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Abstract
Millennial generation workforce is a new emerging generation and soon will become dominant workforce in Indonesia. Sadly, millennial generation has high turnover intention in Indonesia. Millennial employee turnover intention is a new problem for human resources because millennial employee has different characteristic compare to its predecessor. Therefore, to resolve millennial employee turnover, the analysis for the affecting factors is necessary. Recently, we found other factors in general generation such as salary and compensation, perceived alternative employment opportunity, employee development system, and employee involvement may affect the millennial employee turnover intention. In this study, to find out the other factors, we conducted a research especially in Indonesia. Data tested by using factor analysis and the results of multiple regression analysis indicated that millennial employee turnover intention significantly affected by perceived alternative employment opportunity and employee development system. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Keyword: millennials, turnover intention, perceived alternative job, employee development system, salary and compensation, involvement

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12959/issn.1855-0541.IIASS-2018-no3-art5

¹ Antonio Frian is the student of Magister Management Program in Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia (antonfrian@ymail.com)

² Fransiska Mulyani is the student of Magister Management Program in Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia (fransiska.mulyani02@gmail.com)
Introduction

In current workforces, there are various generations (Baby Boomer, X, and millennial) work together in one workplace. Each generation has different attitude, characteristic, and different skill, therefore it will be challenging for companies to create suitable work environment for various generation (Gursoy et. al, 2008). Some studies showed that understanding generational difference in workplace will give companies chances to develop strategies for motivation, work environment, compensation, and new human resources policy, therefore companies are able to fulfill each generation needs. (Egri & Ralston, 2014; Kupperschmidt, 2000; Lyons et. al, 2005). Companies that could understand and value generational difference have higher opportunity in business. (Mikitka, 2009).

Some countries such as America in 2015 faced generational change in workplace. Generation X was the dominant workforce until 2015. Millennial generation took over as the dominant workforces in America. (Fry, 2018). Workforce generational change made different work motivation arise. Generation difference in workplace research result showed that generational difference has significant impact toward work satisfaction, turnover intention, and organizational commitment (Costanza et. al, 2012). Similar researches supported the result in generation difference. (Ng & Feldman, 2010; Parry & Urwin, 2011; Twenge, 2010). Millennial generation has been increasing and will replace other generation predecessor such as Baby Boomer and Generation X. Work environment faces cultural changes and millennial generation become uncomfortable with their current workplace, therefore it will affect their turnover intention.

Employee turnover research conducted by other researchers to analyze factors that affect turnover intention and give recommendation for companies system in order to reduce employee turnover. Currently the dominant workforce generation in labor market is millennial generation and in the near future this generation will become the largest workforce in labor market. Indonesia total workforces from all generation are (Gen baby boomer, X, millennial) 160,369,900 and the millennial generation is 39% from total workforces (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2016). Research result from Dale Carnegie Indonesia showed that only 25% of millennial generation fully engaged with companies, meanwhile 9% millennial employee feeling disengaged with their companies and the other 66% partially engaged (Dale Carnegie Indonesia, 2016). 60% from millennial generation intent to leave the company if they are feeling disengaged. Some partially engaged employee soon will turn into disengaged employee and finally they will leave the company too, therefore they will
affect turnover from company. Companies will face generational difference and have to understand their characteristic in order to maintain the turnover rate.

Millennial generation soon will replace their predecessor and have different characteristic. Millennial generation tend to have higher turnover rate compare to previous generation because of some factors. These factor was researched by Zhang (2016) and there are several factors that affect employee turnover such as personal aspect (age, gender, education, status, etc.), organizational aspect (Company size, salary, promotion, training, individual work attitude, etc.), and social economic aspect (transportation, residence, cost of living, health and education facility, etc.). These factor are for all generation and not specific for millennial generation. Similar research conducted by Saragih (2016) show several factors that affect millennial employee turnover such as salary, facility, career opportunity, supervision, relationship, work, job flexibility, and work location. Factors revealed by Saragih do not cover all factors that affect millennial employee turnover in general, which may actually affect millennial employee turnover. We will conduct the research for other factors in general that may affect millennial employee turnover based on this gap. The research objective is to find out the other factors that affect millennial employee turnover and able to help companies to face millennial generation. What factors that may affect millennial employee turnover in Indonesia? This research focuses on millennial employee that actively work in Indonesia.

**Literature Review**

Generation is a group defined by birth year, age, and incident in their lives. (Kupperschmidt, 2000). People in the same generation tend to have same characteristic, attitude, and behavior because they grew up in the same era (Beldona et. al, 2008). Generational difference in other research showed different work attitude arise because of different work value and work value affect their work result (Elizur, 1984). Work value difference could create different perceived work experience based on their own job and affect their involvement in workplace. (Christian et al., 2011; Kahn, 1990). Perceived work experience affects work meaning from each person and it refers to work significance and skills difference (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Work value affects work motivation based on work value. Millennial generation had lower work value compared to other generations, therefore they tend to have lower work involvement (Park & Gursoy, 2012).

Millennial generation or as known as Generation Y is a newest generation in workforces and they born in 1980-2000. Millennial
Millennial generation is different from other generation (Baby Boomer and Generation X). Research result from Howe & Straus (2007) proved that millennial generation was special, vital, promising for social and future development, they also guided by regulation and security devices. Millennial generation had self-confident and optimistic characteristic, they also team oriented, focused on achievement, always wanted to do the best and need to achieve something higher. Millennial generation also prideful and assertive compared to other generations (Twenge & Campbell, 2001). Similar research showed millennial generation had higher locust of control and prideful compared to other generation (Trzesniewski & Donnellan, 2010).

Millennial generation grows with economic prosperity, fast technology development such as internet, social media, and globalization. Millennial generation appreciated freedom and work life balance compared to baby boomer (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Smolla & Sutton, 2002; Twenge, 2010). Millennial generation had lower work value and prefer work with lots of holiday compared to other generations (Twenge et. al, 2010). Other research showed that millennial generation gave better work result in meaningful job and could not stand boring work environment (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

Millennial generation’s different characteristic built different behavior such as communication pattern. Millennial generation attempted to build positive and open communication constantly, but also collected and shared information (Gursoy et. al, 2008; Hill 2002; Howe & Strauss, 2007; Marston, 2007; Martin, 2005; Zemke et al., 2000). Millennial generation workforce is a hard-working, high responsibility, and team oriented (Elam, Stratton, & Gibson, 2007; Gloeckler, 2008), but millennial generation tends to blame other generation because their lack and sensitiveness toward work feedback, and show turnover intention (Twenge & Campbell, 2012).

Employee becomes an important issue and challenge that every company have to face in globalization era because employee turnover affects company productivity. Turnover became a problem because high employee replacement cost (Lucas, 2012). The impact caused by employee turnover can be financial (training cost, recruitment, etc.) or non-financial (low motivation for other employee, bad company image) (Boushey & Glynn, 2012), therefore it could reduce companies performances. (Staw, 1980). High turnover could evoke several loss in short time for individual, companies, and society. (Dalton & Todor, 1979). Companies’ performance rose if they were able to reduce cost from employee replacement, motivationg employee, and also increasing
innovation in company (Lee, 2017). Companies should be able to maintain turnover rate, therefore it would reduce costs and preserve productivity in companies and also kept the talented employee. Employee turnover required to replace employee with low productivity and replace them with better skills and potentials (Phillips, 1990). Turnover rate from each company is different and the highest turnover rate is in private sector. Public Sector had lower turnover rate compared to private sector (Rankin, 2006). Lower turnover rate was cause by turnover intention because there are several more attractive job. Turnover could also cause by companies or personal factor, companies attempted to replace them with better employee or moved away with their couple (Campion, 1991). Employee’s bad relationship with the company also affect their turnover intention (Carsten, 1987). Bad employee development also becomes factor that support their turnover intention. Several research showed that employee turnover rate caused by turnover intention (Abdulbaset, 2015; Fernet et. al, 2017; Labrague, 2018).

Turnover intention is the intent or effort to leave current workplace without coercion (Adams & Beehr, 1998). Turnover intention expressed employee’s thinking about attempting to leave their current job (Tett & Meyer 1993). Several researches showed many factors affect turnover intention (Avcı and Küçükusta, 2009; Çarıkçı and Çelikkol, 2009) such as company support (Hui et. al, 2007), citizenship behavior (Bellou, 2008), workplace justice (Choi, 2011), and organizational commitment (Boyas et. al, 2012). Turnover intention could create losses for company if not anticipated (Şahin, 2011). High Turnover intention would increase the frequency to leave current job and give negative impact for companies (Demir and Tütüncü, 2010) such as financial cost, other than that turnover intention would affect communication between employees (Şahin, 2011). Several research used turnover intention as predictor in turnover rate (Hom et. al, 1992; Griffeth, 2000; Ajzen, 1991; Holtom, et. al, 2008) and showed that individual intention can be seen as actual behavior to leave their job (Holtom et. al, 2008). Planned behavior theory has been used in many research and workplace attitude (Arnold et. al, 2006), one of them was in turnover (Van Breukelen et. al, 2004).
Hypothesis Development

Salary and Compensation

Salary and compensation are payment that received by employee for their contribution in company. Employee that received suitable salary with their education level tend to stay in their company (Cho & Lewis, 2011). According to Queiri (2015) research showed that salary and compensation didn’t affect Generation Y turnover intention. This result was support by Eddy (2010), where millennial generation didn’t expect high salary in their workplace. Surprisingly, it was different from Tolbize (2008) and Curpall et. al (2005) researches on several generation such as baby boomers and Generation X. Their researches result showed that low salary will increase turnover intention. This difference showed that there are different characteristic between baby boomer & Generation X and Millenial generation.

Hypothesis 1: Salary and compensation have negative influence on turnover intention in millennial generation

Perceived Alternative Job Employment

Perceived alternative job employment is workers’ recognition of other job replacement for their current job (Price & Mueller, 1986). Worker sees an opportunity for job changing in job market; therefore perceived alternative job employment arises and affect turnover intention. According to Shikiar & Freudenberg (1982) showed positive correlation between recruitment rate in labor market towards turnover. Turnover intention could arise if there is perceived alternative job employment with better job and give out better opportunity (Saeed, 2014). Queiri (2015) researched perceived alternative job employment in Malaysia on Generation Y. Malaysia services sector development rose and opened up new job opportunity, therefore affect turnover intention from employee. This research tests perceived alternative job employment influence towards turnover intention on millennial generation.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived alternative job employment has positive influence on turnover intention in millennial generation.

Employee Development System

Employee development is an employee enrichment with knowledge & skills. According to Rahman & Zekeriya (2013) employee development system affect turnover intention and suggest that every company should have good employee development system to reduce turnover intention. Other research conducted by Eisenberger et. al (2001) & Foong-Ming (2008) showed that workers tend to have higher satisfaction and motivation if there is employee development system in the company and
it reduces turnover intention. This theory supported by Liu et. al (2006) that employee development system in form of training or development opportunity will affect turnover intention. The absence of employee development system makes employee hard to grow and create turnover intention. This research tests employee development system influence towards turnover intention on millennial generation.

**Hypothesis 3: Employee development system has negative influence on turnover intention in millennial generation**

**Employee Involvement**

Employee involvement is employee attachment toward his/her job in organization (Ashkanasy, Wilderom, & Peterson 2000). According to Alfes et. al (2013) showed that involved employee tend to have lower turnover intention. Employee with high involvement works as hard as possible and fills himself with work thought; therefore the turnover intention becomes lower. Other research conducted by Vera, Rixardo J. (2001) shown that many cases in employee involvement that had direct effect on turnover intention. Similar researches showed the same result that employee involvement had positive influence on turnover intention (Harter et. al, 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; De Lange et. al, 2008).

**Hypothesis 4: Employee involvement has positive influence on turnover intention in millennial generation.**

Figure 1: Research Theoretical Framework
Research Methods
This research was conducted by using quantitative approach with questionnaire, therefore the interferences were become minimal and there was no manipulated variable in this research. This research setting was non-contrived because it was field studies, where the research environment was natural (no environment manipulation) and there was no interference on sample activities.

Survey was conducted by collecting information through questionnaire. Convenience sampling was used in this research. Convenience sampling is a non-probability method where the sample easy to access, geographical proximity, available for certain time, or willing to participate (Dörnyei, Z., 2007). Convenience Sampling assume the target was homogeneously (Lawrence et al., 2013). Sample target in this research was 200 sample. In this research the unit of analysis was individual which is employee in millennial generation. This research was one-shoot study which the samples were collected in one period to see the phenomenon during research. Research instrument was self-administrative questionnaire where respondent read and answered the question directly. Questionnaire was distributed online. Questionnaire development based on previous research conducted by Mulyapradana (2011) and Kanungo (1982).

Research method used in this research was to see the relationship between independent variable \(x\) and dependent variable \(y\). Dependent variable in this research was turnover intention and there were four independent variables in this research which is salary and compensation \((x_1)\), perceived alternative job employment \((x_2)\), employee development system \((x_3)\), and employee involvement \((x_4)\). Dependent dan independent variables were measured by using 5-likert scale. The measurement result was analyzed by using multiple regression analysis in SPSS 23.
Table 1: Variable Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>INTENTION [INT] Employee intention to quit from his/her current job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x1</td>
<td>Salary and compensation</td>
<td>SALARY [SAL] Employee perceived on current salary and compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x2</td>
<td>Perceived alternative job employment</td>
<td>OTHER JOB [OTH] Perceived alternative job availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x3</td>
<td>Employee development system</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT [DEV] Employee development system provided by the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x4</td>
<td>Employee involvement</td>
<td>INVOLVEMENT [INV] Psychological condition that interpret other person participation in workplace, identifying themselves with their current job, and realizing work achievement as importance for their pride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1</td>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>EDUCATION Last formal education achieved by sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c2</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GENDER Sample gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c3</td>
<td>Personal economic condition</td>
<td>ECONOMIC Salary per month received by employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c4</td>
<td>Position/Rank</td>
<td>POSITION Employee current position/rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c5</td>
<td>Organization scale</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION Organization scale, usually seen by it’s number of workforces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c6</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>AGE Employee age based on birth year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result

Validity and Reliability Measurement

Validity and Reliability test conducted to test the validity and reliability of the data. Validity measurement was evaluated using KMO and Bartlett’s Test, Communalities, and Component Matrix. Based on authors validity test, several instruments are not valid such as DEV2, INV1, INV4, INV7, INV8, INV11, INV12, INV18, INV19, INV20, INV21, INV23. The final result shows in Table 2.
Table 2: Validity Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test and Construct</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>INV</th>
<th>Component Matrix</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMO result</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT1</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.952 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.961 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT3</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.811 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL1</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772 .325 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL2</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.732 .621 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL3</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.891 .261 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL4</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.890 .246 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL5</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.778 .235 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL6</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.816 .194 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL7</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.749 .631 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL8</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.812 .469 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL9</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.800 -.100 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL10</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.943 -.197 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.749 -.611 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.753 .591 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.561 .455 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.739 .601 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.752 -.607 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTH6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.599 -.383 - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.818 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.924 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.923 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.938 - - - -</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEV5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.556 .624 -.012 -.354 -.202</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.794 .546 .442 -.148 .528</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.768 .698 .331 -.294 .291</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.718 .714 .213 -.356 .193</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.702 .689 -.235 -.396 -.123</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.739 .741 -.411 .121 .08</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.737 .694 -.296 .227 .343</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.728 .769 -.308 .056 -.199</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.771 .678 -.534 -.045 -.153</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Validity Test Result (cont’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test and Construct</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>SAL</th>
<th>OTH</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>INV</th>
<th>Component Matrix</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV24</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability evaluated using Cronbach’s alpha. Cronbach’s alpha for each instrument are INTENTION = .897; SALARY = .944; OTHER JOB = .774; DEVELOPMENT = .919; dan INVOLVEMENT = .876. The recommended cut off point for Cronbach’s alpha reliable test is .7 (Hair, 2010). All the reliability scores are above recommended cut-off point, therefore all the remaining instrument are valid and reliable.

Hypothesis Testing
Hypothesis testing was done by using multiple regression analysis with SPSS version 23. In Hypothesis 1 test, the result for SAL (β = +.037; t-value = .524; p = .601) showed that SAL didn’t have significant influence because t-value < 1.96. Hypothesis 4 test showed the same result, the INV result (β = +.065; t-value = .468; p = .641) implied that INV also didn’t have significant influence. However the test on Hypothesis 2 (OTH) and Hypotheses 3 (DEV) had the opposite result. The test result on OTH (β = +.334; t-value = 3.759; p = .000) and DEV (β = -.227; t-value = .065; p = .001) showed that both of them have significant influence, which means perceived alternative job employment had positive influence on turnover intention and also development system had negative influence on turnover intention.

Based on the test result, Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 4 are not supported, meanwhile Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 are supported. Findings in this research showed these variables cover 15.4% from all variables that may affect turnover intention \(R^2 = .154\); p = .000), meanwhile the other 84.6% affected by other variables that was not included in this research.

Discussion
This research tried to find the factors that affect turnover intention for millennial generation in Indonesia by using variables that had not test in other research. Authors test 4 variables which is salary and compensation, perceived alternative job employment, employee development system, and employee involvement. multiple regression test showed that salary and compensation and employee involvement
didn’t have significant influence on turnover intention. However, perceived alternative job employment and employee development system had significant influence. In other word, based on these findings we can see that millennial generation is looking a job not based on its salary & compensation and job involvement. Surprisingly they are looking for a job that meet their expectation related to perceived alternative job employment and have employee development system.

Perceived alternative job employment had positive influence toward turnover intention, which means the higher or bigger the millennial employee perception on other job employment, most likely they will leave their current job (higher turnover intention). This result supported by Chiyifeng & Tay (2010), they showed that turnover intention can occur because there are better opportunities in other job, which means the other job employment had better quality or could meet the expectation from millennial generation (Garner, 2008).

The other variable is employee development system, where employee development system had negative influence toward turnover intention in millennial generation. This result showed that the better companies’ employee development system, turnover intention will become lower. Liu, et. al (2006) research showed that employee that didn’t receive development, chance for grow, and skill upgrade most likely will quit their current job (have high turnover). That is why employee development system in companies will have significant influence on millennial employee turnover. Millennial generation wanted to feel they are precious for the company and hoped the company invest on them, also need employee development system (Pricewaterhouse C, 2008). Deloitte research (Deloitte, 2016) saw millennial generation that satisfy with the grow opportunity and development program will tend to become more loyal to the company. Both result from PWC and Deloitte research supported this finding, where turnover intention will become lower if there is employee development system. Millennial generation saw grow opportunity and training program from company as a sign that the company values them and willing to invest for them, therefore millennial generation will become more loyal and reduce turnover intention. This statement also supported by Giancola (Giancola, 2008) which also state the most important thing for millennial generation employee is the chance for grow and self-development.

As on the Table 3 shows, authors finds that man and woman in millennial generation has same turnover intention rate. The other finding is the higher education level from the employee will tend to have higher turnover intention rate. The older millennial generation (born in 1980-
1987) has lower turnover intention compared to younger millennial generation. The older millennial employee generation has more responsibility compared to younger millennial generation. Older millennial employee generation tends to responsible for their family. The other finding is income, where the high or low income has same turnover intention and this also supports hypothesis 1. The other finding is organization scale. Big or small organization has same turnover intention.

Gender has same perceived alternative job employment and their age also affect the perceived alternative job employment, where millennial generation in 30-38 years old have lower perceived alternative job employment that 20-29 years old millennial generation. The other finding is undergraduate millennial employee has higher perceived alternative job employment than high school education level. The other findings in position, salary, organization scale do not affect perceived alternative job employment because the mean value > 3.

The finding in employee development system is the millennial generation aging from 30 to 38 years old more care about the development system because it will affect their career in the future. Millennial generation with income level \( \geq \) IDR 5 mio./month also wants employee development system. The other finding is employee in the bigger organization scale demand better employee development system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Mean INT</th>
<th>Mean OTH</th>
<th>Mean DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-38 years old</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>84.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank/Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Managerial</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; IDR 5 mio./month</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \geq ) IDR 5 mio./month</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (Employee &lt; 1000 people)</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (Employee ( \geq ) 1000 people)</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n = 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research result gives important implication for company Human Resource (HR) and other researchers especially in Indonesia, where perceived other job employment and employee development system
have significant influence on turnover intention. Company that ignores human resource management development by considering millennial generation will have financial impact. The financial impact will become bigger in the course of time because millennial generation will become dominant generation in all companies especially Indonesia. Human resource management development will increase the meet of millennial generation expectation toward company, therefore employee welfare and productivity increase especially in millennial generation.

**Conclusion**
The research result has shown that salary and compensation and employee involvement have no significant influence on turnover intention in millennial generation. Otherwise the perceived alternative job employment and employee development system have showed that both of it have significant influence on turnover intention. Perceived alternative job employment has positive influence toward turnover intention, while employee development system has negative influence toward turnover intention.

Perceived alternative job employment occurs if employee sees better job in labor market and it makes millennial employee intent to leave their current job. This thing occurs because there is other company that will give them a better opportunity in their job. Research result has shown human resource in company that if there is better job alternative then the intention to quit will arise. Otherwise if there are no better jobs then there will be no turnover intention. Company can increases millennial generation job satisfaction, organizational commitment, reward, and other things to ensure the company is the best workplace for millennial generation. This things can be done by considering current reward/payment, work culture, and other good things from other company; therefore the company can surpass other companies as suitable workplace for millennial employee.

This research result also suggests that companies have employee development system because employee development system will reduce turnover intention. Managers and HR managers from company have to give development for millennial generation because it will affect their career path and also increase their value as competitive employee, therefore able to compete with other employee in labor market. Malik et. al (2011) research showed that Human resources especially in employee development can create good workplace for employee. This also apply for millennial employee. Great employee development system will increase competitiveness from employee, therefore the company productivity will increase.
Perceived alternative job employment and employee development system must be considered by companies because it will affect turnover intention from millennial generation. Millennial generation will become dominant workforce and someday will lead the company. Companies must develop and adapt the Human Resource Management corresponding to millennial generation. If the companies have not prepared the Human resource management, therefore turnover intention will arise and affect turnover rate. Financial loss will occur within the companies.
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