

NOT ALL LEAVING IS CREATED EQUAL:
DIFFERENTIATING THE ANTECEDENTS OF CHANGING ORGANIZATIONS
VERSUS SWITCHING OCCUPATIONS

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science

by
Huisi Li
May 2015

© 2015 Huisi Li

ABSTRACT

The process of leaving an organization versus an occupation is an important but under-studied approach in turnover research. Drawing from focus-congruence approach and using a sample of 2,382 teachers in rural China, results show that organizational and occupational turnover intentions are distinct constructs and relate differently to antecedents. Specifically, relationships between factors with an *organizational* focus (i.e., leader support, colleague support, and material support for work) and organizational turnover intentions are significantly stronger than those between these factors and occupational turnover intentions, whereas relationships between factors with an *occupational* focus (i.e., occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and occupational choice motivations) and occupational turnover intentions are significantly stronger than those between these factors and organizational turnover intentions. Results illuminate the growing teacher shortage in China, emphasize the importance of accurate specification of foci of work attitudes, and show that employee movement varies in a richer fashion than the stay-leave criterion routinely deployed.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Huisi (Jessica) Li is a MS/PhD student of human resource studies at Cornell University. She earned her M.A. in international comparative education in 2013 from Stanford University and her M.S. in industrial/organizational psychology in 2012 from Peking University. She studies employee turnover and its effects on team stability and performance, as well as communication processes within multinational teams.

This thesis is dedicated to my mother Ms. Yanying Shen.

謹以此論文獻給我的母親沈彥英女士。

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my advisor Professor John Hausknecht for his wisdom, patience, engagement, and encouragement through my learning process of this master thesis. Furthermore I would like to thank Professor Michael Sturman for his very thorough, constructive, and helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. I would also like to acknowledge the financial and intellectual support from both the Graduate School of Education at Stanford University and the ILR School at Cornell University. I am also grateful to my family and friends, especially to Xiaomu Lin, for standing by me in my hard times during this work and beyond.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Theoretical Background.....	5
Hypotheses	8
Method	14
Results	18
Discussion.....	23
References.....	30
Appendices	45

NOT ALL LEAVING IS CREATED EQUAL:
DIFFERENTIATING THE ANTECEDENTS OF CHANGING ORGANIZATIONS VERSUS
SWITCHING OCCUPATIONS

Introduction

Teacher Shortage in Rural China

The teacher shortage in rural China has become a full-blown crisis. Between 2000 and 2013, stocks of full-time primary school teachers in rural China dropped by 44 percent (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2000, 2014). Despite the fact that there has been a considerable decrease in the number of rural students, and even though various national endeavors exist to recruit teachers, teacher turnover still severely hinders course offerings (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2008) and exacerbates already-low performance among high poverty schools (McLaurin, Smith, & Smillie, 2009). For example, a rural school in Western China has, on average, less than one English teacher (0.2) and less than one music teacher (0.1; Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2014). Rural teacher shortages have the added consequences of escalating the financial costs of recruiting and training replacement teachers (Neild, Useem, Travers, & Lesnick, 2003), impeding procedural consistency (Neild, et al., 2003), exacerbating social inequality and income gaps (Peske & Haycock, 2006), and curbing student academic performance, even for children in classrooms where teachers remain (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). Moreover, in the context of rural-to-urban labor migration, and given national resident policies in China, the scenario contributes to the education problem of an estimated 61 million "left-behind" children (i.e., 22% of all Chinese

children) who must stay in rural areas while their migrant worker parents travel to or live in large cities to work.

Organizational and Occupational Turnover

Interestingly, two related but distinct problems simultaneously contribute to teacher shortage in rural China: *teacher migration*, which occurs when teachers move from rural to urban schools, and *teacher attrition*, which occurs when teachers leave the teaching profession altogether to pursue other lines of work (Johnson, Berg, & Donaldson, 2005). More formally, teacher migration fits the traditional definition of *organizational turnover* (i.e., people leaving organizations, regardless of whether they stay or leave their occupations), whereas teacher attrition is consistent with definitions of *occupational turnover* (i.e., people leaving their occupations, regardless of whether they stay or leave their organizations). Although rarely recognized, these two types of employee movement are conceptually distinct and likely have different antecedents.

Drawing from U.S. data, teacher turnover patterns show that departures were fairly evenly split between those moving to a different school (around 7.4% annually between 1987 and 2000) and those leaving the teaching occupation entirely (around 7%; Ingersoll, 2003). Thus, occupational turnover actually represents a considerable portion of employee mobility, yet has received scant attention (alone, and even less so when considered simultaneously with organizational turnover). Thus, from a conceptual standpoint, and as exemplified by the emergent teacher mobility patterns as evidenced in modern-day China, employee movement varies in a richer fashion than the traditional, undifferentiated, “stay-or-leave” categorization that is typical in the general turnover literature (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012). Thus, the teacher shortage in rural China likely requires researchers and policy makers to consider teachers’

organizational and occupational turnover simultaneously to identify which factors drive each type of employee decision. If such antecedent conditions differ, researchers could predict employee movement more accurately, while policy makers could better target interventions to tackle the social and economic problems caused by teacher shortages in China and elsewhere.

At present, we know very little about where people go when leaving their current position (e.g., to a different organization but within the same occupation, same organization but different occupation, or different organization and occupation). Current U.S.-based turnover scholarship largely limits its focus to organizational turnover, leaving unanswered questions about occupational movement (Lane, Mathews, & Presholdt, 1988; Woo & Maertz, 2012). However, the distinct decisions processes of leaving an organization versus an occupation are likely to be quite different. Treating organizational and occupational turnover as synonymous ignores the potentially markedly different etiologies of these phenomena. As a result, the differentiated relationships of various antecedents with organizational and occupational turnover are unknown. This represents a critical gap in our knowledge, one that is important to address because studying destinations of leaving (different organizations or new occupations) informs researchers about the relevant pre-turnover work attitudes and decision processes contributing to each type of movement (Hom et al, 2012). Thus, providing empirical evidence to substantiate the distinctiveness of organizational and occupational turnover in their nomological networks is much needed.

Study Purpose

This study contributes to understanding the teacher shortage phenomenon in China by empirically examining organizational and occupational intentions and their relevant antecedents. Guided by the foci-congruence approach (Klein, Molley, & Brinsfield, 2012), I studied a range

of organization- and occupation-focused factors using provincially-representative surveys of 2,382 primary and junior secondary school teachers in the Gansu Province¹, a northwestern interior province of China. This large sample of teachers is particularly relevant and appropriate because the distinction between organizational and occupational turnover is highly meaningful in the setting, as indicated by the clear distinction between teacher migration and teacher attrition in the education literature (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Moreover, this offers a great opportunity to understand this large-scale occupational labor mobility under the current market economy reformation. Although a fluid labor force is widely recognized to be highly beneficial to advanced liberal economies, the case in China is complicated by the vast and increasing social inequality, especially access to quality education. From a practical standpoint, to provide solid ground for intervention, researchers and policy makers would benefit from understanding those factors that respectively influence a person's organizational or occupational turnover. Although the Chinese government has been trying different interventions, such as subsidized bonuses, pay-for-performance, and social security (Ministry of Education, 2008), it is unclear whether these policies effectively control organizational turnover, occupational turnover, neither, or both. This study can shed light on those factors most responsible for each type of employee movement.

¹ Lying between the Tibetan and Huangtu plateaus, most areas of Gansu are plateau and mountainous. It shares many similarities in terms of climate, geography, economic, and social conditions with other provinces classified as being in the northwestern China, including Inner Mongolia, Ningxia, Qinghai, Shaanxi, and Xinjiang. As the second poorest among all provinces in China, Gansu's average rural per capita net annual income was only RMB 1, 852 (about \$ 300), during data collection in 2004 (Gansu agriculture economy information net, 2009).

Theoretical Background

Perspective of Multiple Foci of Work Attitudes

Although turnover research largely neglects the different targets of turnover intentions, studies on various other work attitudes, such as commitment, identification, attachment, satisfaction, person-environment fit, all show the value of explicitly and clearly specifying the foci of attitudes (Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011, Porter & Steers, 1973; Riketta & Dick, 2005; Van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Foci refer to the specific targets to which a bond is formed—for example, to organizations, occupations, supervisors, work teams, projects, or professional associations (Becker, 1992; Cohen, 2003; Reichers, 1985). For example, people hold differing levels of commitment across a range of workplace targets, such as supervisors (Becker et al., 1996), work goals (Klein et al., 2012), organizational programs (Klein, Wesson, Hollenbeck, Wright, & DeShon, 2001; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), regional entities (Scott & Timmerman, 1999), union (Conlon & Gallagher, 1987), and careers (Ellemers, de Gilder, & van den Heuvel, 1998). Individuals commit to multiple foci because they have multiple social roles and reference groups to whom they refer to when making judgments (Gouldner 1957, 1958). Further, meta-analytic data reveals that organizational and occupational commitment, although correlated ($r = 0.42$, $p < .05$), still are distinct constructs (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In a recent review, Klein, et al. (2012) argued that commitment to different foci represent different constructs and argued that some targets (e.g. team and team goal) are more interconnected while others (e.g., employer and a profession) are largely distinct (Klein et al, 2012).

Further, according to social identity theory (Tajfel, 1972; Turner, 1982), employees can belong to multiple groups and hold multiple social identities simultaneously (Hogg & Terry,

2000). A person can identify with an organization, divisions or teams within organization, and occupations that transcend organizations (Hogg & Terry, 2000). Identity-driven behaviors have important implications for turnover (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Riketta, 2005), as subjective beliefs about one's social identity influence the possibility of social mobility and social change (Hogg & Terry, 2000). Because employees have both organizational and occupational identities, and potentially different beliefs related to each, they can form separate organizational and occupational turnover intentions.

Applying the multiple foci logic to turnover suggests that turnover intentions should also be refined to reflect more complex attachments to multiple foci, which is not evident in previous global approaches to studying general turnover intentions. Typically in turnover research (Mobley, 1977; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979), turnover intentions have been operationalized with respect to the *job*, for example, asking how often an employee thinks about quitting his or her job and how likely he or she would be to search for an alternative job. As such, referring to job as the target of one's attitude confounds the attitude toward one's organization and that toward one's occupation, the two of which, though both related to one's current position or job, are likely quite different. In fact, close inspection of turnover intentions scales (e.g., Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999) indicates that the items measure both organizational and occupational turnover intentions and thus may lead to construct contamination. In sum, turnover intentions can be usefully disaggregated to reflect multiple foci.

Differentiating Turnover Intentions Antecedents

Differentiating organizational and occupational turnover intentions allows for careful examination of antecedents that may bear stronger relationships with particular types of employee movement. For example, one descriptive report suggested that teachers who left their schools and those who left the occupation had different reasons in mind (Ingersoll, 2003).

Specifically, more teachers changed schools than left teaching entirely, citing dissatisfaction in school staffing actions, poor administrative support for their work, and lack of faculty influence and autonomy as key reasons, whereas dissatisfaction with salary influenced decisions to leave teaching more so than changing schools (Ingersoll, 2003).

To understand the relationship between various factors and either organizational or occupational turnover intentions, and consistent with multiple foci approach discussed above, the *focus-congruence* approach is of particular relevance (Klein, et al, 2012). It suggests that predictors and criteria are more strongly related when they are expressed and measured at the same level of specification and with the same focus (Smith, 1976; Klein, et al, 2012). For example, researchers examining workgroup and organization commitment found that each form of commitment is most strongly related to potential outcomes of the same focus (Ricketta & Dick, 2005). Also, theoretically related constructs, but with a different referent (i.e., occupation versus organization), were not correlated. For example, Blau (1985) found significant negative a correlation between organizational commitment and organizational turnover intentions but not between organizational commitment and occupational turnover intentions. Alternatively, he found a significant negative correlation between occupational commitment and occupational turnover intentions but not between occupational commitment and organizational turnover intentions. Thus, relationships between congruent foci should be stronger than when foci differ (Klein et al, 2012).

Focal constructs

Testing of the focus-congruence approach with organizational and occupational turnover intentions requires examining two sets of factors: constructs with an *organizational* focus and those with an *occupational* focus. Thus, I identified leader support and colleague support as

factors with an organizational focus and occupational satisfaction, and salary satisfaction with an occupational focus. While specific rationale for the relevance and foci of each factor examined will be provided in detail in the Hypotheses section, I chose to examine these variables based on previous empirical research and meta-analyses (Allen, Bryant, & Vardaman, 2010; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008; Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996; Maertz & Campion, 1998; Maertz & Griffeth, 2004; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Woo & Maertz, 2012). Second, through observation and qualitative interview of the sample members (e.g., teachers and principals in rural China, I identified two additional factors that are highly relevant in the current setting, namely material support for work and motivations for joining the occupation. The former has an organizational focus, while the latter has an occupational focus. I propose that attitudes with an organizational focus (e.g., leadership support, colleague support, and organizational material) will be more strongly related to organizational than occupational turnover intentions, while those with an occupational focus (e.g., occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and one's intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for choosing an occupation) will be more influential to occupational turnover intentions than to organizational turnover intentions. This study aims to sensitize researchers about the construct validation of turnover intentions with different foci and stimulate more much needed research in occupational turnover.

Hypotheses

Wanting to Leave the Organization

Leader support. Employees consider their leaders as organizational representatives. In their eyes, leaders stand for their organizations, rather than for the entire industry. According to

social exchange theory, when leaders give their followers much support, the followers feel indebted to the leaders and the organization, thus are more likely to be engaged in tasks and committed to the organization (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960; Gerstner, 1997; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). In the case of teachers, where the teacher-principal relationship can be considered a leader-member relationship (Erdogan, Liden, & Kraimer, 2006), principals stand for a school rather than the entire teaching profession. There is some preliminary evidence of the different impacts of leader support on organizational turnover intentions and occupational turnover intentions. According to one report, 46% of former public school teachers who changed schools reported dissatisfaction with inadequate support from management and administration, compared to only 25% of those who left teaching altogether (Bobbitt, 1994). Leader support should be considered a work perception with an organizational focus rather than occupational focus, and thus I would propose that it has a stronger relationship with organizational turnover intentions than with occupational turnover intentions.

Colleague support. Colleagues comprise the immediate context in which an employee works. Employees who are embedded in a social web at work develop a disinclination to leave (Burton, Holtom, Sablinski, Mitchell, & Lee, 2010; Grant, 2007; Lee, 2004). Similar to leader support, daily shared work experiences with colleagues do not generalize to the entire occupation. Researchers (Kerr & Slocum, 1987; Kopelman, Brief, & Guzzo, 1990) have argued that variation in employee retention across organizations is related to organizational culture, which is organization-specific and varies among companies in the same industry (Brightman & Sayeed, 1990; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; Rentsch, 1990; Sheridan, 1992). There is some preliminary evidence of the different impacts of leader support on organizational turnover intentions and occupational turnover intentions. For example, in a study on group mentoring

activities for U.S. teachers, supportive communication among colleagues was found to be negatively related to organizational but not occupational turnover (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Also, 7% of the teachers who changed schools reported dissatisfaction with the lack of professional competence of their colleagues, compared to only 0.4% of those that left teaching (Bobbitt, 1994). Based on the above reasoning, colleague support should be considered to have an organizational focus rather than occupational focus, and thus I would propose that it has a stronger relationship with organizational turnover intentions than with occupational turnover intentions.

Material support for work. Organizations are generally expected to provide the materials needed for an employee to perform work-related tasks; indeed, it is almost taken for granted that organizations provide employees with adequate work materials (Mintzberg, 1979). In order to establish stable patterns of employee behavior, organizations should design material structures as a means of coordination and division of labor (Mintzberg, 1979). However, organizations function in complex and varying ways due to differing flows, including flows of material, information, and decision processes (Mintzberg, 1979). For some employers, the material flows might be too complicated to efficiently prepare all of the work materials for their employees, or else resource constraints hinder them from handling even non-complex systems. For most occupations, the levels of organizational material support vary from one employer to another, which is particularly evident in the current study. Because of the decentralization of school finance in China, there is tremendous inequality in the economic resources available to different schools (Park, Rozelle, Wong, & Ren, 1996). A lack of education financing in a particular area is likely to result in a higher ratio of dilapidated school facilities, including a lack

of teaching aids, laboratory instruments and office space (Rozelle, 1996). For teachers in these schools, simply moving to another school can solve the problem of inadequate work materials.

Based on the above arguments, I propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Leader support has a stronger negative relationship with organizational turnover intentions than with occupational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2: Colleague support has a stronger negative relationship with organizational turnover intentions than with occupational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 3: Material support for work has a stronger negative relationship with organizational turnover intentions than with occupational turnover intentions.

Wanting to Leave the Occupation

Occupational satisfaction. Work satisfaction, a factor which might conceptually overlap with occupational satisfaction, has been studied extensively as a predictor of turnover (Mobley et al., 1979). Martin (1979) defined job satisfaction as the extent to which employees have a positive affective orientation toward their membership in the system. However, the “system,” or the focus of satisfaction, can carry different meanings for different employees (and researchers). For example, for public school teachers, “the system” might refer to the education system, whereas for salespersons, it might refer to the organization or more narrowly the sales department or team. It is important that researchers are conscious about which system they are referring to, for example, by distinguishing between satisfaction towards the organization and the occupation. However, the majority of researchers have only aimed to study overall job satisfaction (Chapman & Lowther, 1982; Ingersoll, 2001; Perie, Baker, & Whitener, 1997), leaving out the consideration of one’s satisfaction toward one’s occupation. In this study,

occupational satisfaction is examined and proposed to be more closely related to the employee's occupational turnover intentions than to organizational turnover intentions.

Salary Satisfaction. Whether salary satisfaction is an organization-specific or an occupation-wide factor depends on the dispersion of pay for the same type of job across different organizations and occupations. For example, for top executives (all of whom have the same occupation), the difference of pay and compensation structure between different organizations might be considerable. In this case, salary satisfaction should be considered an organization-specific factor and thus more closely related to organizational turnover intentions than occupational turnover intentions. In other cases, the contrary may be true. For teachers, salary level generally does not vary significantly across different public schools, so changing schools is not likely to alleviate dissatisfaction with one's pay. This is a critical factor in this study, because teachers generate less income than other professions in the market. Thus, leaving teaching entirely is more likely to increase an individual's salary satisfaction. Numerous studies have shown that teachers are more likely to stay in their profession when their salary is higher relative to other occupations (Dolton & Klaauw, 1995; Ingersoll, 2001; Stinebrickner, 2001; Perie et al., 1997; Currall, Towler, Judge, & Kohn, 2005). Also, 17.4% of private school teachers who left the occupation reported dissatisfaction toward salary, contrasted with only 5.6% of private school teachers who changed schools (Bobbitt, 1994). In this study, I expect salary satisfaction to have an occupational focus, and thus be more closely related to the employee's occupational turnover intentions than to organizational turnover intentions.

Intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivation. Reasons for choosing an occupation clearly have an occupational focus. People have different reasons for choosing an occupation and they differ systematically and reliably in their motivational orientations toward

work (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). Intrinsic motivation involves engaging in work for its own sake because the work itself is interesting or satisfying; extrinsic motivation primarily involves a response to something apart from the work itself, for example, rewards (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Both subjective experience and performance tend to be better when one is intrinsically versus extrinsically motivated (Amabile et al., 1994). Thus, it should be expected that intrinsic motivation has a negative relationship with occupational turnover intentions, while extrinsic motivation has a positive one. Researchers have also found that motivational orientation influences one's perceptions of the work environment (Amabile et al., 1994). It is suggested that intrinsically motivated adults may tend to be oriented toward aspects of the work environment that support intrinsic motivation, and extrinsically motivated adults may tend to be oriented differently. Thus, I expect that the motivations behind occupational choices continue to influence employees' turnover intentions even years later. Based on the above arguments, by assessing the extent to which individuals' intrinsic and extrinsic motivations were strong and salient to them, employees' occupational turnover intentions should be better predicted than organizational turnover intentions.

Based on the above argument, I propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4: Occupational satisfaction has a stronger negative relationship with occupational turnover intentions than with organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 5: Salary satisfaction has a stronger negative relationship with occupational turnover intentions than with organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 6a: Intrinsic occupational choice motivation has a stronger negative relationship with occupational turnover intentions than with organizational turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 6b: Extrinsic occupational choice motivation has a stronger positive relationship with occupational turnover intentions than with organizational turnover intentions.

Method

Participants and Procedures

The data of this study were collected in rural areas of northwestern China in 2007 as part of a large and publicly available dataset called The Gansu Survey of Children and Families, which is a rigorous multi-level and longitudinal study of rural children's welfare (more information can be found at <http://china.pop.upenn.edu>.) 2,382 primary or junior secondary school teachers from 198 schools comprised the sample of this study: 60% were male, 83% were married, 25% had only finished their secondary education and the other 75% had finished their tertiary level education, 51% were from the same township, and 41% was teaching in primary schools (versus secondary schools). The average age was 36.5, and on average had been a teacher and worked in the same school for 14.40 and 8.29 years respectively. All surveys were administered in person by trained research assistants. All items were developed in Chinese by the research team based on past research, as well as careful piloting and discussion with local teachers and principals to ensure that the items were suitable for this setting.

Measures

Organizational and occupational turnover intentions. Two items measuring turnover intentions were used in the study. They were “I want to move to a different school” (organizational turnover intentions) and “I want to change my occupation” (occupational turnover intentions). This method is similar to that of other researchers that have used single

items to measure turnover intentions (Krausz, Koslowsky, Shalom, & Elyakim, 1995). These two constructs were measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*).

Both turnover intentions and all their antecedents were treated as individual level variables in subsequent analysis, but regarding the nested structure of the data (i.e., teachers nested within schools), agreement and reliability indices are reported here. For organizational turnover intentions, ICC1 = 0.167, ICC2 = 0.7064, and rwg = 0.296 and for organizational turnover intentions, ICC1 = 0.112, ICC2 = 0.602, and rwg = 0.327.

Leader support. Four items measured leader support. They were “My principal has high expectations for me,” “My principal respects me very much,” “My principal offers me opportunities for self-development,” and “My principal offers good suggestions on my teaching.” This construct was measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, 3 = *not sure*, 4 = *somewhat agree*, and 5 = *completely agree*). Cronbach’s $\alpha = .78$. ICC1 = 0.132, ICC2 = 0.645, and rwg = 0.838.

Colleague support. Four items measured colleague support. They were “I have a lot of opportunities to discuss with my colleagues on teaching,” “The activities organized by the teaching section/department are valuable,” “I get along well with my colleagues in the school,” and “The teachers in my school are highly motivated to work”. This construct was measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*). Cronbach’s $\alpha = .63$. ICC1 = 0.137, ICC2 = 0.655, and rwg = 0.765.

Material support for work. Two items measured material support for work. They were “The school has adequate teaching materials and equipment” and “The school has adequate books and journals that I can refer to for preparation of my classes.” This construct was

measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*). Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$. ICC1 = 0.186, ICC2 = 0.733, and rwg = 0.379.

Occupational satisfaction. One item, "I am satisfied with my job as a teacher," measured occupational satisfaction. This construct was measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*). ICC1 = 0.073, ICC2 = 0.486, and rwg = 0.556.

Salary satisfaction. One item, "I am satisfied with my salary," measured this construct. This construct was measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*). ICC1 = 0.097, ICC2 = 0.565, and rwg = 0.2.

Intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivation. I included three intrinsic reasons and four extrinsic reasons for choosing to be a teacher that were appropriate for this setting. The intrinsic occupational motivation were measured by three items: "I chose to be a teacher because I love being together with students," "I chose to be a teacher because I believe that education is very important for the development of the country," and "I chose to be a teacher because I had always wanted to be teacher since I was little." The extrinsic occupational motivation were measured by four items: "I chose to be a teacher because the tuition in normal universities was very low", "I chose to be a teacher because I did not have a high enough score to enter any other university except normal universities", "I chose to be a teacher because I thought being a teacher was not difficult", and "I chose to be a teacher because teaching is a stable occupation." These constructs were measured on a 3-point Likert scale (1 = *completely disagree*, 2 = *not sure*, and 3 = *completely agree*). Cronbach's α were 0.6 and 0.5, respectively for intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivations, which fall somewhat below conventional cutoffs because they are formative constructs and people may choose an occupation because of one particular intrinsic reason (or extrinsic reason) but not the others. For intrinsic occupational choice motivation,

ICC1 = 0.120, ICC2 = 0.622, and rwg = 0.689 and for extrinsic occupational choice motivation, ICC1 = 0.097, ICC2 = 0.563, and rwg = 0.527.

Control variables. Age, gender (0 = *male* and 1 = *female*), education attainment level (0 = *secondary level* and 1 = *tertiary level*), tenure in the teaching profession and in the current school (in years), level of school taught (0 = *primary* and 1 = *secondary*), and whether they were working in their original hometowns (0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*) were also measured. I included these variables because, similar to teachers in other countries (Lachman & Diamant, 1987), younger, male, unmarried, and teachers with greater human capital were found to be less satisfied with positions as teachers in rural China, while teachers who are more socially similar to the local community were found to be more satisfied (Sargent & Hannum, 2005).

Measurement Issues

Exploratory factor analysis was carried out to evaluate the factor structure of the survey items. As advised by previous researchers (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2004), I used maximum likelihood extraction, oblique rotation, and multiple number-of-factors criteria, such as eigenvalues greater than 1, scree test, percentage of variance accounted for, parsimony, and parallel analysis (Conway & Huffcutt, 2003). The result of parallel analysis suggested a 6 factor structure. In this model all items loaded on anticipated factors, except that the single item measuring occupational satisfaction has double loadings. Considering the theoretical implications, this item is treated as a separate factor, rendering a 7 factor structure, which explained 65.85% of total variance. In general, there is support for obtaining 7 factors from the 19 items for measuring all the independent variables.

It should also be noted that although data were collected from one source at one time, common method bias does not necessarily threaten the validity of the results. As researcher have

suggested, self-report data does not automatically reflect common method variance (CMV) rather than the intended true construct variance (Brannick, Chan, Conway, Lance, & Spector, 2010). Further, given the focus of self-referential constructs, the use of self-report measure here is justifiable (Brannick, et al., 2010). Moreover, I applied procedural and statistical remedies to lessen the potential influence of common method effects (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Procedurally, proximal separation position (i.e., positioning measures of the constructs at least six items apart; Weijters, Geuens, & Schillewaert, 2009; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012) and uncommon scale were used to mitigate method effect (Weijters, Cabooter, & Schillewaert, 2010; Podsakoff, et al., 2012; Kothandapani, 1971; Flamer, 1983). Also, all the surveys were conducted face to face with research assistants to assure that respondents were thorough and accurate in question comprehension, memory retrieval, and response selection, and thus less susceptible to method bias. Statistically, there are also reasons to believe that CMV is not biasing results. First, as Spector noted, “it isn’t method variance” if there are non-significant and near zero correlations, as is the case here in Table 1 (Brannick, et al., 2010). Second, in multivariate linear relationships, CMV decreases when more independent variables are included due to the attenuation of covariance and the partialling out of CMV. When more than 5 predictors are included, the CMV is effects are small (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010). In sum, despite prevailing misconceptions about common method bias in any self-report measure, I took proactive design steps to mitigate method effects and the used self-reports as the best indicators of self referential constructs (Conway & Lance, 2010).

Results

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Regarding organizational turnover intentions, 26.6% agreed, 40.1% disagreed, and 33.3% were unsure with the statement that “I want to move

to a different school”. Concerning occupational turnover intentions, 20.8% agreed, 48.1% disagreed, and 31.1% were unsure with the statement that “I want to change my occupation”. This is very similar to the situation in the U.S., where total teacher departures were fairly evenly split between the teacher changing schools and switching occupations (Ingersoll, 2003). As indicated in Table 1, the moderate correlation ($r = .36, p < .05$) between organizational turnover intentions and occupational turnover intentions demonstrates that they should be considered separate, although related, constructs. Most control variables significantly correlated with the two dependent variables, with the exception of marital status. All independent variables were significantly correlated with both dependent variables in the predicted directions, while the correlations between the independent variables were not high enough to suspect multicollinearity.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Before hypothesis testing, I first conducted two sets of multilevel ordinal logistic regression analyses in Mplus7.2, one for each type of turnover intentions. As presented in Table 2, Model 1 included only the control variables in the equations. In Model 2, besides control variables, only focus-matched factors were included. In other words, in the organizational turnover intentions regression, the predictors were leader support, colleague support, and material support for work, whereas in the occupational turnover intentions regression, the predictors were occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and the intrinsic and extrinsic reasons for choosing the occupation. For both outcomes, Model 2 had a significantly better fit than Model 1, as indicated by the very large drops in the -2 log likelihood Akaike Information Criteria (AIC), Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC), and Sample-Size Adjusted BIC. Model 3, which added the focus-mismatched predictors to Model 2, was better than Model 2 at predicting the outcomes; however the drops in model fit indices are much smaller. Including both organization-focused and

occupation-focused predictors in the prediction of occupational turnover intentions was only a little more effective than only including occupation-focused predictors; similarly, including both in the prediction of organizational turnover intentions was only a little more effective than only including organization-focused predictors.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

From the coefficients in Model 2, one can interpret the relationship between the predictors and the outcomes. For example, for prediction of organizational turnover intentions using Model 3, for 1 point increase in leader support scores, the proportional ordered log-odds of being in a higher organizational turnover intentions category decrease by 0.38, or, in other words, the odds of low organizational turnover intentions category versus the combined middle and high categories are $\exp(0.38) = 1.46$ times greater, holding all other variables constant. Likewise, the odds of the combined low and middle organizational turnover intentions categories versus high category are also 1.46 times greater, given that parallel line test ensured the proportional odds assumption. In general, organizational turnover intentions are negatively related to leader support, colleague support, material support for work, occupational satisfaction, and salary satisfaction, positively related to extrinsic occupational choice motivation, and not significantly related to intrinsic occupational choice motivation. Occupational turnover intentions are negatively related to leader support, colleague support, occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and intrinsic occupational choice motivation, positively related to extrinsic occupational choice motivation, and not significantly related to material support for work. One might attempt to make comparisons between the odds ratios of each factor or their significance levels to determine which factor is more predictive of either type of turnover intentions. This approach might be able to provide preliminary support of the hypotheses but is nevertheless inaccurate, because in

regular regressions the squared standardized regression coefficients of correlated factors do not sum to R^2 and regression coefficients only represent the incremental contribution of each predictor when all remaining predictors are present (Johnson & Lebreton, 2004). The following methods, namely net regression and relative important analysis, are more rigorous for hypotheses testing.

Thus hypothesis tests were was conducted using the net regression method. To test whether the magnitude of the relationship between the antecedent and either type of turnover intentions is indeed statistically significant requires a test of the difference between betas for different dependent variables from a single sample (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003, p. 157 & 642). Whether the difference in magnitude of the relationship between the antecedent of interest and either type of turnover intentions is statistically significant is indicated by the significance of that antecedent's beta in a regression equation in which the dependent variable represents the difference between the occupational turnover intentions and the predicted value of the organizational turnover intentions, as derived from regression equations using the same set of independent variables. As indicated in Table 3, the negative effects of leader support, colleague support, and material support for work on organizational turnover intentions were significantly stronger than their negative effect on occupational turnover intentions, supporting Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. The negative effects of occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation for occupational choice on organizational turnover intentions were significantly weaker than their negative effect on occupational turnover intentions, supporting Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6a. The positive effect of extrinsic motivation for occupational choice on organizational turnover intentions was significantly weaker than its positive effect on occupational turnover intentions, supporting Hypothesis 6b. These findings provide additional evidence that the

organizational turnover intentions and occupational turnover intentions are two distinct dimensions of turnover intentions with varying antecedents.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

In addition, I evaluated the relative importance of predictors in the two multivariate regressions using relative weight analysis (LeBreton & Tonidandel, 2008). Relative importance analysis is useful for understanding the extent to which each predictor drives the prediction, or in other words, the contribution each predictor makes towards explaining variance in the criterion (Johnson & LeBreton, 2004; Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). In Table 4, both the raw relative weight values and the rescaled weights (scaled as a percentage of predictable variance) for every predictor in the model are reported (LeBreton & Tonidandel, 2008). Statistical significance of the relative weights was also tested (Tonidandel, LeBreton, & Johnson, 2009). Organization-focused predictors all contribute more to the prediction to organizational turnover intentions than to occupational turnover intentions. Specifically, leader support drives 18.3% of the variance explained in organizational turnover intentions versus 2.6% of that in occupational turnover intentions, colleague support 24.5% versus 7.5%, and material support for work 17% versus 0.8%. Occupation-focused predictors all contribute more to the prediction to occupational turnover intentions than to organizational turnover intentions. Occupational satisfaction drives 47.5%, of the variance explained in occupational turnover intentions versus 8.3% of that in organizational turnover intentions, salary satisfaction 8.3% versus 8.1%, intrinsic occupational choice motivation 22.3% versus 5.8%, and extrinsic occupational choice motivation 2.87% versus 2.84%. In sum, the results of relative importance analysis further confirmed the notion that organization- focused factors are more strongly associated with organizational turnover

intentions than with occupational turnover intentions, whereas occupation-focused factors are more strongly associated with the latter than the former.

Another way to interpret Table 4 is to compare the contribution of the different predictors to a same outcome. Results showed that for the prediction of occupational turnover intentions, occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivations ($\epsilon = 0.16, 0.03, 0.07, \text{ and } 0.01$, respectively, $p < .05$) accounted for significant amounts of criterion variance (47.5%, 8.3%, 22.3%, and 2.89%, respectively, $p < .05$), whereas leader support, colleague support, and material support for work accounted for smaller amounts of variance (2.56%, 7.49 %, and 0.76%, respectively, $p < .05$). On the other hand, for the prediction of organizational turnover intentions, leader support, colleague support, and material support for work ($\epsilon = 0.03, 0.04, \text{ and } 0.02$, respectively, $p < .05$) accounted for significant amounts of criterion variance (18.3%, 26.5%, and 17%, respectively, $p < .05$), whereas occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivations accounted for smaller amounts of variance (8.27%, 8.12%, 5.80%, and 2.84%, respectively, $p < .05$). In sum, the results of relative importance analysis lend further support to the hypotheses.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Discussion

Theoretical Implications

By examining teacher migration and teacher attrition in China as the case in point, this study contributes to turnover literature by examining the relationships between organizational and occupational turnover intentions and their various antecedents, thereby demonstrating their

distinctiveness. Drawing on the focus-congruence approach (Jackofsky & Peters, 1983; Klein et al., 2012), this study shows that employees distinguish between intentions to leave their organizations and occupations. In line with earlier theorizing (e.g. Jackofsky & Peters, 1983; Jackofsky, 1984; Krausz et al., 1995; Wright & Bonett, 1992), these results suggest that organizational and occupational turnover intentions are distinct constructs that are modestly correlated ($r = .36$), sharing only 13% of their variances. Further, this study contributes to turnover literature by calling researchers' attention to different foci of turnover intentions. Besides the distinction between organizational and occupational turnover intentions found in this study, the distinction between turnover intentions with other foci is no less meaningful. Specifically, the focus of turnover or discontinuous intentions may be extended from organizations to occupations, teams (or supervisors; Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002), projects, or a geographical location.

Second, this study addresses prior calls to assess organizational and occupational factors in turnover research (Woo & Maertz, 2012). The findings show that associations are stronger when the foci of turnover intentions and potential antecedents match than when they do not (Jackofsky & Peters, 1983). Specifically, organizational-focused factors - leader support, colleague support, and material support for work - were more related to organizational turnover intentions than to occupational turnover intentions. Organizational-focused factors - occupational satisfaction, salary satisfaction, and both intrinsic and extrinsic occupational choice motivations - were more related to occupational turnover intentions than to organizational turnover intentions. While most previous research has only focused on predicting organizational turnover intentions, this study is one of the few to simultaneously measure different dimensions of turnover intentions. As Hom

and colleagues (2012) argued, this approach allows for precisely explaining and predicting more criterion variance, which can facilitate across-study comparisons and accumulation of results.

Third, this study contributes to focus-congruence approach by generalizing it to a wider range of organizational phenomena. Because of varying beliefs about one's different roles and social identities (Tajfel, 1972; Turner, 1982; Hogg & Terry, 2000), employees are able to form different attitudes towards organizational and occupational turnover. Similar to turnover intentions, other important work attitudes (e.g., commitment, identification, attachment, and trust) that are often treated as a single-target constructs might also have more than one focus, reflect different constructs, and be related to different antecedents. For example, occupational commitment (Blau, 1985, 1988, 2000) plays a different role than organizational commitment in influencing job satisfaction and withdrawal intentions (Duffy, Dik, & Steger, 2011). In agreement with other researchers (Becker et al., 1996; Kristof-Brown & Guay, 2011, Porter & Steers, 1973; Riketta & Dick, 2005), I argue here for the value in explicitly and clearly specifying the targets of turnover intentions.

Limitations and Future Directions

Due to the cross-sectional data and potential common method variance in this study, definitive conclusions about the differentiated models of turnover intentions require further work. This study also does not employ methods that would warrant causal inference, and “predictor” and “antecedent” are used here in a general sense. Future researchers might use objective data collected from multiple sources, such as supervisors, colleagues, or customers. To better ascertain a clear trend over time and make causal inferences, researchers should try to collect longitudinal and/or qualitative data.

Second, future research should use samples from various types of organizations and occupations to test turnover attitudes with different foci. In other types of organizations (and bigger schools), the dynamics within work groups might have a significant impact on turnover intentions. Researchers who studied the importance of work-group identification relative to organizational identification have found that the former was stronger than the latter as well as more predictive of organizational attitudes and behavior, such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions, job involvement, and job motivation (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000). Also, some suggestions for management and human resources in other occupations may not be applicable to the education system but useful for other organizations. For instance, Dalton and Todor (1993) suggested that changes in absenteeism and intra-organization transfer policies could reduce turnover. For many organizations, especially those that are large and decentralized, breaking down boundaries between work groups or having more flexible schedules might boost retention.

Third, future studies could examine the mechanisms or boundary conditions of the relationship between organizational and occupational turnover intentions. Blau (1989) suggested that occupational turnover intentions may have incremental effects on turnover behavior beyond the effects of organizational turnover intentions. It also seems there might be a reciprocal relationship between organizational and occupational turnover intentions (Chang, Chi, & Miao, 2007). As Woo and Maertz (2012) reasoned, the reason that occupational turnover intentions positively relates to organizational turnover intentions may be that changing occupations implies changing organizations, when some employees do not have the opportunity to change occupations within a given organization. Occupational attachment might yet reduce turnover intentions under the condition that this particular occupation is compatible, supported, and given

adequate status within the organization, and not readily available at other organizations (Lee Carswell, Allen, 2000). The opposite condition may translate into higher organizational turnover intentions for those who identify significantly with their occupation (Woo & Maertz, 2012).

Fourth, future studies should examine actual turnover behaviors and subsequent post-exit destinations to reveal a more refined picture of employee turnover. Following Hom and colleagues (2012), different types of movement might include intra-organizational transfer, changing organizations, switching occupations, and leaving the work force entirely (e.g., for full-time parenting or educational pursuits). It would be both theoretically and practically meaningful to study how subtypes of turnover arise from particular motivational forces and differ along the variables of attitude, behavior, speed and destination (Hom et al., 2012). Hom and colleagues (2012) discussed ways to measure the expanded turnover criteria and their proximal states, and to investigate the subtypes' profiled differences. An empirical test of their model would be helpful for understanding employee movement to different destinations.

Practical Implications

Differentiating between antecedents for organizational turnover intentions and occupational turnover intentions has practical implications for turnover interventions. For example, in the case of intervention to curb teacher turnover in rural China, policy makers and education administrators should separate the issue of teacher shortage into two problems, namely teachers' migration to more economically developed areas and teachers' attrition from the occupation. At the country or regional level, policy makers should pay attention to both the school-specific factors and the occupation-wide factors that might contribute to teachers' intentions of withdrawal. Little is likely to be achieved, in terms of tackling the inequality of education quality

between urban and rural areas, if policies focus only on occupation-wide factors, for example selecting teachers that choose the occupation for intrinsic reasons. A teacher might have high levels of intrinsic motivation but still might leave a resource-constrained and low-performing school for a more desirable school. On the other hand, by only focusing on interventions at the school level, such as social exchange between principals and teachers, colleague support between teachers, or school material support, policy-makers might still fail to retain teachers in the education system. In order to keep teachers both in their current schools and in the occupation, both school-specific and occupation-wide factors need to be addressed simultaneously. At the school level, administrators and teachers must be well informed to make the best use of school-specific resources, such as social exchange between principals and teachers, colleague support between teachers, and school material support for performing teaching. For example, although a school might not have the power to raise its teachers' salaries, it can cultivate collaboration and cohesion among teachers and between teachers and the principal.

More importantly, these or similar recommendations are relevant for employers, managers and decision makers in other types of organizations and occupations. Conceptually distinguishing between organizational leavers who go to other organizations to continue doing the same type of job with occupational leavers who quit the occupation entirely, is part of the foundation for designing any effective turnover intervention policy and procedure. The understanding of a nuanced and more accurate picture of turnover intentions would allow practitioners to take into consideration the full complexity of the challenges they face and the resources they can utilize.

Given the results here, thinking about organizational and occupational turnover intentions simultaneously may be particularly meaningful for designing HR policies. An example would be

in what Osterman (1987) calls a “craft” employment subsystem, which is characterized by great mobility and more loyalty to the skill or occupation than to an organization. For example, because of the strong demand for and short supply of computer personnel, engineers’ loyalties lie with their occupation rather than an organization. He argued that when employees have considerable market power, mobility is often rewarding to employees, but disrupts key operations and leads to sharp wage increases. Facing this particular combination of high organizational turnover intentions and low occupational turnover intentions, organizations usually adopt HR systems in which there is little need to invest in non-firm-specific training and where firms often lay off professionals if demand falls (Osterman, 1987).

In conclusion, this study provides evidence of the uniqueness of employees’ intentions to change organizations as distinguished from leaving the occupation. Among factors that impact these two types of withdrawal intentions, in general, associations are stronger when the foci of turnover intentions and potential antecedents match than when they do not. For future research, focus-congruence approach offers a useful perspective for examining this phenomenon in organizations, so that researchers and practitioners can arrive at a more nuanced understanding of both organizational and occupational commitment and withdrawal.

References

- Allen, D. G., Bryant, P. C., & Vardaman, J. M. (2010). Retaining talent: Replacing misconceptions with evidence-based strategies. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24, 48 – 65. doi:10.5465/AMP .2010.51827775
- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., & Tighe, E. M. (1994). The work preference inventory: Assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950–967. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.5.950
- Ashforth, B. E., & Johnson, S. A. (2001). Which hat to wear? The relative salience of multiple identities in organizational contexts. *Social Identity Processes in Organizational Contexts*, 31, 48.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20–39. doi:10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are the distinctions worth making?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 232–244. doi: 10.2307/256481
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 177–190. doi:10.1002/job.4030140207
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(2), 464–482. doi:10.2307/256788
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 277–288.

- Blau, G. (1988). Further exploring the meaning and measurement of career commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 284–297, doi:10.1016/0001-8791(88)90020-6.
- Blau, G. (1989). Testing the generalizability of a career commitment measure and its impact on employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35, 88–103, doi:10.1016/0001-8791(89)90050-X.
- Blau, G. (2000). Job, organizational, and professional context antecedents as predictors of intent for interrole work transitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 330–345, doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1718.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. Transaction Publishers.
- Bobbitt, S. A. (1994). *Characteristics of strayers, movers, and leavers results from the teacher followup survey : 1991-92*. DIANE Publishing.
- Brannick, M. T., Chan, D., Conway, J. M., Lance, C. E., & Spector, P. E. (2010). What is method variance and how can we cope with it? A panel discussion. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(3), 407–420. doi:10.1177/1094428109360993
- Brightman, H. J., & Sayeed, L. (1990). The pervasiveness of senior management's view of the cultural gaps within a division. *Group & Organization Management*, 15(3), 266–278. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/105960119001500303
- Burton, J., Holtom, B., Sablinski, C., Mitchell, T., & Lee, T. (2010). The buffering effects of job embeddedness on negative shocks. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76, 42–51. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.006
- Chang, H.-T., Chi, N.-W., & Miao, M.-C. (2007). Testing the relationship between three-component organizational/occupational commitment and organizational/occupational

- turnover intention using a non-recursive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 352–368. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2006.10.001
- Chapman, D. W., & Lowther, M. A. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75(4), 241-247. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id = EJ265232>
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(3), 339-356. doi: 10.1348/096317902320369749
- Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P. C., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). (3rd Ed.) *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Conlon, E. J., & Gallagher, D. G. (1987). Commitment to employer and union: Effects of membership status. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(1), 151-162. doi: 10.2307/255901
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(2), 147–168. doi: 10.1177/1094428103251541
- Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 325–334. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6
- Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 55–70. doi:10.5465/AMR.1986.4282625

- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 613–640. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00245.x
- Dalton, D. R., & Todor, W. D. (1993). Turnover, transfer, absenteeism: An interdependent perspective. *Journal of Management*, 19(2), 193–219. doi:10.1016/0149-2063(93)90052-O
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Self-Determination*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dolton, P., & Klaauw, W. von der. (1995). Leaving teaching in the UK: A duration analysis. *Economic Journal*, 105(429), 431–444. doi:10.2307/2235502
- Duffy, R. D., Dik, B. J., & Steger, M. F. (2011). Calling and work-related outcomes: Career commitment as a mediator. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 78(2), 210–218.
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2010.09.013
- Ellemers, N., de Gilder, D., & van den Heuvel, H. (1998). Career-oriented versus team-oriented commitment and behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 717–730.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.83.5.717
- Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Kraimer, M. L. (2006). Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 395–406. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2006.20786086
- Flamer, S. (1983). Assessment of the multitrait-multimethod matrix validity of Likert scales via confirmatory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 18(3), 275–306.
doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr1803_3
- Gansu agriculture economy information net. (2009) Accessed from
<http://gsnjxx.gsny.gov.cn/lltt/2009/02/25/1235554266475.html>

- Gerstner, C. R. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827
- Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles. I. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 281*-306.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles. I. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 444*-480.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*(2), 161–178. doi:10.2307/2092623
- Grant, A. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review, 32*,393– 417. doi:10.5465/AMR.2007.24351328
- Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*, 463– 488. doi:10.1177/014920630002600305
- Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*(2), 191–205. doi: 10.1177/1094428104263675
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 474–487. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.474
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 121–140. doi:10.2307/259266

- Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 231–274. doi:10.1080/19416520802211552
- Hom, P. W., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2012). Reviewing employee turnover: Focusing on proximal withdrawal states and an expanded criterion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(5), 831–858. doi:10.1037/a0027983
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499–534. doi:10.2307/3202489
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Is There Really a Teacher Shortage? A Research Report*. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. University of Washington, Box 353600, Seattle, WA
[http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno = ED499091](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED499091)
- Jackofsky, E. F. (1984). Turnover and job performance: An integrated process model. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(1), 74–83. doi:10.2307/258234
- Jackofsky, E. F., & Peters, L. H. (1983). Job turnover versus company turnover: Reassessment of the March and Simon participation hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 490–495. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.3.490
- Johnson, S. M., Berg, J. H., & Donaldson, M. L. (2005). *Who stays in teaching and why: A review of the literature on teacher retention*. Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Project on the Next Generation of Teachers.
- Johnson, J. W., & Lebreton, J. M. (2004). History and use of relative importance indices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7(3), 238–257.
doi:10.1177/1094428104266510

- Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: a longitudinal investigation. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 4*(4), 337. Doi. 10.1037/1076-8998.4.4.337
- Kerr, J., & Slocum, J. W. (1987). Managing corporate culture through reward systems. *Academy of Management Executive, 1*(2), 99–107. doi:10.2307/4164733
- Klein, H., Molloy, J., & Brinsfield, C. (2012). Reconceptualizing workplace commitment to redress a stretched construct: Revisiting assumptions and removing confounds. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 130–151. doi:10.5465/amr.2010.0018
- Klein, H. J., Wesson, M. J., Hollenbeck, J. R., Wright, P. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2001). The assessment of goal commitment: A measurement model meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 85*(1), 32–55. doi:10.1006/obhd.2000.2931
- Kopelman, R. E., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1990). The role of climate and culture productivity. *Organizational Climate and Culture, 282-318*.
- Kothandapani, V. (1971). Validation of feeling, belief, and intention to act as three components of attitude and their contribution to prediction of contraceptive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 19*(3), 321–333. doi:10.1037/h0031448
- Krausz, M., Koslowsky, M., Shalom, N., & Elyakim, N. (1995). Predictors of intentions to leave the ward, the hospital, and the nursing profession: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*(3), 277-288.
- Kristof-Brown, A., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Person–environment fit. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol.3, pp. 3–50). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Lachman, R., & Diamant, E. (1987). Withdrawal and restraining factors in teachers' turnover intentions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 8(3), 219–232.
doi:10.1002/job.4030080304
- Lane, I. M., Mathews, R. C., & Presholdt, P. H. (1988). Determinants of nurses' intentions to leave their profession. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9(4), 367–372.
- LeBreton, J. M., & Tonidandel, S. (2008). Multivariate relative importance: Extending relative weight analysis to multivariate criterion spaces. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 329–345. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.329
- Lee, P. C. B. (2004). Social support and leaving intention among computer professionals. *Information & Management*, 41(3), 323–334. doi:10.1016/S0378-7206(03)00077-6
- Lee, K., Carswell, J. J., & Allen, N. J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799–811. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.799
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Wise, L., & Fireman, S. (1996). An unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 5–36. doi:10.2307/256629
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In *Research in personnel and human resources management*, Vol. 15 (pp. 47–119). US: Elsevier Science/JAI Press.
- Loeb, S., & Reininger, M. (2004). *Public policy and teacher labor markets. What we know and why it matters*. Retrieved from [http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno = ED485592](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED485592)

- Maertz, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (1998). Turnover. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 13, 49 – 83. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-0471977225.html>
- Maertz, C. P., & Griffeth, R. W. (2004). Eight motives of employee attachment and turnover: A theoretical synthesis with implications for research. *Journal of Management*, 30, 667– 683. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2004.04.001
- Martin, T. N. (1979). A contextual model of employee turnover intentions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22(2), 313-324.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171
- McLaurin, S. E., Smith, W., & Smillie, A. (2009). *Teacher retention: Problems and solutions*. Online Submission. Accessed from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED507446.pdf>
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(3), 424.
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2000). *Number of teachers, staff & workers in primary schools*. Accessed from http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_591/200506/7923.html
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2014). *Number of Educational Personnel in Primary Schools*. Accessed from <http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s8490/201412/181903.html>

- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2008). *National education supervision report 2008*. Accessed from http://www.moe.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_914/201001/xxgk_81660.html
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1496182). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from <http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1496182>
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237–240. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493–522. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.86.3.493
- Neild, R. C., Useem, E., Travers, E. F., & Lesnick, J. (2003). Once & for all: placing a highly qualified teacher in every Philadelphia classroom. What We Know and Need to Do. A Report from " Learning from Philadelphia's School Reform". *Research for Action*. Accessed from http://www.researchforaction.org/wp-content/uploads/publication-photos/145/Neild_R_Once_and_For_All.pdf
- Osterman, P. (1987). Choice of employment systems in internal labor markets. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 26(1), 46–67. doi:10.1111/j.1468-232X.1987.tb00693.x
- Paré, G., & Tremblay, M. (2007). The influence of high-involvement human resources practices, procedural justice, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors on information

- technology professionals' turnover intentions. *Group & Organization Management*, 32(3), 326–357. doi:10.1177/1059601106286875
- Park, A., Rozelle, S., Wong, C., & Ren, C. (1996). Distributional consequences of reforming local public finance in China. *The China Quarterly*, 147, 751–778. doi:10.1017/S030574100005178X
- Perie, M., Baker, D., & Whitener, S. D. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics and teacher compensation*. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics. Accessed from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED412181.pdf>
- Peske, H. G., & Haycock, K. (2006). Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students Are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality: A Report and Recommendations by the Education Trust. *Education Trust*. Accessed from: <http://www.edtrust.org/sites/edtrust.org/files/publications/files/TQReportJune2006.pdf>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63(1), 539–569. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80(2), 151–176. doi:10.1037/h0034829

- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*(5), 603–609. doi:10.1037/h0037335
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(3), 465-476. Accessed from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258128>
- Rentsch, J. R. (1990). Climate and culture: Interaction and qualitative differences in organizational meanings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(6), 668–681.
- Ricketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*(2), 358–384. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.05.005
- Ricketta, M., & Dick, R. V. (2005). Foci of attachment in organizations: A meta-analytic comparison of the strength and correlates of workgroup versus organizational identification and commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*(3), 490–510. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2004.06.001
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(1), 4-36. doi:10.3102/0002831212463813
- Rozelle, S. (1996). Stagnation without equity: Patterns of growth and inequality in China's rural economy. *The China Journal, (35)*, 63-92. doi:10.2307/2950276
- Sargent, T., & Hannum, E. (2005). Keeping teachers happy: Job satisfaction among primary school teachers in rural northwest china. *Comparative Education Review, 49*(2), 173–204. doi:10.1086/ce.2005.49.issue-2

- Scott, C. R., & Timmerman, C. E. (1999). Communication technology use and multiple workplace identifications among organizational teleworkers with varied degrees of virtuality. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 42(4), 240–260. doi:10.1109/47.807961
- Sheridan, J. E. (1992). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(5), 1036–1056. doi:10.2307/256539
- Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2010). Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(3), 456–476. doi:10.1177/1094428109351241
- Smith, P. C. (1976). Behavior, results, and organizational effectiveness: The problem of criteria. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 745–775). Chicago: Rand McNally
- Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*. doi:10.3102/00028312041003681
- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?. *American educational research journal*, 41(3), 681-714.
- Stinebrickner, T. R. (2001). A dynamic model of teacher labor supply. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 19(1), 196–230. doi:10.1086/209984
- Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorization (English translation of "La categorisation sociale"). In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Introduction a la psychologie sociale*, vol. 1: 272-302. Paris: Larousse.

- Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(1), 1–9. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9204-3
- Tonidandel, S., LeBreton, J. M., & Johnson, J. W. (2009). Determining the statistical significance of relative weights. *Psychological Methods*, 14(4), 387–399. doi:10.1037/a0017735
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, 15-40. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1982-12053-001>
- Van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(2), 137–147. doi: 10.1348/096317900166949
- Weijters, B., Cabooter, E., & Schillewaert, N. (2010). The effect of rating scale format on response styles: The number of response categories and response category labels. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 27(3), 236–247. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2010.02.004
- Weijters, B., Geuens, M., & Schillewaert, N. (2009). The proximity effect: The role of inter-item distance on reverse-item bias. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 26(1), 2–12. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2008.09.003
- Woo, S. E., & Maertz, C. P. (2012). Assessment of voluntary turnover in organizations: Answering the questions of why, who, and how much. In *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 570–594). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (1992). The effect of turnover on work satisfaction and mental health: Support for a situational perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(6), 603–615. doi:10.1002/job.4030130606

Appendices

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Main Variables

	Mean	s. d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 Age	36.54	41.70	1.00																
2 Gender	.40	.49	-.04*	1.00															
3 Marital status	.83	.37	.11**	-.09**	1.00														
4 Education level	.76	.43	-.11**	.07**	-.11**	1.00													
5 Tenure of teaching	14.40	10.15	.20**	-.26**	.43**	-.52**	1.00												
6 Tenure in the school	8.29	7.70	.12**	-.11**	.29**	-.30**	.60**	1.00											
7 From same township	.51	.50	.08**	-.20**	.11**	-.24**	.25**	.17**	1.00										
8 Teaching grade	.59	.49	-.08**	-.16**	-.03	.42**	-.27**	-.09**	-.16**	1.00									
9 Leader support	3.65	.71	-.02	-.05*	-.05*	.02	-.04*	-.05*	.04	-.02	.78								
10 Colleague support	2.62	.42	.04	.04*	-.02	-.12**	.08**	.03	.04*	-.13**	.32**	.63							
11 Material support for work	1.76	.75	.05*	.08**	.01	-.09**	.09**	.10**	.00	-.04*	.18**	.34**	.82						
12 Occupational satisfaction	2.63	.63	.06**	.04	.08**	-.13**	.19**	.13**	.10**	-.12**	.08**	.28**	.16**	1.00					
13 Salary satisfaction	1.85	.84	.09**	-.05*	.07**	-.18**	.27**	.17**	.11**	-.13**	.09**	.21**	.20**	.22**	1.00				
14 Intrinsic occupational choice motivation	2.51	.49	-.05*	.10**	.00	-.22**	.09**	.12**	-.11**	-.18**	.14**	.33**	.16**	.36**	.19**	0.60			
15 Extrinsic occupational choice motivation	1.70	.47	-.01	-.08**	.07**	.06**	.05*	.08**	.05*	.08**	-.07**	-.06**	.06**	-.04	.06**	-.06**	0.50		
16 Occupational TI	1.72	.78	-.06**	-.04*	.02	.16**	-.15**	-.11**	-.09**	.17**	-.14**	-.28**	-.12**	-.49**	-.25**	-.39**	.12**	1.00	
17 Organizational TI	1.86	.80	-.04*	-.04*	-.01	.11**	-.11**	-.12**	-.08**	.06**	-.21**	-.28**	-.22**	-.17**	-.16**	-.17**	.07**	.36**	1.00

Note. N= 2,382. * $p < .05$ and ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed). TI= turnover intentions.

Table 2

Results of Multilevel Ordinal Logistic Regression on Occupational and Organizational Turnover Intentions

Variables	DV: Occupational turnover intentions						DV: Organizational turnover intentions					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Controls	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Age	-.04 *	.02	-.02	.02	-.03	.02	-.01	.01	-.01	.01	-.01	.01
Gender	-.36 ***	.10	-.05	.10	-.09	.10	-.16	.10	-.14	.10	-.07	.10
Marital status	.26 *	.11	.25 *	.12	.25 *	.12	.14	.11	.07	.12	.05	.12
Education level	.11 *	.04	.05	.05	.05	.05	.16 ***	.04	.12 **	.05	.11 *	.04
Organizational tenure	.00	.01	.00	.01	-.01	.01	-.02 *	.01	-.02 **	.01	-.02 *	.01
Occupational tenure	.00	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	-.00	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
From same township	.10	.05	.03	.05	.03	.05	.07	.05	.05	.05	.03	.05
Teaching grade	.15	.09	.09	.09	.08	.09	-.07	0.09	-.10	.09	-.12	.09
IV												
Organization-focused factors												
Leaders support					-.20 **	.07			-.40 ***	.07	-.38 ***	.07
Colleague support					-.32 **	.12			-.82 ***	.12	-.65 ***	.12
Material support for work					.10	.07			-.27 ***	.06	-.24 ***	.07
Occupation-focused factors												
Occupational satisfaction			-1.34 ***	.08	-1.33 ***	.08					-.19 **	.07
Salary satisfaction			-.37 ***	.06	-.34 ***	.06					-.20 **	.06
Intrinsic occupational choice motivation			-1.13 ***	.10	-1.07 ***	.11					-.14	.10
Extrinsic occupational choice motivation			.50 ***	.10	.47 ***	.10					.27 **	.09
-2 log likelihood	4726.29***		4015.03***		3971.97***		18003.7***		4669.33***		4619.81***	
Akaike (AIC)	4748.29		4045.03		4007.97		18037.70		4697.33		4655.81	
Bayesian (BIC)	4811.79		4131.57		4111.74		18135.84		4778.08		4759.58	
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC	4776.84		4083.91		4054.55		18081.83		4733.60		4702.39	

Note. N = 2,382. Reported in the table are proportional ordered log odds. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Table 3

Results of Net Regression Analyses

Variables	Organizational TI vs. Occupational TI		
	B ^a		SE
Controls			
Age	.00		.00
Gender	.38 ***		.01
Marital status	.14		.11
Education level	-.11 **		.04
Organizational tenure	.03 ***		.01
Occupational tenure	.01		.01
From same township	-.12 *		.05
Teaching grade	.22 **		.08
IV: Organization-focused factors			
Leader support	.79 ***		.07
Colleague support	.47 ***		.13
Material support for work	.65 ***		.06
IV: Occupation-focused factors			
Occupational satisfaction	-1.15 ***		.08
Salary satisfaction	-.29 ***		.05
Intrinsic occupational choice motivation	-.88 ***		.10
Extrinsic occupational choice motivation	.26 **		.09
-2 log likelihood	5185.63***		
Akaike (AIC)	5225.63		
Bayesian (BIC)	5340.93		
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC	5277.38		

Note. N = 2,382. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (2-tailed). TI = turnover intentions. ^a Reported are proportional ordered log odds, with each reflects the difference between magnitudes of the relationships between an antecedent and either type of TI (or difference between betas for different dependent variables from a single sample; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003, p. 157 & 642).

Table 4

Results of the Relative Importance Analysis

DV	Occupational turnover intentions		Organizational turnover intentions		
	Relative Weight		Relative Weight		
	Raw	Rescaled (%)	Raw	Rescaled (%)	
IV	Organization-focused factors				
	Leader support	0.008	2.559	0.025	18.313
	Colleague support	0.024	7.488	0.036	26.497
	Material support for work	0.003	0.769	0.020	16.988
	Occupation-focused factors				
	Occupational satisfaction	0.155	47.531	0.011	8.273
	Salary satisfaction	0.027	8.274	0.011	8.120
	Intrinsic occupational choice motivation	0.073	22.27	0.008	5.799
	Extrinsic occupational choice motivation	0.009	2.868	0.004	2.837
	Control				
	Age	0.000	0.228	0.001	0.469
	From same township	0.002	0.859	0.002	1.297
	gender	0.001	0.406	0.002	1.394
	Marital status	0.001	0.223	0.000	0.261
	Education	0.007	2.258	0.004	2.595
	Occupational tenure	0.005	1.518	0.002	1.780
	Organizational tenure	0.003	0.876	0.007	5.140
	School type	0.006	1.866	0.000	0.236
	Sum	0.324	100	0.133	100

Note. N = 2,382. All estimates are significant at $p = .05$ level.