Research Article
The Causes of Labour Turnover in Bottling Companies in Nigeria: A Comparative Study of Coca-Cola Plc and Seven Up Plc. Lagos, Nigeria

[1]B.A. Chukwu, [2]O.S. Ofotokun, [1]J.T. Fadeji and [1]V.U. Sule
[1]Department of Business Administration, Igbinedion University Okada, Edo State, Nigeria
[2]Department of Sociology, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

Abstract: This study compared the causes of labour turnover in Coca-Cola Plc and Seven Up Plc. in Lagos, Nigeria. They are the major producers of soft drink in Nigeria. Labour turnover costs soft drink industries in Nigeria considerable amount of money yearly in recruiting and training replacements. It is an economic drain to the industry. A sizeable income is also incurred through new employees that are more prone to accidents, causes more breakages and make more mistakes than experience workers. Other loses are also incurred through reduced production, work disruption and increase scrap and overtime as a result of departed workers. A cross-sectional survey was utilized to collect data for answering research questionnaires and testing hypothesis in this study. The data collected from questionnaire instrument were also analysed using percentages (%) and Z-test for comparing two proportions. Comparative analysis of the data showed that Seven Up Plc. rated unwillingness to perform as major cause of discharge while Coca-Cola Plc. rated attitudinal causes. Both companies rated unsatisfactory pay as the major cause of resignation. Seven Up Plc. was not significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc. on a hypothesis testing about the difference between proportions of samples. The Null hypothesis assumed that there were no difference in parameters and that the difference observed between sample percent was due to chance.

Keywords: Discharge rate, labour retention, labour turnover, resignation response rate, rate, turnover cost

INTRODUCTION

Labour turnover is the sum of the aggregate accession and Separation rates. The accession rate is calculated as a sum of aggregate flow from unemployment to employment, from inactivity to employment and from one employment to another, divided by initial or average employment in a given year (Burgess *et al*., 1997). The separation rate is a sum of aggregate flows from employment to unemployment, from employment to inactivity and from one employment to another, divided by initial or average employment in a given year (Burgess and Rees, 1998).

There are many potential causes of labour turnover. Voluntary separation (resignation) is initiated by the employee, while involuntary terminations are initiated by the employer. The employee has no choice in their termination, such as long term sickness, moving overseas, death or employer initiated termination (Martin, 2003).

Ruby (2002) classified labour turnover into internal and external. Internal turnover involves employees leaving their current positions and taking new position within the same organisation. Both positive (such as increased moral from the change of task and supervisor) and negative (such as project/relational disruption exists

and therefore, it may be equally important to monitor its external counterpart. Internal turnover might be moderated and controlled by typical human resource mechanism such as an internal recruitment policy or formal succession planning.

Labour turnover is a serious and ongoing problem of great concern to employers of labour. Joseph (1972) noted that labour turnover costs American industry 11 billion dollar a year. This figure includes costs of recruitment, hiring and training replacements. In addition, new employees are prone to accident, because more breakages and make more mistakes than experienced worker, so that the cost of replacing a man may greatly exceed the hiring estimates (Stessin, 1961).

In the U.S. for the period of December 2000 to November 2008, the average total none seasonally adjusted monthly turnover rate was 3.3%, however, the rates vary widely when compared over different period of time or different job sectors. For example during the period 2001 and 2006, the annual turnover rate for all industry sectors averaged 39.6% before seasonal adjustment, during the same period the leisure and hospitality sector experience an average rate of 74.6% (Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2008). This corroborates the findings of Joseph (1972) which stated that labour

turnover cost American industry 11 billion dollar a year.

When costs are put into consideration, such as time taken to select and recruit a replacement and also opportunity costs, such as lost productivity, the cost of employee turnover to for-profit organizations has been estimated to be up to 150% of employee remuneration package. These include direct and indirect costs. Direct costs relate to leaving costs, replacement costs and transition costs and indirect costs relate to the loss of production, reduced performance levels, unnecessary overtime and low morale (Bureau of Statistics, 2008). These are direct and indirect effects of labour turnover resulting from the causes of labour turnover we want to compare in soft drink bottling companies in Nigeria namely Coca Cola Plc and Seven Up Plc. Coca Cola Plc and seven Up PIc are private companies.

High turnover is caused by unhappiness with the work, inadequate compensation, unsafe and unhealthy conditions, unrealistic expectations, inappropriate processes or tool and poor candidate screening. Others are lack of career opportunities and challenges, dissatisfaction with job-scope or conflict with management (Jackson, 1981; Steer, 1991).

Updating skills of workers through training and reinforcement develops a workforce that is competent, consistent, competitive, effective and efficient. Starting from the first day of work, providing individual with the necessary skills to perform their job is important. Before the assumption of duty, it is necessary the interview and hiring process expose new hires to an explanation of the company, so individuals know whether the job is their choice. It is also important to motivate employees to focus on customer success, profitable growth and the company well being. Employers can keep their employees informed and involved by including them in future plans, new purchases and policy changes as well as introducing new employees to the employees who have gone above and beyond meetings (Dijkstra, 2008).

When companies hire the best people, new talents hired and veterans are enabled to reach company goals, maximizing the investment of each employee. Taking the time to listen to employees and making them feel involved will create loyalty, in turn reducing turnover, allowing for growth (Costello, 2006).

Controlled turnover can be healthy as it clears dead wood and brings new blood and fresh ideas and approaches to the organisation. Most organizations do not usually attach monetary value to the loss caused by labour turnover. They usually feel very reluctant to attack the problem. Some organizations are ignorant of the problem. Considerable time, efforts and money are poured into attracting, selecting and training employee, but also too little of the same are directed towards keeping them. It is worthwhile knowing the causes of labour turnover in Soft Drink Bottling Companies because of the numerous problems associated with labour turnover and its attendant effect on the productivity and effectiveness of an organisation.

The findings from this study cannot be generalized to other Soft Drink Bottling Companies or other industries because the circumstances are not the same. It will require much larger study to be able to generalize. But at least, the result can form basis for further study and a contribution to ongoing research experiments on the causes of labour turnover.

Statement of problems:

- Labour turnover costs huge sum of money in hiring and training replacement.
- New replacements recruited as a result of labour turnover are prone to accidents, causes more breakages of equipment and make more mistakes.
- There is decrease in output as a result of labour turnover, through work disruption, reduced production, increase in scrap and overtime in other to meet deadline.
- Additional turnover is usually created and there is difficulty in recruiting new staff if the departing staff with bad feeling influences the attitude of others towards employer.

Objective of study:

- To compare the causes of labour turnover in Coca-Cola Plc. and Seven Up Plc. In Lagos, Nigeria.
- To find out why employees are discharged in the two industries under study and compare the causes of discharge.
- To find out why employees resign in the two companies and compare the causes of resignation.
- To find out the difference between the proportions of sample from the two companies.
- To proffer solution to the causes of labour turnover.

Relevant research questions: The study did utilize the following research questions:

- Why employees discharged and what are are the causes of their discharge?
- Why do employees resign and what are the causes?
- What impact has labor turnover to the organization?
- Does labour turnover occur in all departments?

Statement of hypotheses: The following hypotheses were also formulated to guide this survey.

- **H_0:** Avoidance of the incidence of non-competitive compensation will not minimize labour turnover in Soft drink bottling companies.
  H_A: Avoidance of incidence of non-competitive compensation will minimize labour turnover in Soft drink bottling companies.

- **H$_o$:** Labour turnover in the Soft drink bottling companies is not due to lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment.
- **H$_A$:** Labour turnover in the Soft drink bottling companies is due to lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment.
- **H$_o$:** Offer of challenging job and hope for future prospects will not guide against labour turnover in the Soft drink bottling companies.
  H$_A$: Offer of challenging job and hope for future prospects will guide against labour turnover in the Soft drink bottling companies.
- **H$_o$:** Good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical or interpersonal working condition will not minimize labour turnover in Soft drink bottling companies.
  H$_A$: Good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical or interpersonal working condition will minimize labour turnover in Soft drink bottling companies.

Significance of study:
- To know the causes of labour turnover in Soft drink bottling Companies in Nigeria.
- Knowledge of basic factors responsible for labour turnover will help to reduce turnover rate and create savings in hiring and training cost.
- To know how competitive organisations respond to labour turnover.
- To monitor and determine variables that influence turnover and manage turnover behaviour.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A research work carried out by Stessin (1961) attributed the causes of voluntary turnover to non competitive compensation, high stress, unpleasant physical and interpersonal conditions, monetary and poor direct supervision.

Steer (1991) in his research finding stated that the cause of labour turnover in an organisation ranges from lack of challenging task, better opportunity for advancement, low salary scale and job attitude. This supported the findings of Testa (2008) that high turnover often means that employees are unhappy with work or compensation, but it can also indicate unsafe or unhealthy conditions or that too few employees give unsatisfactory performance (due to unrealistic expectations, inappropriate processes or tools, or poor candidate screening). The lack of career opportunities and challenges, dissatisfaction with the job scope or conflict with the management, has been cited as predictors of high turnover.

Workers can also leave when their ambition to move up the managerial hierarchy through hard work and display of intelligence is frustrated. The chance of advancement to decision making positions would transform an employee lack of interest into loyalty, commitment and peak performance (Dale, 1969). He also stated that an appraisal process that is ineffective, coupled with discriminating and inequitable salary structure and defective personnel polices can cause labour turnover. This corroborates the findings of Jackson (1981) that opportunity for better pay and better career prospect in other breweries can cause an employee to leave for a greener pasture where a better standard of living is assured. In most Breweries, employees have to move up through the ladder to get to the top, this ambitious brewers tend to take up higher level job in other new brewery where their prospects on the job is guaranteed.

Labour turnover caused by layoffs in agricultural labour market is caused by seasonal conditions which are beyond the employer's control. The problem of seasonal fluctuation in the demands for agricultural product causes labour turnover, since it will be difficult to meet workers demand in terms of welfare and pay during this period (Tran and Perloff, 2002). Most agricultural products are seasonal and workers are out of job after the growing season. By careful planning of work, it is possible to approach a uniform production schedule so that permanent staff is employed throughout the year. If employers were required to hire on an annual basis, most of this planning would become a necessity. The problem of seasonal fluctuation in the demands for a product can in many cases be solved.

Labour turnover is obviously significantly affected by economic fluctuation, in times of economic upswing, enterprises are able to create new jobs and hire more people while separation for economic reasons moderate. This is also a favourable period of new enterprises startups and expansions. At the same time an increase number of job opportunities encourages more people to change their jobs voluntarily (Clark, 2004). In contrast, in downswings, enterprises are forced to cut labour costs and frequently resort to layoffs and to reducing new hires, workers are more reluctant to quit their jobs. Labour turnover thus tends to develop procyclically (Boeri, 1995) and the reasons are more on the supply side in the decision of workers to change jobs, rather than on sides of the enterprises.

Resignation occurs when an employee wants to relocate to other job. This in most cases is cause by poor interviewing procedure that failed to intimate the employee on the type of challenges he was going to meet in his job. The employment interview was only concerned with determining whether the employee is satisfactory and forgets that the job and the company must also be satisfactory to the employee, if he is to remain. The job may be misrepresented during the interview in order to induce a desirable candidate to take the job.

Job security is notable causes of labour turnover and an organisation with job insecurity will experience high turnover (Kuzmarski and Thomas, 1995; Roy, 2002). An employee has no option than to stay if he cannot find job when there is job insecurity. The recognized security was security of continuous employment (Coulson-Thomas, 1997). He found that more secured personalities find it easier to stay and also

stated that the very people that should be the front corporate drive and purpose are frequently plagued by insecurity and doubt.

Lack of job satisfaction leads to employee turnover. Turnover is related to job satisfaction and matching an employee expectation of rewards and satisfaction to what is really offered by the job can help to reduce turnover (Jackson, 1981; Tett and Meyer, 1993).

There is likely to be turnover in an organization where loyalty is missing. An employee who has less opportunity for advancement is likely to be less loyal, less committed and less satisfied in the job (Mottaz, 1986; Tett and Meyer, 1993).

For an employee to know the impact they are making in an organization, they need some feedback. Kuzmarski and Thomas (1995) worked extensively on feed back with respect to employee turnover and noted that insufficient feedback can result to unhappiness on employee and can make them to look for other jobs. According to him, lack of communication and feedback between management and workers has left most employees not sure of what their organizations norms and value are.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Methodology: A cross sectional design was used in this study. A cross sectional design is explanatory and exploratory and involves collection of data to answer research questions and relationships among variables (Asika, 1991). It was used to collect data for hypothesis testing. Descriptive method of analysis was used to distribute relevant research variable using percentages. The difference between the proportion of samples from Seven Up Plc. and Coca-Cola Plc. were analysed using Z-test for comparing two proportions.

The population of sample size: The population of study comprises 276 staff of Coca-Cola Plc and 306 staff of Seven Up Plc. The population size was 582. The sample size was determined using (Yamane, 1964) formular which is stated as follow $n = N/1+Ne^2$.

where,
N = Population size
n = Sample size
e = Level of size
I = A theoretical consonant $582/1+582(0.05)^2 = 149$ samples

Calculation of stratum Allocation using (Kumar, 1976) technique:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

where,
n_h = Stratum allocation
n = Sample size
N_H = Stratum population

Table 1: Demographic analysis of data

	Feature	No. of respondents	Percentage (%)
Department:	Accounting	8	9.63
	Marketing	22	26.51
	Administration	14	16.87
	Production	29	34.94
	Maintenance	10	12.05
	Total	83	100
Age bracket:	Below 30 years	17	20.48
	30-39	34	40.96
	40-49	21	25.30
	50 and above	11	13.25
	Total	83	100
Education:	Primary	7	8.43
	Secondary	17	20.48
	Post Secondary	33	39.76
	University	26	31.33
	Total	83	100
Sex:	Male	60	72.29
	Female	23	27.71
	Total	83	100
Marital status:	Married	55	66.27
	Single	28	33.73
	Widow	-	-
	Divorce/separated	-	-
	Total	83	100

Field survey 2009

N = Overall population

Stratum Allocation for Coca-Cola Plc: $\frac{149 x 276}{582} = 71$ samples

Stratum Allocation for Seven Up Plc: $\frac{149 X 306}{582} = 78$ samples

Hence the sample size was 149 comprising 71 staff of Coca-Cola Plc and 78 staff of Seven Up Plc.

Sample technique: The simple random sampling technique was used to ensure that every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected into the sample.

Instrument for data collection: The data used for this research was obtained using a carefully prepared questionnaire. A total of 149 questionnaires were distributed to staff of Coca-Cola Plc. and Seven Up Plc, Lagos and 83 responses were collected. 41 responses were collected from Coca-Cola Plc and 42 responses from Seven Up Plc. This represents 55.70% of sample size of the population which is a good representation for the population study. The response rate in Coca-Cola Plc and Seven up Plc. were 27.52 and 28.19% respectively.

Data presentation and analysis:
Demographic analysis of data: The Table 1 gives the features of respondents used n the research.

Data analysis according to research questions: Comparison of the causes of discharge in Seven Up Plc. and Coca-Cola Plc. Question 14 in the questionnaire instrument was employed to compare the responses

from Seven Up Plc and Coca-Cola Plc. Question 14 was which of the following are the causes of discharge of employee in your organization? Inability to perform, unwillingness to perform, attitudinal causes such as tardiness and absenteeism and failure to observe rules and regulations.

Forty two 42 respondents from Seven up Plc. which constitute 28.5% of response rate were asked to rate any of the variables in Table 2, they considered as the major causes of discharge. The highest response was recorded on unwillingness to perform (35.71%), followed by attitudinal causes (28.57%). Failure to observe rules and inability to perform had 21.43 and 14.29% respectively. Inability to perform had the least response.

Similarly, 41 respondents from Coca-Cola Plc. which constitutes 27.18% response rate were asked to rate any of the variables in Table 2; they considered as the major cause of discharge. The highest response was recorded on attitudinal causes (36.59%), followed by unwillingness (31.71%). to perform. Failure to observe rules and inability to perform had 19.51% and 12.19% respectively. Inability to perform had the least response.

Inability to perform had the lowest response in both companies. The response rate followed the same pattern in the two companies, when comparing unwillingness to perform, attitudinal causes, failure to observe rules and inability to perform. Seven Up Plc. rated unwillingness to perform as the major cause of discharge while Coca-Cola Plc. rated attitudinal causes. The responses were 15 and 15 for Seven up Plc. and Coca-Cola Plc. These figures represent 35.71% and 36.59% of respondents from Seven Up Plc. and Coca-Cola Plc. respectively.

Comparison of causes of resignation in Coca-Cola Plc and Seven Up Plc. Question 16 in the questionnaire instrument was employed to compare the responses from Seven Up Plc and Coca-Cola Plc.

Question 16 was which of the following is the cause of resignation of employee in your organization? Better opportunity elsewhere, lack of promotability opportunities, unfair and unequal treatment, unsatisfactory pay, poor supervision, interpersonal relationship and unpleasant working condition, inability to perform.

Forty two respondents from Seven Up Plc which constitute 28.52% of response rate were asked to rate any of the variables in Table 3, they considered as the major causes of resignation. The highest response was recorded on unsatisfactory pay (38.09%), followed by Better opportunity elsewhere, (26.19%). Lack of promotability opportunities, unfair treatment and poor supervision had 21.43% and 9.52% respectively, while inability to perform had the least response (4.76%).

Similarly, 41 respondents from Coca-Cola Plc. which constitutes 27.18% response rate were asked to rate any of the variables in Table 3, they considered as the major causes of resignation. The highest response was recorded on unsatisfactory pay (36.58%), followed

by better opportunity elsewhere (31.71%). Lack of promotability opportunities, unfair treatment and poor supervision had 19.51 and 7.32%, respectively. The least response was recorded on inability to perform (4.88%).

Inability to perform had the lowest response in both companies. The response rate followed the same pattern in the two companies when comparing unsatisfactory pay, better opportunity elsewhere, lack of promotability, poor supervision and inability to perform. Both companies rated unsatisfactory pay as the major cause of resignation. The responses were 16 and 15 respectively. These figures represent 38.09% and 36.58% of the respondents from Seven Up Plc. and Coca-cola Plc. respectively.

Test of hypotheses: The hypothesis of the study was formulated in form of Null (H_0) and Alternate (H_A) hypothesis. The data got from the questionnaire instrument had responses supporting either H_o and H_A hence we opted to use Z-test for comparing two proportions. The test of differences between proportions of two samples is similar to the test of difference between the means of two samples. The null hypothesis assumes that there is no difference in the parameters and that the difference observed between the sample percents is due to chance. The theoretical sampling distribution of differences is assumed to be normal with a mean of zero and a standard deviation which is the standard error of the difference between the sample proportions, hence

$$ps1 - ps2 = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{n_2}}$$

$$P = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

And x_1 and x_2 represent the respective number of occurrences in the two samples.

The population proportion, p is usually not known, but can be estimated by combining the data from both samples to give p. The calculated value of Z is computed by the relationship.

$$Z = \frac{(Ps_1 - Ps_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma ps_1 - ps_2}$$

Where H is hypothesized that $p_1 - p_2 = 0$ and ps_1, ps_2 are sample proportions for the first and second populations respectively.

The problem is to test at 5% level, to see if layout in seven up Plc is significantly better than layout 2 coca-cola Plc.

Applicable hypotheses:

H_o: $p_1 - p_2 = 0$
H_A: $p_1 - p_2 > 0$

Table 2: Distribution of responses on the causes of discharge

Variables	Responses from seven Up Plc.	%	Responses from coca-cola Plc.	%	Total
Inability to perform	6	14.29	5	12.19	1
Unwillingness to perform	15	35.71	13	31.71	28
Attitudinal causes	12	28.57	15	36.59	27
Failure to observe rules	9	21.43	8	19.51	17
	42	100	41	100	83

Field survey 2009

Table 3: Distribution of responses on the causes of resignation

Variables	Responses from Seven Up Plc	%	Responses from Coca-cola Plc.	%	Total response
Better opportunity elsewhere	11	26.19	13	31.71	24
Lack of promotability	9	21.43	8	19.51	17
Unsatisfactory pay	16	38.09	15	36.58	31
Poor supervision	4	9.52	3	7.32	7
Inability to perform	2	4.76	2	4.88	4
	42	100	41	100	83

Field survey 2009

$\alpha = 0.05$
At $\alpha = 0.05$, the rejection value is 1.64.

Decision rule: We accept the Null hypothesis of no difference at the 0.5 level if the calculated Z-value is less than the absolute critical Z-value of 1.65.

Hypothesis 1:

H$_0$: Avoidance of the incidence of non-comparative compensation will not minimize labour turnover in soft drink bottling companies.

H$_A$: Avoidance of incidence of non-competitive compensation will minimize labour turnover in soft drink bottling companies.

Data collected from question 9 of the questionnaire instrument was used for this test. Question 9 is, will competitive and adequate compensation minimize labour turnover? Those in favour of competitive and adequate compensation as a means of minimizing labour turnover were used from the two companies for comparison.

Layout 1: Seven Up Plc.

Layout 2: Coca-cola Plc Sample $n_1 = 78$ $n_2 = 71$ No of respondents $x_1 = 31$ $x_2 = 30$ in favour Sample proportion $Ps_1 = x_1/n_1 = 0.3974$ $Ps_2 = x_2/n_2 = 0.4225$ The test is conducted at 5% level to see if layout 1 is significantly better than layout 2. $H_o: P_1-P_2 = 0$ $H_A: P_1-P_2 > 0$ At $\alpha = 0.05$, the rejection value of Z is 1.64. Calculated value of Z is obtained according to the following equation.

$$Z = \frac{(Ps_1 - Ps_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma p_1 - p_2}$$

where, $Ps_1 = 0.3974$, $Ps_2 = 0.4225$, $P_1-p_2 = 0$ (according to Ho)

$$ps1 - ps2 = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{n_2}}$$

$$P = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{62}{157} + \frac{60}{141} = 0.4094$$

Thus $\sigma ps_1 - ps_2 = \sqrt{\frac{(0.4094)(0.5906)}{157} + \frac{(0.4094)(0.5906)}{141}}$

$= 0.057$ And $Z = \frac{0.3974 - 0.4225 - 0}{0.057} = -0.440$

Decision: Since Z -0.44<Zu (1.64), we do not reject Ho. Thus we conclude that the test does not support the alternate hypothesis that layout 1: Seven Up Plc. is significantly better than layout 2: Coca-Cola Plc.

Hypothesis 2:

Ho: Labour turnover in the soft drink bottling companies is not due to lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment.

Ha: Labour turnover in the soft drink bottling companies is due to lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment.

Data collected from question 10 of the questionnaire instrument was used for this test. Question 10 is, is turnover due to lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment? Those in favour of lack of promotability opportunities and unfair and unequal treatment as the cause of labour turnover were used from the two companies for the comparison.

Layout 1: Seven Up Plc

Layout 2: Coca-Cola Plc Sample $n_1 = 78$ $n_2 = 71$ No of respondents $x_1 = 31$ $x_2 = 29$ in favour Sample proportion $Ps_1 = x_1/n_1 = 0.3994$ $Ps_2 = x_2/n_2 = 0.4085$ The test is conducted at 5% level to see if layout 1 is significantly better than layout 2. $H_o: P_1 - P_2 = 0$ $H_A: P_1 - P_2 > 0$ At $\alpha = 0.05$, the rejection value of Z is 1.64. Calculated value of Z is obtained according to the following equation.

$$Z = \frac{(Ps_1 - Ps_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma p_1 - p_2}$$

where, $Ps_1 = 0.3974$, $Ps_2 = 0.4085$, $P_1 - p_2 = 0$ (according to Ho):

$$ps1 - ps2 = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{n_2}}$$

$$P = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{62}{157} + \frac{57}{141} = 0.3993$$

$$\sigma\, ps_1 - ps_2 = \sqrt{\frac{(0.3993)(0.6007)}{157} + \frac{(0.3993)(0.6007)}{141}}$$

$$= 0.05683 \text{ And } Z = \frac{0.3974 - 0.4085 - 0}{0.0568} = -0.1954$$

Decision: Since Z (-0.19) <Zu (1.64), we do not reject Ho. Thus we conclude that the test does not support the alternate hypothesis that Seven Up Plc. is significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc.

Hypothesis 3:

Ho: Offer of challenging job and hope for future prospects will not guide against labour turnover in the soft drink bottling companies.

H_A: Offer of challenging job and hope for future prospects will guide against labour turnover in the soft drink bottling companies.

The data collected from question 11 of the questionnaire instrument was used for this test. Question 11 is, will offering of challenging job and hope for future prospect guide against labour turnover. Those in favour of offering challenging job and hope for future prospect as a guide against employee turnover were used from the two companies for comparison.

Layout 1: Seven Up Plc

Layout 2: Coca-Cola Plc: Sample $n_1 = 78$ $n_2 = 71$ No of respondents $x_1 = 35$ $x_2 = 33$ in favour Sample proportion $Ps_1 = x_1/n_1 = 0.4487 = x_2/n_2 = 0.4648$ The test is conducted at 5% level to see if layout 1 is significantly better than layout 2. Ho: $P_1-P_2 = 0$ HA: $P_1-P_2 > 0$ At $\alpha = 0.05$, the rejection value of Z is 1.64. Calculated value of Z is obtained according to the following equation.

$$Z = \frac{(Ps_1 - Ps_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma p_1 - p_2}$$

where, $Ps_1 = 0.4487$, $Ps_2 = 0.4648$ $P_1-p_2 = 0$ (according to Ho):

$$\sigma ps_1 - ps_2 = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{n_2}}$$

$$P = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{71}{157} + \frac{65}{141} = \frac{136}{298} = 0.4564$$

$$\sigma\ ps_1 - ps_2 \sqrt{\frac{(0.4564)(0.5436)}{157} + \frac{(0.4564)(0.5436)}{141}} =$$

$$0.0578 \text{ And } Z = \frac{0.4487 - 0.4648 - 0}{0.0576} = -0.279$$

Decision: Since Z (-0.28) <Zu (1.64), we do not reject Ho. Thus we conclude that the test does not support the alternate hypothesis that Seven Up Plc is significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc.'

Hypothesis 4:

Ho: Good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical or interpersonal working condition will not minimize labour turnover in soft drink bottling companies.

H_A: Good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical or interpersonal working condition will minimize labour turnover in soft drink bottling companies.

The data collected from question 12 of the questionnaire instrument was used for this test. Question 12 is, can good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical working condition minimize labour turnover? Those who favoured good supervision, reduction of stress and unpleasant physical and working condition as a means of minimizing labour turnover from the two companies were used in this test.

Layout 1: Seven Up Plc

Layout 2: Coca-Cola Plc Sample $n_1 = 78$ $n_2 = 71$ No of respondents $x_1 = 28$ $x_2 = 26$ in favour Sample proportion $Ps_1 = x_1/n_1 = 0.3590$ $Ps_2 = x_2/n_2 = 0.3662$ The test is conducted at 5% level to see if layout 1 is significantly better than layout 2. Ho: $P_1-P_2 = 0$ H_A: $P_1-P_2 > 0$ At $\alpha = 0.05$, the rejection value of Z is 1.64. Calculated value of Z is obtained according to the following equation.

$$Z = \frac{(Ps_1 - Ps_2) - (P_1 - P_2)}{\sigma p_1 - p_2}$$

where, $Ps_1 = 0.3590$, $Ps_2 = 0.3662$, $P_1-p_2 = 0$ (according to Ho):

$$\sigma ps_1 - ps_2 = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n_1} + \frac{p(1-p)}{n_2}}$$

$$P = \frac{x_1 + x_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{57}{157} + \frac{52}{141} = 0.3658$$

Thus $\sigma\,ps_1 - ps_2 = \sqrt{\dfrac{(0.3658)(0.6342)}{157} + \dfrac{(0.3658)(0.6342)}{141}}$

$= 0.0558$ And $Z = \dfrac{0.3590 - 0.3662 - 0}{0.0558} = -0.129$

Decision: Since Z (-0.13) <Zu (1.64), we do not reject Ho. Thus we conclude that the test does not support the alternate hypothesis that Seven Up Plc is significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of findings:

- The causes of labour turnover (discharge) were inability to perform, unwillingness to perform, attitudinal causes such as tardiness and absenteeism and failure to observe rules and regulations.
- A comparison of causes of discharge between 42 respondents from Seven Up Plc. which constitutes 28.52% of response rate and 41 respondent from Coca-cola Plc which constitutes 27.18% of response rate, in Table 2 showed that 35.71% respondents from Seven Up Plc. rated unwillingness to perform as the major cause of discharge while 36.59% of respondents from Coca-Cola Plc. rated attitudinal causes. The responses were 15 and 15 for Seven Up Plc and Coca-Cola Plc. respectively and were the highest number when compared with responses on other variables.
- The causes of labour turnover (resignation) were better opportunity elsewhere, lack of promotability opportunities, unfair and equal treatment, unsatisfactory pay, poor supervision, interpersonal relationship and unpleasant working condition and inability to perform.
- A comparison of the causes of resignation between 42 respondents from Seven Up Plc. which constitutes 28.52% of response rate and 41 respondents from Coca-cola Plc. which constitutes 27.81% of response rate in Table 3, showed that the 38.09% respondents from Seven Up Plc. rated unsatisfactory pay as major cause of resignation while 36.56% of respondents from Coca-cola Plc also rated unsatisfactory pay. The responses were 16 and 15 for Seven Up Plc and Coca-Cola Plc respectively and were the highest number when compared with response on other variables.
- A hypothesis testing about the differences between the proportion of samples from Seven Up Plc. and Coca-Cola Plc. showed that Seven Up Plc were not significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc. The result of the analysis did not support alternate hypothesis that Seven Up Plc. was significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc. and null hypothesis (Ho) was not rejected. The null hypothesis assumed that there was no difference in parameters and that the difference observed between the sample percentages was due to chance.

CONCLUSION

Unwillingness to perform and attitudinal causes were generally accepted as the major factor causing discharge of employee. Unsatisfactory pay was generally accepted as the major causes of resignation. Seven Up Plc. was not significantly better than Coca-Cola Plc. in hypothesis testing about the differences between proportions of samples. The null hypothesis assumed that there was no difference in the parameters and that the difference observed between the samples was due to chance.

RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON RESEARCH FINDING

- Management should endeavour to manage voluntary aspect of turnover e.g. non competitive compensation, high stress etc.
- Organizations should determine variables causing labour turnover and monitor them.
- Human resource managers should eliminate negative characteristics in the working environment and screen out potential leavers during hiring process. The number of terminations required because an employee is incompetent can be reduced by more careful selection and by sifting them into work which they can be fitted.
- The employer must ensure that the job and company is satisfactory to the worker and not only the worker satisfactory to the job and the company.
- Inability to perform can be corrected through training and relocation of an employee to a better fitted job.
- Unwillingness to perform, absenteeism and tardiness should attract outright dismissal or termination to avoid other employees from following their footstep.
- There should be hope for future prospect to employees in order to increase their loyalty and commitment. A loyal and committed staff hardly leaves the organization.

REFERENCES

Asika, N., 1991. Research Methodology in the Behavioural Sciences. Longman Nig. Plc., Logos, pp: 12-30.

Boeri, T., 1995. Is Job Turnover Countercyclical? EUI Working Paper in Economics Series. Paper No. 95/12, European University Institute, Florence.

Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2008. Job Openings and Labour Turnover Survey. Retrieved from: http//datablsgov/PDO/servlet/surveyoutputservlet? Data tool = latest number series id = JTS50000000 TSR.

Burgess, S. and H. Rees, 1998. A disaggregate analysis of the evolution of job tenure in Britain, 1975-1993. Brit. J. Ind. Relat., 36(4): 629-655.

Burgess, S., L. Pacelli and H. Rees, 1997. Job Tenure and Labour Market Regulation: A Comparison of Britain and Italy using Micro Data. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 1712, Centre for Economic Policy Research, London.

Clark, K.A., 2004. The job openings and labor turnover survey: What initial data show. Mon. Labor Rev., 127(11): 14-23.

Costello, D., 2006. Leveraging the employee life cycle. CRM Mag., 10(12): 45-48.

Coulson-Thomas, C., 1997. The Future of the Organisation, Achieving Excellence through Business Transformation. Kongon Press, London, 14: 258.

Dale, S.B., 1969. Personnel, the Management of People at Work. Mac Millan Publishers Co., New York, pp: 8-13.

Dijkstra, E., 2008. What Drives Logistics Professionals? Retrieved from: http://europhia.com/docs/europhia-research-whatdrives-logisticsprofessionals.pdf. (Accessed on: October 21, 2009)

Jackson, M., 1981. Personnel London. 2nd Edn., Heinemann Publishers, London, pp: 4-103.

Joseph, J.F., 1972. Handbook of Modern Personnel Administration. McGraw Hill, Inc., New York, pp: 1-62.

Kumar, S., 1976. A Manual of Sampling Technique. Heinemann Publishers, London, pp: 15-30.

Kuzmarski, S.S. and D.K. Thomas, 1995. Value Based Leadership: Rebuilding Employee Commitment, Performance and Productivity. Prentice Hall, USA, pp: 34.

Martin, C., 2003. Explaining labour turnover: Evidence from UK establishments. Labour, 17(3): 291-412.

Mottaz, C.J., 1986. An analysis of the relationship between education and organisational commitment in a variety of organisation. J. Vocat. Behav., 7: 214.

Roy, S.D., 2002. Job security regulations and worker turnover: A study of the Indian manufacturing sector. Indian Econ. Rev., 37(2): 141.

Ruby, A.M., 2002. Internal teacher turnover in urban middle school reform. J. Educ. Students Placed Risk, 7(4): 379-406.

Steer, R.M., 1991. Motivation and Work Behavior. McGraw-Hill, USA, pp: 168-260.

Stessin, L., 1961. Figures that management does not see: High cost of Labour turnover. Don Sers Moi Ind. Rev. USA, 77: 75.

Testa, B., 2008. Early engagement, long relationship. Workforce Manage., 87(15): 27-31.

Tett, R.P. and J.P. Meyer, 1993. Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analystic findings. Pers. Psychol., 46(2): 259-293.

Tran, L.H. and J.M. Perloff, 2002. Turnover in US agricultural labour market. Am. J. Agric. Econ., 84(2): 427-437.

Yamane, Y., 1964. Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. 3rd Edn., Harper and Row Publishers, New York, pp: 9-12.