

Determining the Factors Affecting Retention of Employees in Taiwanese Electronic's Firms - General Vs Repatriated Employees

Adam H. Cave

Assistant Professor, Business Administration, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (HUFS)
South Korea

Email: profahcave@gmail.com

Wu-Hua Chung

Pukyong National University, South Korea

Soon-Gwon Choi

Associate Professor, International Commerce and Logistics, Pukyong National University
South Korea

Email: sgchoi@pknu.ac.kr

Abstract

This study set out to examine the differences leading to turnover intention between two groups, general and repatriated employees. The issue of whether job satisfaction, organizational commitment and attitude of job-hopping can affect Taiwanese IT general employees and repatriates' intention to leave the organization was analyzed, and helped to explain the potential difference in turnover intention between the two groups of employees. Based on the results, for general employees, payment, nature of work and job-hopping were found to be negatively related to turnover intention. For repatriated employees, organizational commitment was the only factor found to be significantly related to turnover intention. Surprisingly, there was no significant difference in turnover intention between the two groups, which is contrary to most empirical observations that suggest a higher rate of turnover among repatriated employees. However, there exist very strong differences in terms of reasons to leave an organization between these two groups. The findings of this paper strongly suggest that there exists substantially different reasons leading to turnover between the two groups, and that further support programs or initiatives would go a long way in addressing both groups' concerns.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction; Organizational Commitment; Repatriate; Turnover intention; Job-hopping; International HRM (IHRM)

Introduction

As international barriers continue to come down and companies reach outside of their own borders in order to expand, or access resources, new and reoccurring issues are continually faced in terms of human resources. Industries span countries and continents and the attention to quality and management issues require the continual movement of labor from headquarters to subsidiaries. A lot of scholarly attention has been placed on the use of expatriate managers and their ability to transfer knowledge, maintain parent controls and simply to ensure that processes and guidelines are properly implemented. Receiving less attention in this regard is the retention of these employees after their foreign placement and how this experience affects their views upon headquarters and the conditions of their continued employment. This aspect of employee turnover is becoming more and more an issue as global expansion continues and has become a very important threat to be addressed in human resource management.

Employee turnover, especially for senior managers, technical personnel and sales, will inevitably take business experience, technical secrets, and customer relations away to other firms. When these people move to other organizations, the enterprises' core technology and key resources also flow along with them, which allow competitors to obtain successful techniques, financial resources and customer networks without extensive investment of time or money. As for the original company, it suffers equally in terms of the lost investment in training and development of the employee. In this vein, repatriates are invaluable as they play an integral role in the organization due to the knowledge acquired through communication between the parent company and its subsidiaries. Therefore, many companies regard repatriates as a significant investment in human capital (Lazarova & Caligiuri, 2000; Fink & Rohr, 2005). Hence, if they leave their job, the company is not only losing money in terms of retraining, but also losing the knowledge and experience of that employee. In terms of the repatriate level of turnover, Black (1988) finds that in the United States almost 25% of repatriated employees quit their jobs within one year. Pursuant to this, Yan et al, (2002) suggest that an international assignment is only truly successful if an organization is able to retain its repatriated employees.

Gomez-Mejia and Balkin (1987) indicate that the major problem of repatriates is that these employees are not satisfied with their repatriation, suggesting that in any study of turnover intention, the concept of job satisfaction becomes extremely important as an overriding concern. The purpose of this study is to determine whether and how job satisfaction and its associated factors affect employees' turnover intention in Taiwanese electronics companies. This analysis is broken down into two groups (general employees and repatriates) in order to determine potential differences in attitudes and organizational relationships in terms of turnover intention. The results will help enterprises understand how to address employees' demands and concerns toward their jobs and discover successful ways of retaining them. This in turn will reduce turnover rate and the associated costs.

In order to achieve these objectives the paper is laid out in the following manner. A literature review looking into job satisfaction and turnover intention follows. Then development of the hypotheses relating to the two groups and reasons are set forth for testing purposes. After that, an outline of the methodology is presented, followed by the results from testing the hypotheses on the two groups, with an ensuing discussion. Finally, a conclusion is outlined along with research gaps and potential future research avenues.

Theoretical Framework

Turnover Intention

Nauman (1992) suggests that turnover means that an individual leaves the organization and goes elsewhere to look for employment. This can refer to voluntary or involuntary departure, but signifies the permanent withdrawal from an organization (Ngo, 2009). The initial difference to note here is that turnover is a type of behavior, while turnover intention refers to motivation. It is generally too late to urge employees not to leave when a resignation is the topic of discussion. In contrast, however, knowing the motivational aspects of employees before they want to leave can reduce turnover behavior. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) posit that turnover intention is referred as an individual's estimated probability that they will stay at the current organization. According to the American Kepner-Tregoe consulting service company's research, based on the turnover cost of IT professionals, an employee's turnover will directly cause the company financial losses of at least 25% above the departed employee's annual income.

Ferguson and Ferguson (1986) divided turnover types into two classifications, voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary turnover indicates the movements in an organization that are an employee's active behaviors, which belong within the grouping of personal decision. Involuntary turnover means someone who leaves the organization not based on their own choice and is essentially unavoidable, such as retirement and death. Abelson (1987) further points out those employees leaving an organization can be divided into the groupings of avoidable and unavoidable in terms of the organization. Avoidable turnover means that the organization has some measure of control and can affect turnover, such as, dismissal, layoff, forced retirement, better pay or working conditions elsewhere or a problem with leadership/administration. Unavoidable turnover refers to the case where irrespective of employees' choices, the organization cannot control and prevent turnover, such as severe medical issues, death, spouse imposed relocation, mid-career change, staying home to care for spouse/children, pregnancy and a decision not to return after period of absence.

In relation to turnover intention, most empirical studies find that it is related to voluntary turnover. That is, in terms of intention, employees are actively thinking about leaving under their own free will or have been developing their intentions while on international assignment (Harvey, 1989). Additionally, Lee and Liu (2006) found that repatriation adjustment and organizational commitment were negatively related to turnover intention and function as strong predictors of repatriate behavior.

Job Satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) provides one of the earliest indicators of the concept of job satisfaction and posits that job satisfaction is the personal satisfied feeling, both psychologically and physiologically, to the work environment. Following scholarly opinions, the realization is that job satisfaction is based on personal emotion, and that job satisfaction generally is based on the relationship of the individual job characteristics with the whole job attitude (Hodson, 1991). According to research on job satisfaction, most studies have examined the effect of overall satisfaction on turnover with only a few investigating the specific relationship between turnover and the specific aspects of job satisfaction, such as payment and nature of work (Koustelios et al., 2003; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Economists' research indicates that payment has a strong negative association to turnover. Price's (1977) model points out the impact of payment on turnover intention through job satisfaction as a motivator for employees to get involved in organizations. The higher and lower levels of payment will reflect the increasing and decreasing of employees' job satisfaction. Payment mainly helps repatriated employees to settle financial pressures after they return to their home countries and further would affect their job satisfaction. Dowling and Schuler, (1990) indicates that when expatriates are overseas, they receive not only a basic salary, but also an overseas work allowance, bonuses, income tax allowance, currency protection, subsistence allowance (educational subsidy for children, moving allowance, vacation allowance and spousal assistance, etc.) and other supplements: such as medical treatment, insurance, return visits, among others. However, a significant shock to repatriates occurs when they return to the parent company; most of these additional allowances are discontinued, which strongly influences the financial situation of repatriated staff.

Harvey (1989) suggests that the payment systems upon return are considered inadequate, resulting in repatriated employees' poor performance in terms of job adaptation and organizational input, which leads to the high turnover of repatriates. Black et al, (1992) discovered that of the expatriates studied, 77 percent were unsatisfied with their compensation systems, thus further cementing the concept of payment as integral to repatriates' levels of satisfaction.

In addition to payment, the literature points out that the job satisfaction depends on matches between employee abilities and knowledge on the one hand and job content or tasks on the other (Robbins, 1998). Based on Hackman et al's (1978) research, job repetitiveness is considered important in decreasing employees' job satisfaction and further increases their turnover intention. Different job activities will allow employees to feel more challenged and can further use their abilities and skills. As for repatriates specifically, they have the same problems with the nature of work because the company sent them on an international assignment. However, when they returned, they find they cannot apply the knowledge they acquired overseas. Bossard and Peterson (2005) claim that, unfortunately, many companies assign repatriates to jobs that do not match their knowledge, abilities or skills acquired abroad. In fact,

this situation is one of the main complaints of repatriates upon their return. According to Peltonen (1997), approximately 60% of repatriates state that the company does not take into account their international experience and skills when assigning them to roles after the repatriation process. Other literature further suggests that the company should place repatriates in a position where their experience and knowledge are useful and valuable (Black and Gregersen, 1999; Hurn, 1999). This should enhance not just repatriate, but all employees', commitment to their organization.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is described as an individual's level of loyalty toward his/her organization (Price, 1997). In Meyer and Allen (1991), proposed a model of organizational commitment that was divided into a three-dimensional construct consisting of the components: 1) affective commitment, an employee's emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement in an organization; 2) continuance commitment, and commitment based on costs that an employee is associated with upon leaving the organization; and 3) normative commitment, the employee's feeling of obligation to stay with the organization. Lee & Liu, (2006) determined in their study that organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intention. Through these results, it is important for human resource management to realize how certain initiatives may strengthen or weaken individuals' commitment to the organization. In particular for repatriates, Black et al. (1992) found that 79 percent felt that market demand for their international skills was at a high level, and they were not subject to only one opportunity to work for the parent company, but could find similar and more satisfactory positions in other firms. Thus, determining how to enhance and strengthen repatriates' commitment to the organization also exists as a major problem in terms of turnover intention.

Lazarova and Caligiuri, (2001) point out that the reason why the turnover rate is high among repatriates is because most repatriates know they are inherently valuable to the company after finishing their international assignment, no doubt possessing a feeling of superiority. If the company assigns repatriates to a job that falls below their expectations, they may think of leaving and look for a more personally rewarding job and help establish and expand another MNC's international business due to their first-hand knowledge and precious experience in different markets.

In addition, previous studies on repatriation have suggested a variety of factors that affect whether expatriates remain with their company upon repatriation. Some of these factors include: being placed in non-challenging jobs, lack of promotion opportunities, lack of a future career plan, lack of support from managers and colleagues, and sluggish career advancement (Abueva, 2000; Black et al., 1992). Of these many factors, it seems apparent that the parent company does not satisfy or attempt to solve these problems upon return, thus lowering a repatriate's affective commitment to the organization. Harvey, (1989) suggests that if the potential repatriation problems are thoroughly considered by the MNC in advance, repatriate turnover will decrease.

Hypothesis Development

Job satisfaction vs. Turnover Intention

A great deal of previous research supports the relationship between job satisfaction and lower turnover rates (Trevor, 2001; Khilji & Wang, 2007; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Trevor (2001) determined that job satisfaction plays a major role in most theories on turnover while Amah (2009) points out that the various dimensions of job satisfaction and turnover intention are both obviously and negatively correlated. Hence, it is clear that increasing the repatriate's job satisfaction is paramount in attempting to reduce their intention to leave the company. Job satisfaction is the positive emotional response to a job situation resulting from attaining what the employee wants and values from a job (Olsen, 1993). In meta-analysis, Carsten and Spector (1987) found a significant negative correlation of $-.26$ between job satisfaction and turnover. Similarly, Hellman (1997) conducted a meta-analysis and found the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave was significantly different from zero and consistently negative.

Payment vs. Turnover Intention

Harrington et al. (2001) observed that emotional exhaustion; lower levels of intrinsic job satisfaction and dissatisfaction with salary and promotional opportunities were the main predictors for turnover intention. Chen et al. (2010) shows that job satisfaction is significantly negatively related to turnover intention, and the impact of which is reduced in the following order: work remuneration, working conditions, job prospects, working relationships, working environment and a few others. Further, in Chen et al. (2010), a study of 387 Chinese staff members in STS electronic company found that the main factor which will affect turnover intention for employees is payment. Black and Gregersen (1999) found that repatriates experience a modification of their compensation, generally downward due to loss of expatriate-based benefits, and this leads to a decrease in satisfaction as it impacts the readjustment process. Harvey (1989) also found the financial proclivities of repatriates in his research, which suggests that when repatriates make comparisons with those who have not had expatriate assignments, they become discouraged. Keeping this in mind, dissatisfied employees are more likely to leave an organization than satisfied employees. Hence, according to the determination of job satisfaction in terms of payment, the first hypothesis is:

H1: Job satisfaction in terms of payment is negatively related to turnover intention.

Nature of Work vs. Turnover Intention

Once expatriates live overseas for some time, they are bound to be influenced by the local environment and develop differences from their home countries, which may cause modifications in perceptions for the expatriates and have an impact on their repatriation adaptation (Black and Gregersen, 1992). In this case repatriates have to learn how to re-adapt themselves to their new jobs and relevant issues in their life, and the company plays an

important role in this regard. Morgan et al. (2004) found that repatriates display greater levels of satisfaction when they are assigned to what they consider a suitable position upon their return. In light of this however, Peltonen (1997) found that 60% of repatriates felt that the organization did not take into account their international experience or skills when placing them in their jobs upon return. Chen et al. (2010) tested job satisfaction factors that included: work characteristics, work remuneration, working environment, working relationship, working conditions, job prospects and so forth. In this study, work characteristics were considered one of the main factors that were negatively related to turnover intention. Therefore, offering a suitable and appropriate match of job position to a repatriates' knowledge or talent can further lower their turnover intention, leading to the following hypothesis:

H2: Job satisfaction with nature of work is negatively related to turnover intention.

Supervision vs. Turnover Intention

In general, the degree of autonomy and its relationship to responsibility enhances an employees' feeling of job satisfaction. Black and Gregersen (1991) suggest that when workers have less autonomy, worker performance is likely to decline due to task monotony or a perceived lack of skills. Similarly, employees on international assignments enjoy a large degree of autonomy and responsibility while abroad that they otherwise may not experience (Bossard & Peterson, 2005). Thus, upon return repatriates potentially lose some of their autonomy and may feel more stifled in their actions and options than when they were on international assignment. In this vein, Bonache (2005) found a significant relationship leading to greater dissatisfaction among repatriates compared to expatriates in terms of lack of autonomy in their jobs. Therefore we suggest that differences in supervision in terms of interpersonal skills and levels of autonomy can affect the employees' turnover intention. This train of thought applies to all employees in general which brings us to the next hypothesis:

H3: Job satisfaction in terms of supervision is negatively related to turnover intention.

Organizational Commitment vs. Turnover Intention

Before Porter et al. (1974), scholars focused on job satisfaction as the major cause of turnover. However, their study highlighted the importance of organizational commitment in explaining turnover and claimed that organizational commitment was a better predictor than job satisfaction and displayed a negative correlation to turnover intention. This is further evidenced in research as many other studies have found that organizational commitment, like job satisfaction, has been shown to be negatively related to turnover (e.g. Bluedorn, 1982; Porter et al, 1974; Peltonen, 1997). Wiener (1988) points out that organizational commitment is an ability to internalize the norms and allow the behavior to mesh with the organization's goals and interests. A high degree of organizational commitment may cause employee behavior to change within the following characteristics: (a) may reflect increased personal expense in the organization, (b) may reflect greater personal attention to the organization, and (c) may reflect time spent getting further involved in the organization. Furthermore, Feldman & Thompson

(1993) determined that a veteran's organizational commitment is higher than young expatriates, because young expatriates have no family responsibility or commitment, hence, if they are not satisfied with the job or company, they are more likely to change. Based on Bentein et al. (2005), the lower the affective and normative commitment, the higher the employees' turnover intention and the greater the possibility of real turnover, therefore bringing us to the following hypothesis:

H4: Job satisfaction with organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intention.

Attitude of Job-Hopping vs. Turnover Intention

Nowadays, as society and economy continues to evolve, changing jobs has become much more commonplace. It used to be that people would stay at a company for life. However recently, labor movement can not only increase personal working experience, but also allows for better use of talent and knowledge at other firms. In particular for expatriated or repatriated employees, due to the large financial investment of the company, their quitting would be considered a large monetary loss for the company. In Khatri et al., (2001), it was proposed that job-hopping is positively associated with turnover intention. The study found that the urge to job-hop was a significant contributor to turnover. Some have suggested the greater the instances or potential for job-hopping within a short time period, the higher the employees' turnover intention and potential negative attitude towards his/her company (Debrah, 1993). Therefore, the potential to change jobs in the future is related to the number of employment changes in the past for an employee, leading into the next hypothesis:

H5: The attitude of job-hopping is positively related to the turnover intention.

General Employees and Repatriates vs. Turnover Intention

While all employees are a considerable investment for a company, repatriates are generally considered managerial level and contain a special skill set based on their expatriate assignments. In addition, previous studies repeatedly point to the differences in levels of turnover suggesting rates of general employees at 5-10% and repatriates between 15-40% and sometimes estimated as high as 50% (Black 1988; GMAC, 2004). The variation in turnover intention between the two groups of employees suggests that repatriates encounter significant differences upon their return, separate from the general concerns of regular employment. Adler (1981) and Abueva (2000) provide some significant reasons which can affect an expatriate's desire to leave the company upon their return, which include being placed in a substandard position, lack of independence, position autonomy, lack of enterprise planning and tutorship, lack of support from supervisors and colleagues, and slow promotion opportunities. Even though general employees might have similar reasons for turnover and concerns in terms of employment, Black et al. (1992) found that repatriated managers and supervisors quit their jobs at almost two times the rate of domestic or general employees. However, to date, there is a lack of empirical studies comparing the difference between repatriates and general

employees' turnover intention in the Taiwanese electronic industry. Through previous studies and comparisons, a significant difference in turnover intention has been relatively consistent, which leads us to our final hypothesis:

H6: There is a significant difference in turnover intention between repatriates and general employees.

Methodology

Sample

This study examines the turnover intention of two groups of employees, general and repatriates, from the highly competitive and international electronics market located in Taiwan. Furthermore, the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job-hopping are analyzed in determining their impact on turnover intention and finally compared between the two groups. The electronics market is an excellent market for testing these hypotheses as it contains many global electronics firms with international operations. Thus, to test the hypotheses empirically, 24 electronics companies located in Taiwan, which conduct international business with international holdings, were selected and questionnaires were distributed personally and additionally by email between September 2011 and November 2011. A total of 600 questionnaires (25 per company with 24 companies) with 500 returned representing a return rate of 83%. From the 500 responses returned 449 (89.8%) of them were considered valid, with 51 being removed due to duplication of answers, nonsensical responses and overt repetition of a certain response. The returned questionnaires displayed a satisfactory breakdown between respondents with repatriates at 138 (30.7%) and general employees representing 311 (69.3%) respondents.

Variable Measurement

The dependent variable in this study is turnover intention, and it was measured using a single indicator on a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree). This variable has been used in previous studies to determine the turnover intention of employees and is supported in Cummann et al. (1979). The five independent variables are separated into job satisfaction determinants: payment (PAY), nature of work (NOW), supervision (SUP), organizational commitment: organizational commitment (OC) and turnover attitude: job-hopping (JH). They were also tested using a 5-point Likert scale through the use of multiple indicators to enhance accuracy of the measures. To test for the potential of multicollinearity among the independent variables it was assessed by examining the variance inflation factor (VIF). As the VIF is lower than 2, there is no significant existence of multicollinearity in this analysis. To test for internal validity a reliability analysis was performed and the result shows a high reliability among the detected factors. Cronbach's alpha was over 0.80 for most of the factors, and one for a construct exceeding 0.90 as shown in the Appendix. Hence, all reliability coefficients met the generally accepted norms of 0.60 and above to be regarded as reliable measures (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Finally, in order to avoid complex linear issues, a

relevant Pearson analysis was undertaken to discover the relevance between the various variables to avoid common method bias, and to fully ensure the validity of the data. Findings from the tests determined that common method bias is not significantly evident in this study.

Results

In order to test the hypotheses in this study, the sample was split into two separate groups for analysis. This study conducted a hierarchical regression analysis by building the following regression model: Regression of TI on PAY, NOW, SUP, OC, JH and the control variables. Table 1 provided the repatriates' results of Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3. In Model 1 only the control variables were included and was considered statistically significant (F=4.803, P<0.01). Model 2 provided the result of the regression analysis including job satisfaction with payment, nature of work, supervision and organizational commitment in the analysis. The results show that gender, education level and organizational commitment are significant variables. This model tested at F=4.771 and is significant (P<0.01). Model 3 depicts the results of regression analysis, where the attitude of job-hopping has been added. The results suggested that the attitude of job-hopping has no significance, but the model was statistically significant, because F=4.403 and this is significant (P<0.01).

	Model-1					Model-2					Model-3				
	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF
(Constant)	2.331	-	7.577	.000	1.453	3.471	-	6.449	.000	1.404	3.404	-	5.818	.000	1.515
Age	-.13	-.13	-.77	.442	1.071	-.14	-.14	-.92	.351	1.192	-.14	-.14	-.92	.351	1.112
Gender	.138	.138	1.479	.000	1.071	.144	.144	1.592	.000	1.107	.141	.141	1.541	.000	1.118
MS	-.35	-.35	-.79	.430	1.212	-.32	-.32	-.92	.330	1.207	-.32	-.32	-.92	.330	1.212
EL	1.05	.925	4.449	.000	1.212	.92	.92	4.139	.000	1.118	.93	.93	4.139	.000	1.164
YA	.24	.24	.49	.629	1.208	.24	.24	.49	.629	1.313	.24	.24	.49	.629	1.313
JC	.07	.07	.14	.889	1.269	.07	.07	.14	.889	1.117	.07	.07	.14	.889	1.227
ET	.183	.183	.86	.390	1.717	.197	.197	.94	.349	1.818	.182	.182	.86	.390	1.818
RT	.33	.33	3.783	.000	1.583	.374	.374	4.528	.000	1.528	.372	.372	4.528	.000	1.549
LC	.469	.469	3.992	.000	1.515	.504	.504	4.489	.000	1.515	.502	.502	4.371	.000	1.515
PAY	.0	.0	.05	.97	1.555	.07	.07	.09	.936	1.666	.04	.04	.50	.936	1.668
NOW	.02	.02	.387	.701	1.231	.05	.05	.97	.331	1.212	.05	.05	.93	.331	1.212
SUP	.027	.027	.26	.793	1.031	.054	.054	.54	.788	1.477	.057	.057	.56	.788	1.488
OC	.06	.06	.451	.651	1.022	.00	.00	.235	.811	1.105	.05	.05	.843	.651	1.111
JH	.057	.057	.27	.781	1.099	.00	.00	.00	.991	1.138	.00	.00	.241	.991	1.411
	.007	.007	.11	.911	1.018	.01	.01	.399	.673	1.073	.002	.002	.09	.673	1.075
	.005	.005	.06	.843	1.018	.017	.017	.2047	.843	1.138	.01	.01	.60	.843	1.144
	.005	.005	.11	.781	1.069	.016	.016	.39	.671	1.088	.016	.016	.19	.671	1.089

	.189	0.006	1.604			.149	2.025	1.292	63.673	1.616	6.107	9.127	06.717	1.617	
	.003		.072			.014	-.12	-.03	.624	1.139	.013	.04	.306	.467	
						-.109	.12	1.403	.044	1.724	-.11	-.04	.66	.81	
						.046	.039	.492	.037	.037	.037	.037	.466	.6	
						-.199	.19	-.03	.07	.07	-.03	-.03	.6	.6	
						.209	.208	2.038	.029	.029	.198	.198	2.030	2.030	
									.026	.026	.026	.026	.298	.298	
	R-square=.257, Adj.R-square=.203, F value=4.803***					R-square=.339, Adj.R-square=.268, F value=4.771***					R-square=.339, Adj.R-square=.262, F value=4.403***				

a) F-value***:0.01

b) Dependent variable: Turnover intention (TI)

c) OC: organizational commitment; NOW: nature of work; PAY: payment; TI: turnover intention; SUP: supervision; JH: job-hopping; MS: marital status; EL: educational level; YA: year age; JC: job category; ET: expatriated time; RT: repatriated time; LC: location

Table 1: Results of hierarchical regression analysis of repatriates

Table 2 provided the general employees' results through Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3. Similar to Table 1, it contains only the control variables. Through the results, there was one significant variable (Age), however the model is not significant as $F=1.606$ ($P>0.01$). Model 2 provided the result of the regression analysis including job satisfaction with payment, nature of work, supervision and organizational commitment into analysis. The results show that both payment and nature of work are significant variables. This model has a value of $F=3.858$ and is significant ($P<0.01$). Model 3 depicts the results of the regression analysis, with the addition of job-hopping. The results determine that the attitude of job-hopping, payment and nature of work are significant, and this model was statistically significant ($F=4.403$; $P<0.01$).

	Model-1					Model-2					Model-3				
	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF	B	Std .B	T	Sig .	VIF
(Const	3.4		15.4	.0		4.2		13.7	.0		3.2		8.9	.0	

ant)	34	-	67	00	2.0	16	-	17	00	2.1	45	-	23	00	2.1			
Age	-	.20	-	.0	05	-	.12	-	.1	44	-	.12	-	.1	44			
Gender	.18	6	2.57	10	1.0	.11	3	1.54	23	1.0	.11	7	1.6	01	1.0			
r	5	-	7	.4	68	0	-	7	.6	93	4	-	46	.4	97			
MS	-	.04	-	42	1.3	-	.02	-	16	1.3	-	.04	-	22	1.3			
EL	.11	5	.770	.2	13	.07	9	.502	.4	60	.11	4	.80	.4	60			
YA	1	-	-	70	1.5	1	-	-	81	1.5	0	-	4	33	1.5			
JC	-	.07	1.10	.6	26	-	.04	.705	.3	78	-	.04	-	.3	78			
PAY	.16	1	5	15	2.1	.10	5	.943	46	2.2	.11	8	.78	28	2.2			
NOW	3	.03	.503	.8	80	2	.06	-	.6	40	0	.06	5	.8	45			
SUP	.04	5	-	56	1.2	.08	4	.439	61	1.3	.08	5	.98	15	1.3			
OC	5	-	.182	.3	92	2	-	-	.4	07	2	-	0	.5	08			
JH	-	.01	-	11		-	.03	.720	72	1.4	-	.01	-	38	1.4			
	.01	5	1.01			.03	6	-	.0	12	.01	8	.23	.0	27			
	3	-	5			1	-	2.66	.08	1.7	6	-	4	.24	1.8			
	-	.06				-	.04	2	.0	06	-	.03	-	.0	37			
	.15	5				.10	5	-	.01	1.0	.08	7	.61	.45	1.0			
	5					6	-	3.27	.9	43	8	-	7	.8	45			
						-	.17	1	52	1.6	-	.14	-	89	1.6			
						.17	2	.060	.2	01	.14	3	2.2	.5	33			
						1	-	1.23	17		2	-	74	.41	1.1			
						-	.23	7			-	.14	-	.0	38			
						.20	2				.12	4	2.0	.00				
						5	.00				7	-	16					
						.00	3				-	.00	-					
						3	.08				.00	8	.14					
						.08	5				6	.04	0					
						0					.03	1	.61					
											9	.26	2					
											.28	0	4.6					
											0		35					
	R-square=.031,			Adj.R-			R-square=.114,			Adj.R-			R-square=.173,			Adj.R-		
	square=.012,						square=.084,						square=.143,					
	F value=1.606						F value=3.858***						F value=5.700***					

a) F-value***:0.01

b) Dependent variable: Turnover intention (TI)

c) OC: organizational commitment; NOW: nature of work; PAY: payment; TI: turnover intention; SUP: supervision; JH: job-hopping; MS: marital status; EL: educational level; YA: year age; JC: job category; ET: expatriated time; RT: repatriated time; LC: location

Table 2: Results of hierarchical regression analysis of general employees

Discussion and Managerial Implications

As displayed in Tables 1 and 2, and a comparison of their results allows us to determine that the payment of general employees is negative and significant ($p < .05$), but not for repatriates. The result then suggests support for H1 with respect to general employees but rejected for repatriates. This is rather surprising as the repatriates display no significant link between payment and turnover intention, although does coincide with some other studies with similar findings (Bonache, 2005). However, this has proven to be a very important factor for general employees in terms of maintaining their current employment. A potential explanation here is that most repatriates are well rewarded upon return and land in a capacity that provides substantial financial support, thus lessening it as a factor in seeking new employment. On the other hand, general employees are to a greater degree subject to the financial aspect of their position based on industry comparisons, and should they be paid less than what they believe they should, they will turn their attention to changing employment. Additionally, due to the experience and knowledge gained from an international assignment, base payment becomes less of a concern for repatriates as they can more easily assess their value in international terms.

For the second hypothesis, the results of nature of work indicate, similar to payment, that for general employees it is significant ($p < .05$), but not for repatriates, thus supporting H2 for general employees but rejecting it for repatriates. The above reasoning for payment may also extend to nature of work. As expatriates are repatriated, when they get back to work, they will find a huge difference in their nature of work, but that is to be expected upon return from an international assignment. Perhaps in some way it is a bit more relaxing as there is less pressure initially, allowing the repatriate breathing room or time to re-adapt without undue work stress. For general employees, boredom with their tasks may lead to exploring other options, and without being challenged they may pursue other avenues of employment.

The third hypothesis is the result of supervision which shows no significance for either repatriates or general employees ($p > .05$), thus leading us to reject Hypothesis 3 for both groups. We can find no correlation between the supervision of employees and their turnover intention. While in many cases the 'bad boss' is a factor in terms of changing companies, in this study we see no evidence supporting this scenario as a significant factor leading to turnover intention. This may be due to the current economic challenges faced and fear of losing a job or possibly the cultural inclination to value higher level employees' wisdom and accept it at face value, thus rendering this statistical result in this study.

The variable of organizational commitment with repatriates is negative and significant ($p < .05$), but not for general employees. The link between organizational commitment for repatriates is strong and relates to their expertise. They are considered valuable, having acquired experience in a different country/work environment. Thus, the stronger their link to the company in terms of commitment, the less likely they will plan to leave. By taking on an international assignment,

repatriates have the opportunity to expand their own networks and potentially feel out other opportunities. This position of being in demand places more of a strain or emphasis on the commitment level of the repatriate to the employer. For general employees, the commitment level is less about the organization itself and more about pay and nature of work, as seen above among other general benefits. The result shows support for hypothesis 4 for repatriates, but rejected for general employees.

In hypothesis 5, the variable of job-hopping, the study finds that for general employees it is negative and significant ($<.05$), but not for repatriates. This may be due to repatriates being more committed to the organization, one of the reasons they were chosen for international assignment perhaps, and less likely to job hop. For general employees, a lack of satisfaction with the status-quo and the ability for lateral movement within the domestic market make it more likely for them to look for better or different alternatives. Hence, the aspect of job-hopping for repatriates is not supported in terms of this study, although for general employees it is a significant factor in turnover intention, thus we support H5 for general employees, but reject it for repatriates.

Hypothesis 6 suggests that “Repatriates and general employees have a strong and significant difference in turnover intention”, and as can be seen from Table 3 the result denotes that it is not significant ($P>.05$).

Groups	N	Mean	Std.D	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
Repatriates	138	2.94	1.251	-1.707	.089
General employees	311	3.16	1.240		

Dependent variable: Turnover intention

Table 3: Result of T-test analysis between repatriates and general employees

Thus, in terms of this study, we posit that hypothesis 6 is to be rejected and repatriates and general employees’ turnover intention are not significantly different. This is an extremely surprising result in this context as previous studies have repeatedly denoted a difference between the two groups of employees with repatriates consistently showing a much higher turnover rate (Black 1988; GMAC, 2004). This lack of significance in displaying a difference between the two groups leads to a confusing result and suggests that further analysis is required to determine the reason behind this result. Conventional wisdom from previous studies suggests that there should be a difference, although we can only hazard a guess as to some of the potential factors leading to such an unexpected finding. Potential factors may include a cultural based contextual component, economic uncertainty leading to higher retention rates, or others that require further development. However, in essence, this study finds that the main thrust of a differentiation of turnover intent is insignificant between these two groups, although differences leading to their turnover intention are apparent and significant.

In summary, for general employees this study finds three factors significantly influencing turnover intention (payment, nature of work and job hopping). These three factors tend to reflect daily concerns of general employees as they are generally comparable across an industry and will lead to a greater interest in either feeling valued, or seeking other opportunities. These findings are not surprising as they follow previous literature in terms of job satisfaction and its linkage to turnover intention (Chen 2010; Vidal et al. 2007). On the other hand, none of the three factors attributed to general employees intent to leave are identified as significant determinants for repatriates turnover intention.

Only one factor was determined as significant for repatriates in this study and that was organizational commitment. Fomenting greater organizational commitment in repatriates is suggested as the main method in reducing turnover intent, as opposed to pay or nature of work. In this vein, similar to other research (Bonache 2005; Lee and Liu, 2006), we see that while increasing pay and using repatriates knowledge effectively are important, the greater need is to establish a strong bond between the employee and the employer. Enhancing employee commitment to the organization can go a long way to retaining their services.

Conclusion and Limitations

This study is aimed at providing enterprises with a solution to retain the talents of general employees and repatriates who are endowed with a wealth of overseas experiences. It would be much easier for repatriates to prepare to face the impact upon return if they and their companies communicated with each other more frequently (Black et al., 1992). The results suggest that the association between employees and their turnover intention is at last partially explained by the variables of payment, nature of work, supervision, organizational commitment and attitude of job-hopping

Human resource management has become much more complex in striving to provide the greatest benefit to employees and engender feelings of job satisfaction. With the increased freedom of movement of labor and boundless access to information, employees have a myriad of ways to find alternative employment and to compare current positions to others. Payment, nature of work and job-hopping will continue to be important aspects of any position and companies need to perform their own due diligence if they wish to retain employees over the long term.

This study has three main limitations. Firstly, only four job related factors (payment, nature of work, supervision, organizational commitment) were used as potential determinants of job satisfaction. Secondly, the sample size of this study is relatively small. Although over 500 questionnaires were sent out, only 138 responses were from repatriates. Hence, we recommend that in future research on turnover intention, more factors should be added that have potential influence on turnover intention such as individual characteristics, supervisor related factors and job characteristics. Finally, the study took place within only one country, Taiwan, and comparisons to different areas and various cultural situations may not be adequately represented by this study.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund of 2012.

References

- Abelson, M. (1987). Examination of avoidable and unavoidable turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 72(383).
- Abueva, J.E. (2000). Many repatriations fail, at huge cost to companies. *New York Times*, May, 17(E1).
- Adler, N.J. (1981). Re-entry: Managing cross-cultural transitions. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 6, 341-356.
- Amah, O.E. (2009). Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention Relationship: The Moderating Effect of Job Role Centrality and Life Satisfaction. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 17(1), 24-35.
- Bentein, K., Vandenberg, R., Vandenberghe, C., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The Role of Change in the Relationship Between Commitment and Turnover: A Latent Growth Modeling Approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (3), 468–482.
- Black, J.S. (1988). Work role transitions: A study of American expatriate managers in Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 119, 277-94.
- Black, J.S., & Gregersen H.B., (1991). When Yankee comes home: factors related to expatriate and spouse repatriation adjustment. *Journal of International Business Studies*. 22(4), 671–98.
- Black, J.S., & Gregersen, H.B., (1999). The right way to manage expats” *Harvard Business Review*, 77(2), 52-63.
- Black, J.S., Gregersen, H.B., & Mendenhall, M.E. (1992). *Global Assignments”* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982) . A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35:2, 135-153.
- Bonache J. (2005) . Job satisfaction among expatriates, repatriates and domestic employees. *Personnel Review*; 34(1),110–24.
- Bossard, A.B., & Peterson, R.B. (2005). The repatriate experience as seen by American expatriate. *Journal of World Business*; 40,9–28.
- Brewster C., & Suutari V. (2005). Global HRM: aspects of a research agenda. *Personnel Review*; 34(1), 5–21.
- Carrel, M., Elbert, N., & Hatfield, R. (1995), *Human Resource Management* (5th ed.). *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall*.
- Carsten, J.M. and Spector, P.E. (1987). Unemployment, job satisfaction, and employee turnover: a meta-analytic test of the Muchinsky model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 374-9.
- Chang, J. (2006) .Organizational commitment and turnover intention of Taiwanese Engineers in Hi-Tech Industry of Southern Taiwan: Examining the selected antecedents of organizational commitment. *National Cheng Kung University IMBA Program*, Dec. 14th
- Chen, L. T., Chen, C. W., & Chen, C. Y. (2010). Are educational background and gender

- moderator variables for leadership, satisfaction and organizational commitment?. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(2), 248-261
- Cotton, J and Tuttle, J (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implication for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (1), 55-70.
- Cummann C, Fichman M, Jenkins D, & Klesh J (1979). The Michigan organisational assessment questionnaire. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Danserau, F.J., Cashman, J.F. and Graen, G. (1974). Expectancy as a moderator of the relationship between job attitudes and turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*; 50,228–9.
- Debrah, Y. (1993). Strategies for coping with employee retention problems in small and medium enterprises in Singapore. *Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Change*, 2(2), 143-172.
- De Loach, R. (2003) . Job satisfaction among hospice interdisciplinary team members. *American Journal of Hospital Palliative Care*, November- December, 20(6), 434-40.
- Dowling, P.J & Schuler, R, S., (1990) .International Dimensions of Human Resource Management, *Boston MA: PWS-Kent*.
- Downes, M., & Thomas, A. S., (1999). Managing overseas assignments to build organizational knowledge. *Human Resource Planning*, 22(4), 33-48.
- Dickter, D.N., Roznowski, M. and Harrison, D.A. (1996) .Temporal tempering: an event history analysis of the process of voluntary turnovers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*; 81,705–16.
- Eugenia, S., Raquel, S. and Isabel, B. (2007) .Antecedents of repatriates' job satisfaction and its influence on turnover intentions: Evidence from Spanish repatriated managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 60 ,1272-1281.
- Feldman, D.C., & Thompson, H.B. (1993). Expatriation, repatriation, domestic geographical relocation: An empirical investigation of adjustment to new job assignments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24, 507-529.
- Ferguson, G. H. and Ferguson, W.F. (1986).Distinguishing Voluntary from Involuntary, Nurse Turnover. *Nursing management*, 17(12),43-44.
- Fink, G., Meierewert, S. & Rohr, U. (2005).The use of repatriate knowledge in organizations”, *HR. Human Resource Planning*, 28 (4),30-36.
- GMAC Global Relocation Services, National Foreign Trade Council, and SHRM Global Forum. (2004). Global relocation trends: 2003/2004 survey report. Oak Brook, IL: Author.
- Gomez-Mejia, Louis & Balkin, David. (1987). Determinants of managerial satisfaction with the expatriation and repatriation process. *Journal of Management Development*, 6(1), 7-17.
- Gregersen, H. B. & Stroh, L.K. (1997). Coming home to the Arctic cold: Antecedents to finish expatriate and spouse repatriation adjustment. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(3), 461-485.
- Hackman, J. R., Pearce, J. L., & Wolfe, J. C. (1978).Effects of changes in job characteristics on work attitudes and behaviors: A naturally-occurring quasi-experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21, 289-304.
- Harrington, D., Bean, N., Pintello, D., & Mathews, D. (2001). Job satisfaction and burnout: Predictors of intentions to leave a job in a military setting. *Administration in Social Work*, 25(3), 1-16.
- Harvey, M. (1989).Repatriation of Corporate Executives: An Empirical Study. *Journal of*

- International Business Studies*, 20, 131-44.
- Hellman, C. M. (1997). Job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137(6), 667-689.
- Herzberg, F. (1956). Job Attitudes: Review and Opinion. *Pittsburg, PA: Psychological Services of Pittsburgh*.
- Hodson, R. (1991). Workplace Behaviors: Good Soldiers, Smooth Operators, and Saboteurs," *Work and Occupations*, 18(3), 271-290.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper.
- Hurn, B.J. (1999). Repatriation: the toughest assignment of all. *Industrial and Commercial Training*: 31 (6), 224–8.
- Ilies, R. & Judge, T.A. (2003). On the heritability of job satisfaction: the mediating role of personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 750-9.
- Johnson, G. & Johnson, W. (2002). Perceived over-qualification and dimensions of job satisfaction: a longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Psychology*. 134, 537–55.
- Khatri, N., Budhwar, P & Fern, C.T., (2001). Explaining employee turnover in an Asian context. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 11(1), 54-74
- Khilji, S.E. & Wang, X. (2007). New evidence in an old debate: Investigative the relationship between HR satisfaction and turnover. *International Business Review* 16, 377-395.
- Koh, H. C. & Goh, C. T. (1995). An analysis of the factors affecting the turnover intention of non-managerial clerical staff: a Singapore study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(1), 103-125.
- Koustelios, A., Kouli, O. & Theodorakis, N. (2003). Job security and job Satisfaction among Greek fitness instructors. *Percept. Mot. Skills*, 97(1), 185-200
- Lan, L. (1996). Antecedents and consequences of expatriate satisfaction: an empirical investigation of hotel managers in Pacific Asian countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*; 27(2), 438–9.
- Laschinger, H.K.S., Shamian, J., & Thomson, D. (2001). Impact of magnet hospital characteristics on nurses' perceptions of trust, burnout, quality of care, and work satisfaction. *Nursing Economics*, 19, 209-219
- Lazarova, M. & Caligiuri, P. (2000). Retaining global leaders through organizational support programs: A test of the psychological contract. In P. M. Caligiuri (Chair) *International HR strategies for developing and retaining global leaders*. Symposium presented at the 60th Annual Academy of Management Meeting, Toronto, Canada.
- Lazarova, M. & Caligiuri, P. (2001). The influence of social interaction and social support on female expatriates' cross-cultural adjustment. In P. M. Caligiuri (Chair) *Female expatriates: New insights and trends*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA, USA.
- Lee, H.W. & Liu, C.H. (2006). The Determinants of Repatriate Turnover Intentions: An Empirical Analysis. *International Journal of Management*; 23(4), 751-762.
- Lee, T.W., Mitchell, T.R., Holton, B.C., McDaniel, L.S., & Hill, J.W. (1999). The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: a replication and extension. *The Academy of Management Journal*; 42, 450–62.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98.

- Morgan L.O., Nie W., Young S. (2004). Operational factors as determinants of expatriate and repatriate success. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*; 24(12),1247–68.
- Napier, N., & Peterson, R. B. Expatriate Re-entry: What do repatriates have to say?. *Human Resource Planning*, 14 (1) (1991), 39-42.
- Naumann, E., (1992). A conceptual model of expatriate turnover. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 499-529.
- Ngo, T.N.H., (2009). A study on factors influencing employee turnover intention. *Master's thesis from Shu-Te University*, no.35
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *Journal of Higher Education*; 64, 453–71.
- Peltonen, T. (1997). Facing rankings from the past: a tournament perspective on repatriate career mobility. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*; 8(1), 107–23.
- Porter, L., Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*; 80(2), 151–76.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., & Boulian, R.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 19,475-479.
- Price, J. L. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International
- Suutari, V., & Brewster, C. (2003). Repatriation: empirical evidence from a longitudinal study of careers and expectations among Finnish expatriates. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*; 14(7), 1132–51.
- Testa, M.R. (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and effort in the service environment. *Journal of Psychology*; 15(2), 226–36.
- Tett, R.P., & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: path analyses based on meta-analytical findings. *Personnel Psychology*; 46, 259–93.
- Trevor, C.O. (2001). Interactions among actual ease-of-movement determinants and job satisfaction. *Academic Management Journal*; 44(4),621–38.
- Vidal, E.S., Valle, R.S. & Aragon, I.B. (2007). Antecedents of repatriates' job satisfaction and its influence on turnover intentions: evidence from Spanish repatriated managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 1272-1281.
- Vroom, V.H (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York:Wiley.
- Wiener, Y. (1988). Form of Value Systems: A Focus on Organizational Effectiveness and Cultural Change and Maintenance. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 534-537.
- Yan, A., Zhu, G. & Hall, D.T. (2002). International Assignments for Career Building: A Model Agency Relationships and Psychological Contracts. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 373-391.