



The Influence of Co-Worker Relationship on Turnover Intention of Employees in Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria

Prof. R. I. Adeghe Ph.D

Department of Banking and Finance, Igbinedion University, Okada, Edo State, Nigeria.

Dr. B. A. Chukwu Ph.D

Department of Business Administration, Igbinedion University, Okada, Edo State, Nigeria.

benedictchukwu103@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research examined the influence of co-worker relationship on employee turnover intention in Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria. Labour turnover cost, Nigeria Industry huge sum of money annually in hiring and training replacements. Retention of employee is not easy and is a complex issue, and there is no single recipe for retaining employees in a company. Management of food and beverage industry can reduce turnover by considering different preventive measures such as providing opportunity for co-workers and supervisors support during task accomplishment. Co-workers and supervisors support will increase employees ability to cope with their work and decrease turnover intention. Employees will opt out of the organization when they cannot get necessary assistance from their co-worker and supervisor. This research adopted a survey research instrument through the administration of questionnaire to three hundred and fifty five(355) staff of the sampled firm. The data for the research was analyzed using descriptive statistics and chi-square. The empirical results from the chi-square analysis showed that co-workers interactions, supervisor interactions, co-workers support and supervisor support with the employee has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5 percent level of significance. Based on the findings of the research, it is recommended that employees should interact fully with their co-worker and supervisor to obtain the necessary support during task accomplishment.

Keywords: co-worker relationship, supervisor support, co-worker support, supervisor interaction, co-worker interaction, turnover intention.

INTRODUCTION

Co-worker relationship is the extent to which employees perceived that co-worker offer them support, encouragement and concern. It is a social interaction that is supportive in both formal and informal relationships. Support from co-worker while performing their duty will allow employees to interact fully with their co-workers and obtain the necessary assistance (O'D'riscol & Cooper, 2002). Co-worker relationship is needed in organizational settings such as food and beverage industry.

In an organizational setting, such as food and beverage industry, co-worker relationship encompasses effective support such as love, and aid in work. (Burker, Borcki & Hurley, 1992; Freeze, 1999). Employees stay in organization when they perceive high co-worker relationship. This is because co-worker relationship help employee to realize their social emotional needs. Co-worker relationship also brings about enthusiasm and feelings of positive effect on employees (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2003). Support from supervisors, organization like food and beverage industry and co-workers will increase employee ability to cope with their work and decrease turnover intention. Food and Beverage employees will slack up in their duties when they do not perceive support from their supervisor and organization, and absenteeism will set in, followed by increase turnover (Marker, 2017).

The models of co-worker relationship are supervisory, peer support and kinship (Price, 2001). Price (2001) has evaluated these models in his work on employee turnover and found that supervisory and peer support has positive impact on job satisfaction and negative relationship with turnover intention. Food and Beverage staff will terminate their appointment if there is lack of support from organization, supervisor and mates, and also when there are interpersonal difficulties, lack of love, and respect, coupled with inability to offer direct help such as aid in work. Other supports which bother on emotion and appraisal of employee will be source of turnover when not fulfilled.

High staff turnover brings destruction to the organization in the form of direct and indirect costs and profitability (Roshidi, 2014). The direct costs are replacement costs, recruitment process cost for advertising, selection, interviewing, hiring, doing their orientation program (Gustafson, 2002). The indirect costs refers to the time consumed till the new employees gets acquainted with the new organization culture, system, his new job responsibilities (Gustafson, 2002).

Apart from the cost implications, staff turnover can reduce customers service, loyalty and cause psychological effects on employees (Oluwafemi, 2010). Staff turnover can disrupt organization strategic planning to achieve objectives when a critical employee is lost. (Oluwafemi, 2010; Capelli, 2008). Loss of an employee as a result of staff turnover can cause additional work stress and lower moral and motivation of employees that stay (Solomon, Hashim, Mehdi & Ajagbe, 2012).

Objective of The Study

This research examined the influence of co-worker relationship on employee turnover intention. The specific objectives of the research are to:

- I. ascertain whether employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers.
- II. determine whether employee will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors.
- III. examine whether employee will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers.
- IV. determine whether employee will intend to leave when they have support from their supervisor.

Research Questions

- I. Will employee intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers
- II. Will employee intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors
- III. Will employee intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers

IV. Will employee intend to leave when they have support from their supervisor.

Statement of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide this study.

Hypothesis 1

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers.

Hypothesis 2

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors

Ho: Employee will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors

Hypothesis 3

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers

Hypothesis 4

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors

Significance of the Study

The study will be of help to the following stakeholders:

- i. The study would be of great interest and valuable to practicing managers especially Human Resource Managers and help them to reduce turnover intention and create savings in hiring and training replacements.
- ii. The study would be of great benefits to researcher in Business Administration and Managementrelated field as it would provide empirical evidence for further studies on the area of employee turnover.

Scope of the Study

The study examined the influence of co-worker relationship on employee turnover intention. The scope of the study would delimit to staff of Bottling Company in Nigeria. The study adopted a survey research design through the administration of structured questionnaires raised on a five point scale to the sampled respondents for the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is the intention of workers to quit their job role and organization (Price, 2001; Adeboye & Adegoye, 2012). Turnover intention is the best predictor of actual turnover, and actual turnover is expected to increase as the intention to turnover increase (Adeboye & Adegoye, 2012). Turnover intention is one of the main determinant of leaving behavior (Price 2001; Brigham, Castro & Shepherd, 2007). Therefore when employees intend to leave and if this is ignored, it will lead to high loss of employees. Loss of employees can cause psychological distress, reduced productivity, quality service, increased recruitment cost (Powell& York, 1992;

Oluwafemi, 2010). It can also lead to work overload, mistrust, disruption in workflow and further turnover (Chukwu; Josiah, Ogungbenle, & Akpeti 2012).

Co-worker Relationship and Turnover Intention

Support from co-worker or supervisor leads to favourable outcome in organization such as reduced stress, turnover intentions, increased commitment, increased productivity and enhanced performance (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2003; Eisenberger, Stiglinhaber, Vanderberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades 2002; Lee, 2004). Therefore it is expected that food and beverage company employees who perceived high social support on their job will be attached, committed, and dedicated to their job.

Marker (2007) stated that poor supervision is the main cause of turnover intention and that support from supervisors and organization will increase employee ability to cope with their work and decrease turnover intention. Employees will slack up in their duties when they do not perceive support from their supervisor and organization and absenteeism will set in followed by increase in turnover (Marker, 2007).

Bakker et al (2003) stated that co-worker relationship conveys feelings of energy, enthusiasm and that when employees receive high co-worker relationship, they become committed to the organization. They also opined that co-worker relationship help employee to realize their social emotional need such as affiliation. Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) found that organizational support is negatively related to voluntary turnover. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) in their research work on perceived organizational support noted that it is related to favorable outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Griffin, Paterson and West (2000) carried out a study on the effect of supervisor support on turnover intention in United Kingdom. The empirical studies were carried out on 48 companies throughout United Kingdom in the manufacturing sector. The objective of the study was to find out the relationship between supervisor support, job satisfaction and turnover intention. They found that a strong correlation exist between supervisor support and job satisfaction. And that when employees are satisfied with supervisor support, they become committed to the organization, and will not want to leave.

Aube, Rousseau and Morin (2007) carried out a research on the perceived organizational support and organizational commitment in North America. The survey was conducted in 239 employees of correctional service in North America. The objective of the study was to find the relationship between supervisor support and turnover intention. The research finding showed that supervisor support had negative relationship with turnover intention.

Goldstein and Rockert (1984) conducted a research on effect of job satisfaction on turnover intention on IT firm in U.K. He used the job diagnostic survey tool developed by Hackman and Oldman (1976). The objective of the study was to find out the relationship between social support, by peers and supervisor on job satisfaction and turnover intention. The research finding showed that social support by peers and supervisors are very important for employees satisfaction and have negative relationship with turnover intention.

Eisenberger et al (2002) conducted a study on the effect of perceived organizational support on turnover intention. The objective of the study was to find out the relationship between organizational support and turnover intention. They found that perceived organizational support mediated the relationship between perceived supervisor support and turnover intention. The finding suggested that perceived organization support is a mechanism through which the effect of supervisor support on turnover intention occur. Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, Liden and Bravo (2011) also found that organizational support is positively related to job performance and

satisfaction when the organization offers development and career advancement, and that this reduce turnover intention.

Chung-chang, Sheng-Hswing and Chen (2016) conducted a research on the factors affecting turnover intention of hotel employees in Taiwan. The objective of the study was to find out the relationship between; job satisfaction, organizational commitment, co-worker relationship and turnover intention. The research finding showed that more humorous co-worker relationships between hostel employees and a higher level of satisfaction regarding their work environment have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction. The empirical results suggest that co-worker relationships and work environment have significant positive effect on job satisfaction. The study showed that co-worker relationships, salary level and organizational commitment in addition to work environment are important facets that influence employee turnover intention.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory asserts that various exchange relationships exists between members of an organization (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). Social exchange theory is an exchange process between parties, that is mutually contingent and mutually rewarding (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). This theory was used by numerous studies to explain the relationship between a diversity of organizational aspect and employee behavior (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005). A sense of attachment and commitment toward the organization is built by high level of social exchange (Gould-William, 2007). Employees that have high positive perception of exchange relation are less likely to leave the organization (Gould-Williams, 2007). The social exchange theory is of the opinion that organizations and managers can provide organizational support to achieve desirable attitude and behaviors from employees (Gould – Williams, 2007, Gould – Williams & Davies, 2005).

Employees stay at their work when they are satisfied with their salary, career growth, training and development and performance appraisal in their organization (Abubarkar, Chanhan& Kura, 2014). Eisenberger, et al, (2002) argued that the greater employees satisfaction with organization support, the more likely they will feel a responsibility to reward their organization.

METHODOLOGY

Survey research method was used in this study. It entails collection of data or information from specific population or sample through questionnaire instrument. Survey research method is use because the goal was to sample the opinion of the people on issues concerning the research. The population of the study comprised Staff of Bottling Company in Nigeria and was 3158. A sample of 355 was selected from this research using Yamane (1964) formular. A stratified random sampling technique was used to distribute sample to Bottling Company using stratum allocation technique of Kumar (1976). This sampling technique is considered most appropriate because it gives everybody in the population equal chance of being selected

Questionnaire was the measuring instrument. The Questionnaire was made up of five pointlikert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree with the statement) to 5 (strongly agree with the statement). The Questionnaire was self development of items. Demographic data was part of the Questionnaire. The validity and reliability of the Questionnaire was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability of the Questionnaire was 0.808. The values of 0.808 was above 0.7 which is within the acceptable limit in Social Science. This means that the data collected were valid and reliable for analysis.

A total of 355 Questionnaire were distributed to Staff of Bottling Company and 302 response were collected which has 85.07% response rate. Table and percentages were used to present and analyzed the data while chi-square was used to test the hypothesis.

Pilot Test

A pilot test was carried out on 40 respondents before questionnaire distribution in order to collect their comments, ensure simplicity and understanding of the Questionnaire, which helped in developing the Questionnaire more efficiently. A favorable comment was obtained from the 40 respondents and the result of the pilot test ensured that the survey was understandable by the 40 respondents.

The reliability analysis was conducted on interaction with co-workers, interaction with supervisors, support from co-worker and support from supervisors. Table 1 showed the reliability analysis of the Questionnaire, and the results show that the reliability coefficient of the Questionnaire ranged from 0.712 – 0.897. The reliability of the Questionnaire was 0.808, this means that the data collected was valid and reliable enough to be used for analysis. A value above 0.7 is acceptable in social science.

Table 1: Result of reliability analysis

Variables	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Interaction with co-workers	4	0.785
Interaction with supervisors	4	0.712
Support from co-workers	4	0.812
Support from supervisors	4	0.836
Turn over intention	4	0.897

Source: Authors computation, 2019

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATION

Data Presentation Analyses for Sample Background Variables.

A total of three hundred and fifty-five (355) questionnaires were given out to respondents and three hundred and two (302) were duly returned and usable, and subsequently analyzed, therefore, the response rate was 85.07%. The demography of the respondents was presented in the table below.

Table 2: Demography of Respondents.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age:		
Below	64	21.2
30-39 years	126	39.7
40-49 years	80	26.5
50 years and above	38	12.6
Total	302	100.0
Sex		
Male	208	66.9
Female	100	33.1
Total	302	100.0
Educational Level:		
Secondary	87	26.5
Post-Secondary	123	40.7
Polytechnic/University	99	32.8
Total	302	100.0

Department		
Accounting	36	11.9
Marketing	76	25.2
Administration	46	15.2
Production	89	29.5
Maintenance	55	18.2
Total	302	100.0
Marital Status		
Single	110	36.4
Married	192	63.6
Total	302	100.0
Year of Service		
Below 5 years	82	27.2
5-10 years	127	42.1
10-15 years	69	22.8
16years and above	24	7.9
Total	302	100.0
Number of Time Change Job		
2times and below	191	63.2
3- 4 times	81	26.8
5times and above	30	10
Total	302	100.0

Source: Authors Computation, 2019.

Table I above shows the age distribution of sampled respondents of whom, 64 (21.2%) of them were aged 30 years below, 120 (39.7%) were aged 30-39 years, 80 (26.5%) of them were aged 40-49 years, 38 (12.6%) were aged 50 years and above. This shows that majority of the respondents were aged 30-39 years. On the issue of sex of the sampled respondents, 202(66.9%) were males and 100 (33.1%) were females. This implies that majority of the respondents were males. On the educational level of the respondents who returned valid copies of distributed questionnaires of whom 80 (20.5%) of them attended secondary school, 123 (40.7%) of them attended post secondary school and 99 (32.8%) of them attended Polytechnic/University. This means that majority of the sampled respondents attended post-secondary school. Base on department, 36 (11. 9%) of the respondents were in accounting department, 76 (25.2%) of the respondents were in marketing department, 46 (15.2%) of the respondent, were in administration department, 89 (29.5%) of the respondents were in production department and 55 (18.2%) of the respondents were in maintenance department. On the issue of marital status of the sampled respondent, 110 (36.4%) of them were single and 192 (63.6%) of them married. This shows that majority of the respondents were married. On the year of service, 82 (27. 2%) had worked for the period of 5years and below, 127 (42.1%) had worked for the period of 5-10 years, 69 (22.8%) had worked for the period of 10-15 years and 24 (7.9%) had worked for the period of 16years and above. This shows that majority of the respondents had worked for the period of 5-10 years. On the number of times changed job, 191 (63.2%) of the respondents had changed job less than twice, 81 (26.8%) of the respondents had changed job for 3-4 times and 30 (10%) of the respondents had changed job for 5 times and above. This means that the majority of the respondents had changed job less than three times.

Test of Hypotheses

Chi- Square formula was used as statistical instrument for testing the hypotheses.

Chi-Square Formula:

$$X^2 = \frac{(of-ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where of = observed frequency

ef = expected frequency

χ^2 distribution is worked out by the value of its Degree of Freedom (df). Contingency table was also used to work out the expected frequencies.

Decision Rule: Reject the null (Ho) hypothesis and accept the research/alternate (Hi) hypothesis if the calculated (χ^2) value is greater than the table value.

$$\text{Expected Frequency } ef = \frac{\text{Roll Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

Hypothesis 1

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-worker.

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers.

Tested Data: Data collected and presented in table 3 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table 3: Whether respondent agree that employee will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co- workers.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	92	30.5
Disagreed	190	62.9
Undecided	20	6.6
Total	302	100

Source: Field Survey 2019

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-worker. 92 respondents representing 30.5 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-worker. 190 respondents representing 62.9 percent disagreed while 20 respondents representing 6.6 percent were undecided on the issue.

Table 4: Contingency

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	60 (53.5)	20 (26.5)	80
Disagreed	121 (123.7)	64 (61.3)	185
Undecided	21 (24.7)	16 (12.3)	37
Total	202	100	302

Source: Author’s computation, 2019

60 is the observed frequency of the number of males that agreed, while 53.5 is the expected frequency. 20 is the observed frequency of the number of females that agreed, while 26.5 is the expected frequency. 121 is the observed frequency of the number of males that disagreed while 123.7 is the expected frequency. 64 is the observed frequency of the number of females respondents that disagreed, while 61.3 is the expected frequency. 21 is the observed frequency of the males that were undecided while 24.7 is the expected frequency. 16 is the observed frequency of the females that were undecided while 12.3 is the expected frequency.

Expected Frequency Calculation.

$$\text{Expected Frequency} = \frac{\text{Roll Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

$$\text{Roll 1 cell 1 } 202 \times 80 \div 302 = 53.5$$

$$\text{Roll 1 cell 2 } 100 \times 80 \div 302 = 26.5$$

$$\text{Roll 2 cell 1 } 202 \times 185 \div 302 = 123.7$$

$$\text{Roll 2 cell 2 } 100 \times 185 \div 302 = 61.3$$

$$\text{Roll 3 cell 1 } 202 \times 37 \div 302 = 24.7$$

$$\text{Roll 3 cell 2 } 100 \times 37 \div 302 = 12.3$$

Table 5: Chi- Square

Of	ef	(of- ef)	(of – ef) ²	$\frac{(of – ef)^2}{ef}$
60	53.5	6.5	42.25	0.7897
20	26.5	- 6.5	42.25	1.5943
121	123.7	- 2.7	7.29	0.0589
64	61.3	2.7	7.29	0.1189
21	24.7	- 3.7	13.69	0.5542
16	12.3	3.7	13.69	1.1130
302				4.110

Source: Author’s computation, 2019

of = observed frequency

ef = expected frequency

X² = Chi-square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of-ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:

of is the observed frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue

ef is the expected frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue.

x^2 Value Calculated = 4.110

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1) (C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

At 3 Significant level the table value is 7.815.

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if the x^2 calculated is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (4.110) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co- workers.

Hypothesis 2

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors.

Ho: Employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisor.

Tested Data: Data Collected and presented in table 6 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table 6: Whether employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	88	29.1
Disagreed	182	60.3
Undecided	32	10.6
Total	302	

Sources: Field Survey 2019

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employee will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors 88 respondents representing 29.1 percent agreed that employees will intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors. 182 respondents representing 60.3 percent disagreed while 32 representing 10.6 percent were undecided on the issue.

Table 7: Contingency

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	61(56.2)	23 (27.8)	84
Disagreed	126 (124.4)	60 (61.6)	186
Undecided	15 (21.4)	17 (10.6)	32
Total	202	100	302

Source: Author's computation, 2019

61 is the observed frequency of the number of males that agreed, while 56.2 is the expected frequency. 23 is the observed frequency of the number of females that agreed, while 27.8 is the expected frequency. 126 is the observed frequency of the number of males that disagreed while 124.4 is the expected frequency. 60 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed, while 61.6 is the expected frequency. 15 is the observed frequency of the males that were undecided while 21.4 was the expected frequency. 17 is the observed frequency of the female respondents that were undecided while 10.6 is the expected frequency.

Expected frequency calculation

Expected frequency = $\frac{\text{Roll Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$

Roll 1 cell 1 $202 \times 84 \div 302 = 56.2$
 Roll 1 cell 2 $100 \times 84 \div 302 = 27.8$
 Roll 2 cell 1 $202 \times 186 \div 302 = 124.4$
 Roll 2 cell 2 $100 \times 186 \div 302 = 61.6$
 Roll 3 cell 1 $202 \times 32 \div 302 = 21.4$
 Roll 3 cell 2 $100 \times 32 \div 302 = 10.6$

Table 8: Contingency

Of	ef	(of- ef)	(of – ef) ²	$\frac{(\text{of} - \text{ef})^2}{\text{ef}}$
61	56.2	4.8	23.04	0.4099
23	27.8	-4.8	23.04	0.8288
126	124.4	1.6	2.56	0.0206
60	61.6	-1.6	2.56	0.0416
15	21.4	-6.4	40.96	1.9140
17	10.6	6.4	40.96	3.8641
302				7.079

Source: Author's computation, 2019

of = observed frequency

$$\begin{aligned}
 ef &= \text{expected frequency} \\
 X^2 &= \text{Chi-square} \\
 X^2 &= \frac{(\text{of-ef})^2}{ef}
 \end{aligned}$$

Where:

of is the observed frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue

ef is the expected frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue.

x^2 Value Calculated = 7.069

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1) (C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

Level of significant = 5% = 0.05

At 3 Significant Level, the table value is 7.815.

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if the x^2 calculated is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (7.079) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors.

Hypothesis 3

Hi: Employees will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers.

Ho: Employee will not intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers.

Tested Data: Data Collected and presented in table 9 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table 9: Whether employees will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	86	28.5
Disagreed	195	64.6
Total	21	6.9
	302	100

Sources: Field Survey, 2019

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondent agree that employees will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers. 86 respondents representing

28.5 percent agreed that employee will intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers. 195 respondent representing 64.6 percent disagree while 21 representing 6.9 percent were undecided on the issue

Table 10: Contingency

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	58(52.8)	21(26.2)	79
Disagreed	128(129.1)	65(63.9)	193
Total	16(20.1)	14(9.9)	30
	202	100	302

Source: Author's computation, 2019

58 is the observed frequency of the number of males that agreed, while 52.8 is the expected frequency. 21 is the observed frequency of the number of females that agreed, while 26.2 is the expected frequency. 128 is the observed frequency of the number of males that disagreed while 129.1 is the expected frequency. 65 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed, while 63.9 is the expected frequency. 16 is the observed frequency of the males that were undecided while 20.1 was the expected frequency. 14 is the observed frequency of the female respondents that were undecided while 9.9 is the expected frequency.

Expected frequency calculation

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{Roll Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

$$\text{Roll 1 cell 1} \quad 202 \times 79 \div 302 = 52.8$$

$$\text{Roll 1 cell 2} \quad 100 \times 79 \div 302 = 26.2$$

$$\text{Roll 2 cell 1} \quad 202 \times 193 \div 302 = 129.1$$

$$\text{Roll 2 cell 2} \quad 100 \times 193 \div 302 = 63.9$$

$$\text{Roll 3 cell 1} \quad 202 \times 30 \div 302 = 20.1$$

$$\text{Roll 3 cell 2} \quad 100 \times 30 \div 302 = 9.9$$

Table 11: Chi- Square

Of	ef	(of- ef)	(of – ef) ²	$\frac{(\text{of} - \text{ef})^2}{\text{ef}}$
58	52.8	5.2	27.04	0.5121
21	26.2	-5.2	27.04	1.0306
128	129.1	-1.1	1.21	0.0094
65	63.9	1.1	1.21	0.0189
16	20.1	-4.1	16.81	0.8363
14	9.9	4.1	16.81	1.6979
302				4.1052

Source: Author's computation, 2019

of = observed frequency

$$\begin{aligned} ef &= \text{expected frequency} \\ X^2 &= \text{Chi-square} \\ X^2 &= \frac{(\text{of-ef})^2}{ef} \end{aligned}$$

Where:

of is the observed frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue

ef is the expected frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue.

x^2 Value Calculated = 4.1052

To find degree of freedom

$$df = (R-1) (C-1)$$

$$(3-1) (2-1)$$

$$3 \times 1$$

$$df = 3$$

Level of significant = 5% = 0.05

At 3 Significant Level, the table value is 7.815.

Decision Rule: Reject H_0 if the x^2 calculated is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (4.105) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that the employee will not intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers.

. Hypothesis 4

H1: Employee will intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors.

H0: Employee will not intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors.

Tested Data: Data Collected and presented in table 12 was used to calculate the expected frequency.

Table 12: Whether respondents agree that employees will intend to leave when they have support from their supervisor.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Agreed	80	26.5
Disagreed	192	63.6
Undecided	30	9.9
Total	302	100

Sources: Field Survey 2019

The table shows the response of the respondents on whether respondents agree that employee will intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors. 80 respondents representing 26.5 percent agreed that employee will intend to leave when they have support of their supervisor. 192 respondents representing 63.6 percent disagreed while 30 respondents representing 9.9 percent were undecided in the issue.

Table 13: Contingency

Responses	Male	Female	Total
Agreed	62(58.8)	26(29.1)	88
Disagreed	120(119.1)	58(58.9)	178
Undecided	20(24.1)	16(11.9)	36
Total	202	100	302

Source: Author's computation, 2019

62 is the observed frequency of the number of males that agreed, while 58.8 is the expected frequency. 26 is the observed frequency of the number of females that agreed, while 29.1 is the expected frequency. 120 is the observed frequency of the number of males that disagreed while 119.1 is the expected frequency. 58 is the observed frequency of the number of female respondents that disagreed, while 58.9 is the expected frequency. 20 is the observed frequency of the males that were undecided while 24.1 was the expected frequency. 16 is the observed frequency of the female respondents that were undecided while 11.9 is the expected frequency.

Expected frequency calculation

$$\text{Expected frequency} = \frac{\text{Roll Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{\text{Grand Total}}$$

Roll 1 cell 1 $202 \times 88 \div 302 = 58.8$

Roll 1 cell 2 $100 \times 88 \div 302 = 29.1$

Roll 2 cell 1 $202 \times 178 \div 302 = 119.1$

Roll 2 cell 2 $100 \times 178 \div 302 = 58.9$

Roll 3 cell 1 $202 \times 36 \div 302 = 24.1$

Roll 3 cell 2 $100 \times 36 \div 302 = 11.9$

Table 14: Chi-square

of	Ef	(of- ef)	(of – ef) ²	$\frac{(of - ef)^2}{ef}$
62	58.8	3.2	10.24	0.1741
26	29.1	-3.1	9.61	0.3302
120	119.1	0.9	0.81	0.0068
58	58.9	-0.9	0.81	0.0137
20	24.1	-4.1	16.81	0.6975
16	11.9	4.1	16.81	1.4126
302				2.6348

Source: Author's computation, 2019

of = observed frequency

ef = expected frequency

X² = Chi-square

$$X^2 = \frac{(of-ef)^2}{ef}$$

Where:

of is the observed frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue

ef is the expected frequency of the number of males and females that agreed, disagreed and are undecided on the issue.

X² value calculated = 2.635

To find degree of freedom

df = (R-1) (C-1)

(3-1) (2-1)

3×1

df = 3

At 3 significant level, the table value is 7.815

Decision Rule: Reject Ho if the x² calculated value is greater than the table value and vice versa. Since the calculated value (2.635) is less than the table value (7.815), the null hypothesis was accepted and the alternate rejected. This therefore means that employees will not intend to leave when they have support from their supervisor.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The result showed that the entire four hypotheses were accepted while the alternate hypotheses were rejected.

Four findings were revealed from the results which showed that:

- i. Employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their co-workers.
- ii. Employees will not intend to leave when they have good interaction with their supervisors.
- iii. Employees will not intend to leave when they have support from their co-workers.
- iv. Employees will not intend to leave when they have support from their supervisors.

Chi-Square statistical Analysis showed that Co-worker Relationship has significant influence on employee turnover intention at 5% level of significance. Employees will not turnover when all issues concerning co-worker relationship is given proper attention and resolved.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this research is to examine the influence of co-worker relationship on employees turnover intention in food in Beverage Industry in Nigeria. To execute this research goal, four objectives were raised from four research questions drawn, and four hypotheses were also formulated and tested. Based on the results from the test of the four hypotheses, it is concluded that co-worker relationship has significant influence on employee turnover intention. And employees will not turnover when all issues concerning co-worker relationship is given proper attention and resolved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the research findings.

1. It is recommended that employees should interact fully with their co-workers to obtain necessary support during task accomplishment.
2. It is recommended that employees should interact fully with their supervisors to get the necessary assistance and support with which they can increase the ability to hope with their work and decreased turnover intention.
3. It is recommended that co-worker relation should encompass effective support such as liking and respect.
4. It is recommended that co-worker relation should encompass direct help to employees such as aid in work, giving information, and giving money.

Limitations of the Study

- i. The sample size of the study was constrained due to the inability of the respondents to voluntarily participate in the survey. In addition, the non inclusion of all Bottling companies in Nigeria would also reduce the sample size of the study.
- ii. The usage of survey research instrument was usually constraint with poor response and this ultimately affects the sample size. Also the reluctant of respondents to answer the questionnaire in the process of data collection, due to fear of victimization by those in authority was another limitation of the study.

REFERENCES

- Abubakar, R, Chanchan, A, & Kura, K (2014) Relationship between perceived organizational politics, organizational trust, human resource management practices and turnover intention among Nigerian Nurses. *Management Science Letters, 4*, 2031 – 2048.
- Adeboye, T. A, Adegoroye, A.A. (2012) Employee's perception of career progression and turnover among bank workers in Ife Central Local Government Area. Osun State. *Research Journal of Organizational Psychology & Educational Studies, 1*, 253 – 360.
- Aube, C, Rousseau, Y & Morin, E.M (2007) Perceived organizational commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*, 471-495
- Bakker, A.B. Demerouti, E & Schaufeli; W.B (2003). Dual process of work in a call centre: An application of the Job demands resources model. *European Journal of work and Organizational psychology, 12*, 393-417.
- Brigham, K.H, Castro, Job,B.&Shepherd, D.A. (2007) A person organization fit model of owner's manager's cognate style and organizational demands. *The Services Industrial Journal 5*, 1042-2587
- Burke, M.J Borci, C.C & Hurley, A. E (1992) Conceptualizing psychological climate in a retail service environment: A multiple stakeholder perspective, *Journal of Applied psychology, 72*, 717-729.
- Capelli, P. (2008) *Talent on Demand Management; Talent Age of Uncertainty*. Harvard Business Press, .Boston, U.S.A
- Chukwu, B.A, Josiah, M, Ogungbenle, S.K & Akpeti, E (2012). The effect of labour turnover in Brewery Industries in Nigeria: A study of Guinness Brewery Industry PLC and Bendel Brewery LTD in Benin City. *Asian Journal of Business Management, 4*, 114- 123.
- Chun-chang, L, Sheng – Hsiung H &Cheny: Z (2016) A study on factors affecting turnover intention of hotel employees. *Asian Economic and Financial Review, 2*, 866-875
- Cropanzoni, R. & Mitchell, M.S (2005) Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31*, 874 – 900.
- Eisenberger, R, Stringlihamber, F, Vandenberg, C. Sucharski, I.L Rhoades, L(2002) Perceived supervisor support, contribution to perceived organizational support and employees retention *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 565-573
- Freeze, M (1999) Co-worker relationship as a moderator of the relationship between work stressors and psychological dysfunction: A longitudinal study with objective measure. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychological, 4*, 179-192
- Goldstein, A, K & Rockert, J.F (1985) An examination of work related correlation of job satisfaction in programmers/analytic, *Management science quarterly. 12*, 103 – 155.
- Gould –Williams, J & Davies, F. (2005) Using Social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practices on employee outcomes: An analysis of public Sector workers. *Public Management Review, 7*, 1 – 4.
- Gould –Williams J. (2007) Practice, organizational climate and employees outcomes evaluating social exchange relationship in local government. *The International Journal of Human Recourse Management, 18*, 1627 – 1647.

- Griffin, M.A, Patterson, M.S & West M.A (2000) Job Satisfaction and team work: The role of Supervisor Support *Journal of Organization Behavior*, 22,531-550.
- Gustafson, C.M (2002) Staff turnover: Retention. *International journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14,106-110.
- Hackman, J. R & Oldman, G. (1967) Motivation through the design of work test theory. *Organizational Behaviour and performance*, 16, 250 – 279.
- Kraimer M.L, Seibert, S.E, Wayne S.J Liden R.C & Bravo J (2001) Antecedents and outcomes of organizational support for development: The critical role of career opportunities *Journal of Applied Psychology*,96,485-500.
- Kumar S (1976) *A Manual of Sampling Technique* London: Heinemann.
- Lee, C.C, Huang, S.H & Zhao, C.Y (2012) A study on factors affecting turnover intention of hotel employees. *Asian Econ Financial Rev.* 866-875
- Marker, M (2007) Turnover drivers and retention factors. *Management Review*, 2, 14 – 27
- O' Driscoll. M. P & Cooper, C.L (2002) *Job Related Stress and Burnout in P Man R (Eds) Psychology at work*. London penguin Books
- Oluwafemi .O. J (2010) Contextual Dispositional Factor, Turnover Intention and Perceived job Alternatives and predictions or Organizational Citizenship behavior of Employees of Nigeria's oil industry, University of Ibadan unpublished Ph.D Thesis.
- Powel, M.J & York.R.O (1992) Turnover in Country public welfare agencies. *Journal of Applied Social Services*,16, 111-1 27
- Price, J.L (2001) Reflection of the determinant of voluntary turnover *Journal of Manpower* 22, 600-624.
- Rhoades, L & Eisenberger, R. (2002) Perceived organizational support: A review of the Literature: *Journal of Applied Psychology*,87, 698-714
- Rhoades, L, Eisenberger R, Armeli S (2001) Affective commitment to the organization: The attributions of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,86, 825-836
- Roshidi, H (2014) Factors influencing turnover intention among technical employees in information technology organization: A case of XYZ (M) SDN. BHD. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 3, 120 – 137.
- Solomon, O., Hashim, H, Mehdi B. T. Z & Ajagbe, A. M. (2012) Employee Motivation and organizational performance in multinational companies: A study of Cadbury Nigeria PLC, *International Journal of Research in Management Technology*, 21, 303 – 312.
- Yamane, T (1964) *Statistics an Introductory Analysis*. Haper and Row publishers, New York.