provide guidance for fostering interdependence and interaction between employees (Tjosvold, 1991; Tjosvold, 1995). Executives can also help created a vision and a mission that incorporate collectivist values in their organization (Tjosvold, 1989). As collectivist values being part of the vision and mission, the organizational culture will shift toward the collectivistic culture, and employees should be able to perceive that the organizational culture is the collectivistic culture. To support the collectivist values in organization, team members can develop shared goals, integrated roles, common tasks, and shared reward distributions that build commitment to collective goals (Hanlon, Meyer and Taylor 1994).

Another important finding is that the family’s expectation of the worker’s job is also significantly and negatively related to the turnover intentions. This means that the family members of the worker play an important role in the decision making of the worker should the worker decides to quit the company. This means that any bad impression from the family members could potentially lead the intention to quit the company from the worker. In order to improve the family’s expectation of the job to decrease turnover intentions, I need to further analyze my data using the family’s expectation of the job as a dependent variable. Multiple linear regression with stepwise method was used to find factors that are significantly related to the family’s expectation. Except for turnover intentions variable, I input every other variables as independent variables. The result has excluded all but two variables (affective organizational commitment and procedural justice) in the multiple linear regression. Table 4 shows the results of multiple linear regression analyses based on the above statistical procedures. Figure 3 shows a graphical version of the above regression results similar to
Figure 3. The path diagram on the relations between individual level factors and turnover intentions.

Note: indicates the positive effect

my analytical model presented in Figure 2. The standardized beta coefficients shown in Figure 3 all has achieved a significant level of p > 0.005. The results show that the individual factors are the most factors that influence the family’s expectation of the job. To be specific, an affective organizational commitment and a procedural justice is shown to be significantly and positively related to the family’s expectation of the job. This indicates that as the employee shows more positive emotional attachment to the organization, the expectation of the family on the job is improved. If the family members perceive that the process, in which the employee is being rewarded, is fair, their expectation of the job also seems to be improved.

According to the result of my analysis, in order to decrease the turnover intentions, the managers need to improve the family’s expectation of the employee’s job, which can be done by increasing the employee’s affective organization commitment and improving the procedural justice in the organization. The research has displayed that line managers’ enactment of HR practices and relations-oriented leadership behavior have been shown to significantly influence employees’
affective commitment (Caroli, Sophie, & Luc, 2011). Since I know that line managers require HR and leadership skill, the company can set up training programs that involve training of HR and relations-oriented leadership skills in order to increase the employee’s affective commitment. Demonstration of the procedural justice can be done by making decisions in an unbiased manner, making fact-based decisions, and actively ask for employees’ input when making a decision that affects the employees by supervisors. Since the cost of applying the procedural justice is far lower than the cost of building employee’s affective organizational commitment, it is within the executives’ best interest to ensure the practice of fair procedures among employees with supervisory responsibilities, which can be done by motivating managers to practice procedural justice (Poon, 2012). Since the research has shown that leaders can be trained to foster an organizational justice (Skarlicki & Latham, 2005), training programs involving the organizational justice can be included to improve the leaders’ procedural justice. Since it seems that both affective commitment and procedural justice can be improved with training programs, I can further cut costs by combining trainings that improve HR, leadership, and organizational fairness together for the managers.

Limitations and conclusions

I need to address the limitations of my study. First of all, my data sample contains only 83 employees. The number of my sample is relatively low compared to many researches. A larger sample size could help provided me more concrete evidence. Some of my hypotheses were not supported in my analysis, but if I can obtain larger sample size, the result of my hypotheses might turn out different from what I current have.

Second, all of my sample data actually came from one company. This may not affect much on an individual level, but on an organizational level, having only one company should hinder the generalizability of my findings to the general theory of my manufacturing workers’ turnover
intentions. Our findings may only apply to only company, and may not work on the rest of similar companies. A larger number of companies that was used to gather my sample size could provide better evidence than with only one company for the factors on the organizational level that affect the turnover intentions. Future researches that collect data from multiple similar companies may yield different results compared to the current research.

Third, the present study limited its sample to only Thai workers who worked for Thai manufacturing company. This could possibly hinder the general findings of the general theory since my result may only apply to one industry in one country. The finding of the present may contradict with other findings in the future because of the fact that this study’s findings are only applied to one country. Future research might need to investigate in more countries than just Thailand in order to be able to generalize the finding of the theory on turnover intentions.

Fourth, my research used cross-sectional data. This means that I cannot possibly rule out the fact that my result may differ should I do my survey on a different period of time compared to the time that I did my survey. The mood of respondents at the time may affect the result of each sample data. The longitudinal data may be needed to test my study to see if the results will be consistent at different time.

Fifth, since my sample data were based on self-report questionnaire and were collected at a single point in time, my sample data were actually subjected to common method bias. By doing extra factor analysis on all of my items for each organization level, questionnaire items were separated into more factors that I initially hope for as well as some items that should belong to one factor appeared on another factor instead, which mean that common method bias is likely to have a fairly limited effect. Validated scales may be need for the future research in order to reduce the sensitivity of the common method bias.

Sixth, one of my external factors, which is a family’s expectation on an employee’s job,
may be subjected to an inaccuracy. This is because my survey did not ask my respondents’ family members directly, but instead I asked how the respondents perceive of their family’s expectation and answer them for the family. Thus my actual result of the family’s expectation may come from how the employees feel about their family’s expectation and not from how the family members actually expect from the job. Future research may need an input from the respondents’ family members on the matter involving the family’s expectation, but this will create a complex situation.

In conclusion, my study provided evidences on the factors that significantly influence the turnover intentions of the workers in manufacturing companies. From my analysis, I found out that culture plays an important part in turnover intentions of employees, namely learning culture and collectivistic culture. Learning culture was found to be positively related to the turnover intentions, and collectivistic culture was found to be negatively related to the turnover intentions. However, these findings may only apply to Thai manufacturing companies, so future research may be needed to conduct on a larger scale in order to find the general theory behind the culture and the turnover intentions. Another important finding is the family’s expectation of the employees’ job is negatively related to the turnover intentions since so far there is no study that focuses on the family influence over the turnover intentions. The authors of future studies are strongly encourage to utilize my finding and to conduct a research to further to explore the area between the family and the organization.
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