

Master Thesis:
**“Job-hopping among 25-35-Year-Olds in
France and the United States: A Comparative
Study.”**

Athénaïs Lelièvre

Dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Filipe Sobral

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the international
MSc in Management, at Universidade Católica Portuguesa and for the MSc in
Management at Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública e de Empresas, at
Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2nd of June 2025.**

ABSTRACT

Title: Job-Hopping Among 25–35-Year-Olds in France and the United States: A Comparative Study

Author: Athénaïs Marie Léa Lelièvre

Using Maertz and Griffeth's eight-force voluntary turnover model, this study explores, identifies, and compares the primary motivational factors influencing job-hopping intentions in white-collar professionals aged 25–35 in France and the United States.

A Qualtrics survey of 170 respondents used 0–100 sliders to evaluate Maertz and Griffeth's eight forces (affective, calculative, contractual, alternative, normative, moral, constituent, behavioral), and a 5-point Likert scale for job-hopping intentions. Country-specific Ordinary Least Squares regression models controlled for age, industry, and past turnover. In both samples, higher affective commitment reduced job-hopping intentions, whereas higher calculative evaluations of alternative job opportunities increased intentions to leave. In the U.S., lower moral forces increased job-hopping, and past turnover predicted job-hopping intentions, suggesting a habit. France's work-life balance laws strengthen affective commitment, whereas the flexible American labor market encourages mobility and analytical decision-making. Self-reported data, a small sample, and missing factors limit causal inference, introduce bias, and reduce generalizability. Future research should adopt longitudinal designs, broader samples, and objective measures. In contrast to U.S. companies, which must offer transparent career pathways and ethics-oriented leadership programs, French organizations should prioritize affective commitment. Reducing job-hopping can enhance employee well-being, reduce organizational expenses, and foster workforce stability, contributing to greater societal and economic resilience.

This is the first comparative application of Maertz and Griffeth's model to examine Millennial job-hopping motivations in France and the U.S., explaining how different labor-market institutions and cultural norms shape motivations.

Keywords: Job-Hopping; Voluntary Turnover; Maertz and Griffeth's Motivational Forces; Millennials; France; United States. **Category:** Master's Thesis

RESUMO

Título: Job-Hopping Among 25–35-Year-Olds in France and the United States: A Comparative Study

Autor: Athénaïs Marie Léa Lelièvre

Utilizando o modelo de oito forças de rotatividade voluntária de Maertz e Griffeth, este estudo compara os principais fatores motivacionais que influenciam as intenções de troca de emprego em profissionais de colarinho branco (25–35 anos) na França e nos EUA.

Uma pesquisa no Qualtrics com 170 respondentes avaliou as oito forças por meio de deslizadores de 0 a 100 e intenções de mudança em escala Likert de 5 pontos. Modelos de regressão de Mínimos Quadrados Ordinários controlaram idade, setor e histórico de rotatividade. Os resultados mostram que maior comprometimento afetivo reduz as intenções de troca, enquanto avaliações calculativas de oportunidades alternativas as aumentam em ambos os países. Nos EUA, forças morais mais fracas elevaram as intenções de job-hop, e a rotatividade passada previu novas intenções, sugerindo hábito. Na França, as leis de equilíbrio entre vida profissional e pessoal fortalecem o comprometimento afetivo, enquanto o mercado de trabalho flexível dos EUA estimula mobilidade.

Limitações incluem dados autor relatados, amostra pequena e fatores omitidos, que restringem inferências causais, introduzem viés e reduzem a generalização. Pesquisas futuras devem adotar desenhos longitudinais, ampliar amostras e usar medidas objetivas.

Em contraste com empresas americanas, que devem oferecer carreiras transparentes e programas de liderança ética, organizações francesas devem focar no comprometimento afetivo. Reduzir a troca de emprego pode beneficiar o bem-estar dos funcionários e a estabilidade organizacional.

É a primeira aplicação comparativa deste modelo para Millennials na França e nos EUA.

Palavras-chave: Troca de Emprego; Rotatividade Voluntária; Forças Motivacionais; Millennials; França; EUA. **Categoria:** Tese de Mestrado

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my thesis advisor, Professor Filipe Sobral, for his support, guidance, and encouragement throughout this journey. His insights were fundamental to shaping my work.

I would also like to thank my friends all over the world for always being there to motivate and support me during this process. This would never have been possible without you, and I am grateful to have you in my life.

Ultimately, I would like to thank my parents, Olivia and Emmanuel, for their unconditional love, support, and encouragement from the very beginning. You have always been there and always believed in me, and I could never thank you enough for all the sacrifices you have made for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Theoretical Background	4
	2.1 Job-Hopping	4
	2.1.1 Definitions.....	4
	2.2 Motivational Theories and Frameworks.....	5
	2.3 Impact on Organizations.....	7
	2.3.1 Recruitment and Turnover Costs	7
	2.3.2 Increased Workload and Reduced Productivity.....	7
	2.3.3 Low Morale and Workplace Instability	8
	2.4 Job-hopping Intentions	8
	2.4.1 Compensation and Career Advancement.....	8
	2.4.2 Work Environment and Organizational Culture	9
	2.4.3 Work-Life Balance.....	10
	2.5 Social Media as a Catalyst.....	11
	2.6 Country-Specific Labor Market Dynamics	13
	2.6.1 Economic Climate.....	13
	2.6.2 Labor Laws	14
	2.6.3 Minimum Wage Policies.....	15
	2.6.4 Termination Policies	15
	2.6.5 Parental Leave Policy	16
	2.6.6 Union Representation.....	16
	2.7 Cultural Values and Workplace Norms.....	17
	2.8 Research Questions.....	18
3.	Methodology and Research Design.....	20

3.1 Measures & Procedure.....	20
3.2 Participants	21
3.3 Model Summary	21
3.4 Robustness Checks	22
4. Findings.....	24
4.1 Results	24
4.1.1 Model 1 - France.....	24
4.1.2 Model 2 - United States	24
4.2 Discussion.....	25
4.2.1 Which of Maertz and Griffeth’s eight motivational forces most strongly predict job-hopping intentions among white-collar professionals aged 25–35?	25
4.2.2 How does the significance of these motivational forces vary between young professionals in France and the United States?.....	26
4.3 Contributions and Implications	27
4.4 Limitations and Future Research.....	27
5. Conclusion.....	29
6. Annexes.....	30
7. Bibliography.....	33

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Table 1: Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) Theoretical Framework Describing Eight Motivating Factors.....	5
Table 2: OLS Regression Results for Job-Hopping Intentions among White-Collar Professionals between 25 and 35, France vs. United States.....	23

1. Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving labor market, organizations are facing increased rates of voluntary turnover, a broad phenomenon in which employees choose to leave their positions of their own accord (Gusvita et al., 2023). Under the general topic of voluntary turnover, job-hopping has become a common practice involving frequent changes from one job or company to another in search of the ideal position that meets specific criteria, such as better pay or career growth (Larasati et al., 2019). This trend has also emerged as a defining characteristic of early-career professionals. Although all job-hopping is considered voluntary turnover, not every instance of voluntary turnover is classified as job-hopping. The latter refers to frequent job changes over a short period, often indicating unique motivational factors and organizational consequences. This trend has become increasingly common among professionals, driven by shifting career values, economic uncertainty, and the omnipresence of social media, as well as the incorporation of digital technology into daily work life (Raveendra et al., 2024). For instance, platforms like LinkedIn and Glassdoor elevate job vacancies and popularize the idea of frequent change by showing success tales of rapid career progress through job hopping. Because of comparison and visibility, younger professionals now have higher expectations for their development, recognition, and purpose (LinkedIn, 2018).

Millennials, those born approximately between 1989 and 1999, constitute a significant portion of today's labor force and have professional expectations, attitudes, and beliefs that diverge from those of previous generations (Kuron et al., 2015). Compared to previous generations, such as Baby Boomers or Gen X, millennials prioritize flexibility, purpose-driven work, and continuous growth (Kuron et al., 2015; Binolac et al., 2022). This shift in priorities contributes to an increase in job-hopping, as Millennials seek opportunities that align with their aspirations.

This resurgence in job mobility among young professionals has a significant impact on workforce stability and companies' organizational strategies. Employers face challenges retaining talent, particularly among workers under 35, who feel disconnected, are burnt out, or in search of deeper purpose (Haynes et al., n.d.). One of the most persisting organizational issues is employee turnover, which has a direct effect on morale, output, and the credibility of the leadership. (O'Connell, 2010; Reeves, 2024). In 2022, over 22% of workers aged 20 and older spent a year or

less at their jobs (Castrillon, 2023). Among Gen Z professionals, a recent survey found that 54% intend to leave their current jobs within the next two years (Leonhardt, 2023). Therefore, understanding their motivations is essential for organizations seeking to improve retention and engagement strategies.

To better understand the dynamics driving this trend, this study focuses on two culturally and economically distinct countries: France and the United States (U.S.). These nations were selected because of their divergent workplace cultures and labor market frameworks, which could have a significant impact on job-hopping behavior. Strong employee protections, strict recruiting and firing policies, and deep cultural norms that prioritize work security and collective rights are characteristics of the French labor market (OECD, 2024). At-will employment, individual mobility, and merit-based development are more prevalent in the United States, which has a more flexible, employer-driven structure (Weise, 2020). These structural and cultural distinctions make France and the U.S. ideal for a comparative study.

This research intends to address a gap in existing literature by investigating the reasons why white-collar professionals aged 25 to 35 in France and the United States frequently change jobs. By adopting a comparative lens, organizations can gain practical insights, enabling them to develop retention tactics. The theoretical framework guiding this study is Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) voluntary turnover model, which identifies and categorizes eight motivational forces influencing job-hopping: affective, calculative, contractual, alternative, normative, moral, constituent, and behavioral. The model's multidimensional approach is particularly suited for cross-national comparison, as it explores the emotional and structural variables that influence mobility. Previous research has applied the model in different cultural contexts, confirming its adaptability in analyzing turnover across diverse work environments (e.g., Maertz & Campion, 2004; Hom et al., 2017).

Therefore, the research question guiding this study is: **What are the key motivational forces influencing job-hopping intentions among white-collar professionals aged 25 to 35, and how do these forces differ between France and the United States?**

To answer this question, a survey-based methodology will be used to gather data on job-hopping motivations, intentions, career expectations, and workplace dynamics from participants in both countries.

This research contributes to both academic literature and organizational practice. The importance of career expectations and work satisfaction in influencing job-hopping has been studied in earlier research (Griffeth & Hom, 2004). Still, few studies have focused on these variables in a cross-national setting. By contrasting France and the United States, this study deepens our understanding of patterns in employee turnover and retention. The results will help professionals create retention strategies that are effective and tailored to the unique requirements and expectations of young professionals in various labor markets.

To address the research question, this study is structured as follows: a theoretical background exploring job-hopping intentions, motivational theories, labor market dynamics in France and the United States, and the cultural values shaping workplace behavior in both countries; the research questions are stated; the following section outlines the methodology and research design employed in this research; then general findings composed of the results and the discussion; ending with the conclusion.

2. Theoretical Background

Drawing on important theoretical frameworks, such as Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) and Maertz and Griffeth's Eight Motivational Forces (2004), this literature review examines the definitions, drivers, and organizational effects of job-hopping. Its purpose is to identify gaps in existing research, particularly in understanding the evolving motivations behind millennial job-hopping and its implications for both employees and organizations. By analyzing key motivational theories, this review provides a theoretical foundation for further study on voluntary turnover and talent retention.

The scope of this review is focused on job-hopping as a phenomenon shaped by motivational forces, the influence of social media, and country-specific labor market dynamics. By outlining these factors, this review aims to deepen the understanding of job-hopping trends and their broader impact on workforce stability.

2.1 Job-Hopping

2.1.1 Definitions

According to Larasati and Aryanto (2019), job-hopping, present since the beginning of the industrial era, is “an activity of changing jobs or moving jobs from one company to another company frequently to find the best job to meet certain criteria” and we can refer to a person who performs job-hopping as a job-hopper. Pranaya (2014, as cited in Larasati and Aryanto, 2019) argues that job-hopping refers to employees leaving a company voluntarily, not because they were forced to or fired. This phenomenon, known as voluntary turnover, is becoming an issue in various industries among millennials, as “employers have a hard time maintaining employees who frequently switch jobs” (Binolac et al., 2022). Indeed, some employees “cannot devote themselves to the organization for a long period,” so they will decide to switch companies for several reasons (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019).

Literature also refers to job-hopping as the “hobo syndrome, an internal tendency of the employees” (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019), while there are other mentions of job-hoppers being called “fleas” or “jumping fleas” (Salelatu, 2019; Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2021).

2.2 Motivational Theories and Frameworks

Organizations seeking to retain their employees must understand the key elements influencing voluntary turnover. Maertz and Griffeth (2004) created a theoretical framework describing eight motivating factors that affect an employee's decision to leave or remain with a company. Through the integration of behavioral, psychological, and environmental elements, these forces provide a thorough method for understanding turnover intentions.

Table 1

Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) Theoretical Framework Describing Eight Motivating Factors

Affective Forces	The motivational drive involves feelings induced by the organization and its members.
Calculative Forces	They involve an internal assessment of one's prospects for future membership in the organization.
Contractual Forces	They include perspectives about what the employee owes the company and what the company owes the employee.
Behavioral Forces	They are the “tangible and psychological costs of leaving the organization”.
Alternative Forces	Beliefs of employees regarding their capacity to secure an advantageous alternative to working at the present company.
Normative Forces	Expectations of family or friends regarding employees' turnover behavior.
Moral Forces	Values of an employee regarding general turnover behavior.

Constituent Forces	They consider that relationships between employees and groups within the organization are impacted by attachment to or a desire to distance oneself from others.
---------------------------	--

The decision to adopt Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) model as the theoretical framework for this study stems from its comprehensive and multidimensional approach to voluntary turnover. This model captures both psychological and structural factors, allowing for meaningful cross-generational and cross-national comparisons. Its design makes it particularly suitable for analyzing Millennials, whose career choices are shaped by diverse motivations, such as emotional fulfillment, social pressures, and ethical considerations. Furthermore, the adaptability of Maertz and Griffeth's model, along with its established cross-cultural relevance, facilitates a significant comparison between France and the United States, two countries that differ in labor regulations, cultural practices, and organizational standards. By employing Maertz and Griffeth's model within this comparative and generational context, the study offers a theoretically robust framework to identify and better understand both global and context-specific motivations for job-hopping.

The eight motivational forces influencing voluntary turnover are interrelated in several ways and might change simultaneously depending on events and cognitions (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). For instance, an organization's failure to fulfill a promotion promise can have a detrimental effect on many forces, including the employee's sense of contractual obligation, emotional commitment to the company, and intention to stay. Second, a variety of driving factors might either facilitate or hinder an employee's decision regarding turnover. For instance, individuals may be more interested in other employment options if they have a limited attachment to the organization, which may increase their likelihood of leaving. Finally, suppose a worker is considering moving to a new position, they may be enticed by chance yet feel under pressure from relatives who prefer to remain in their current location. In this instance, the decision may be influenced by the allure of the new job as well as the desire to stay for family reasons (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004).

Rather than treating these forces in isolation, Rubenstein et al.'s (2017) meta-analysis of over 300 studies confirms that traditional predictors, including job satisfaction, organizational

commitment, and intent to quit, remain some of the strongest indicators of why employees choose to leave their positions. Supporting this premise, Costanza et al.'s (2012) meta-analysis on generational differences, revealing that Millennials express higher intentions to quit than older generations. However, they also warn that the actual behavioral differences may not be as significant as often assumed, thus adding nuance to the understanding of millennial turnover. This indicates that while Millennials might be more likely to contemplate quitting, their decision to leave is still shaped by many of the same factors that influence other groups.

2.3 Impact on Organizations

According to Larasati and Aryanto (2019), “job-hopping behavior has a lot of negative impacts on current companies and other fellow employees”, frequently resulting in the unintentional release of private company data. Frequent job changes among millennials can disrupt organizational dynamics in various ways, from increased workforce instability to higher financial costs, as outlined below.

2.3.1 Recruitment and Turnover Costs

The increase of job-hoppers poses a threat to companies, especially regarding the replacement, training, and onboarding of new employees (Binolac et al., 2022; Gusvita et al., 2023). Companies would require greater funds to be spent on “the recruitment of new employees” (Liu et al., 2010; Suryaratri & Abadi, 2018). According to Merhar (2016, as cited in Chiat & Panatik, 2019), the “cost of employee turnover is expensive as organizations are required to pay direct costs whenever an employee leaves, and additional costs of training and recruitment for new hires also will occur due to the turnover. [...] it will cost 6 to 9 months’ salary on average for each time a business or organization replaces a salaried employee.”

2.3.2 Increased Workload and Reduced Productivity

Additionally, this phenomenon reduces a company’s overall productivity, as its employees will face an unexpectedly increased workload (Memon et al., 2015). Indeed, when “an employee with experience and knowledge in a specific position quits the work, it causes a slowing in the scheduled tasks as it takes time to replace someone with an intimate experience with new workers

and the newcomers need a certain time to learn and follow up the procedure and experience (Hamel, 2014).

2.3.3 Low Morale and Workplace Instability

According to Binolac et al. (2022), job-hoppers have negative repercussions on the overall workplace. Zheng (2015, as cited in Chiat & Panatik, 2019) further argues that “feelings of job insecurity occur in the remaining employees in an organization whenever workers are being laid off or resign by their own volition, and the remaining workers also must take on extra tasks and duties when someone leaves. This situation creates a low morale in the group of employees, and they will tend to perform lower and less enthusiastically.”

2.4 Job-hopping Intentions

2.4.1 Compensation and Career Advancement

According to Viakarina & Pertiwi (2021), employees frequently switch jobs to benefit financially and improve their careers rapidly. Employees are motivated to change jobs if they dream of earning higher salaries, as argued by Kruse (2014, as cited in Larasati & Aryanto, 2019). Indeed, money is the Millennials’ primary motivation to change jobs, before management quality (Ng et al., 2010).

Job-hopping enables individuals to expand their career options and is considered a “precursor of future careers” (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019). Indeed, “as opposed to relying on one job for life, millennials think about their careers a little differently, preferring a more varied career path with consistent pace and lag time” (Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2021). Their career paths and decisions are often driven by a desire for self-improvement, with a strong focus on professional growth and personal development (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019).

For millennials, job-hopping is not only a way to earn higher salaries, but also a phenomenon that could help them “gain self-development and skills, reach their dream jobs, and gain stability in their careers” (Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2021). Furthermore, Viakarina and Pertiwi (2021) stated that the primary factor driving individuals to leave organizations is the pursuit of new opportunities. Career progression and advancement opportunities remain particularly important for this generation (Kong et al., 2015; Ng et al., 2010).

2.4.2 Work Environment and Organizational Culture

“The workplace culture of the 21st century can be defined by [millennials’] career ambitions, attitudes toward work, and knowledge of new technologies. There is no doubt that millennials, who constitute the majority of today's workforce, have unique characteristics compared to their predecessors” (Binolac et al., 2022).

The millennial generation is known for its flexibility in terms of working style (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019). Indeed, research conducted by Binolac et al. (2022) shows that millennial employees are more likely to job hop when there is a shift from working from home to working in the office and vice versa, highlighting that giving Millennials more autonomy to choose their work setup will enhance retention. Flexibility includes “the duration of work and work location, where they want a work duration that allows them to still have a social life and time to gather with family” (Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2021). Still, according to the authors, millennials, known as the generation that grew up with technology, naturally seek flexible workspaces beyond the office. This trend was significantly reinforced by the remote work policies introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Binolac et al. (2022) state that according to PWC's published *Millennials at Work: Reshaping the Workplace*, “millennials are often dissatisfied with strict organizational structures and put off by information barriers. They look forward to quick advancement, a varied and exciting profession, and frequent feedback. Thus, millennials seek management styles and corporate cultures significantly different from those of previous generations, tailored to their requirements and preferences.” Indeed, still, according to the authors, millennials require a new management and leadership style, as they are products of the digital era. Companies start to realize that conventional leadership styles are not always successful and will not help their employees achieve their goals, particularly millennials who are not reticent about job hopping.

Mr. Hoshi argues that millennials value open criticism and conversation, whereas previous generations were more reticent in these areas. They prefer clear-cut norms and responsibilities over vague ones (Binolac et al., 2022). According to Ng et al. (2010), they also “like supervisors and managers who are always available for feedback; hence, management quality is a primary motivation (after money).” Indeed, millennials favor mentors who are “visionaries, strategic thinkers, inspirational, and personable” (Binolac et al., 2022) and will not hesitate to “look for

newer and better career opportunities, requiring evaluation and assessment from their superiors,” according to Adiawaty (2019, as cited in Gusvita et al., 2023).

Millennials highlight the importance of the social aspects of work, such as pleasant coworkers and an engaging atmosphere, and seek to “work with and learn from respected colleagues and supervisors and want to develop connections with coworkers” (Ng et al., 2010). Although the millennial generation thrives in a collaborative work environment and collaboration enhances their work satisfaction (Binolac et al., 2022), millennials are “very competitive with their co-workers” (Larasati & Aryanto, 2019).

“A nurturing work environment is a feature of a company that encourages and stimulates productivity, improves self-esteem, increases job satisfaction, and fosters peer cohesion and employee retention” (Gomes & Neves, 2011) which will “help the management attract and retain employees with potential and skills” (Binolac et al., 2022).

Millennials are driven and career-focused, but they do not intend to sacrifice their personal lives for their work (Abril-Sánchez, Levin, & Del Riego, 2012).

2.4.3 Work-Life Balance

Larasati and Aryanto (2019) argue that job satisfaction and turnover intention are tightly linked, with “job dissatisfaction, lack of commitment, workplace stress, increased working hours, and lack of employee-friendly policy” contributing to those high turnover rates. Indeed, employees job-hop until they find a fulfilling workplace in line with their criteria (Daming & Xiaoyun, 2010).

According to research, job satisfaction positively influences employee commitment, reduces absenteeism, and lowers actual turnover rates (Muthuveloo & Rose, 2005; Hausknecht et al., 2008; Chen & Bliese, 2011; Larasati & Aryanto, 2019), and the more satisfied the employees are, the more dedicated they are to the organization they work for (Shore & Martin, 1989). Indeed, a motivated workforce will be willing to stay at a company and is “more creative, productive, and turning out with high-quality work and outperforming the unmotivated employees” (Chiat & Panatik, 2019).

In the twenty-first century, work-life balance is a critical and essential concern for corporate workers and all states (Binolac et al., 2022) as “workforce members value work-life balance more than money alone (Meenakshi, V., & Ravichandran, 2013; R.S., & Murthy, 2015).

“Despite being ambitious and career-focused, millennials have no intention of sacrificing their personal lives for their careers. They desire career choices and job satisfaction by determining workplace flexibility [...]” (Abril-Sánchez, Levin, & Del Riego, 2012). According to Zhang et al. (2007), the reason might be that most millennials “see their parents (boomers) working long hours only to become victims of corporate downsizing, frequent layoffs, and high divorce rates. When millennials start to enter the workforce, they become more aware of being placed in the same position and prefer making a life over making a living.”

2.5 Social Media as a Catalyst

Visibility granted by social media aligns directly with Maertz & Griffeth’s Alternative Forces, which emphasize that perceived availability and attractiveness of other options can increase turnover intentions. When workers continuously encounter attractive job offers or see peers achieving more fulfilling roles elsewhere, their sense of viable alternatives grows, potentially prompting them to consider leaving even in the absence of dissatisfaction. Millennials, who were adults when social media first emerged, use social media to experience alternative forces in a unique personal way. They are constantly exposed to success stories, career prospects, and idealized professional lifestyles through platforms like Instagram, TikTok, and LinkedIn. Millennials are more likely to compare their circumstances and feel unsatisfied or enticed by the alternatives when they observe their peers discussing career accomplishments, job changes, and benefits like flexible scheduling or remote work (Rivers, 2018). The visibility of these opportunities may make other employment opportunities seem more alluring. Additionally, social media creates a narrative of professional success that highlights non-traditional career routes and entrepreneurship, which makes alternative roles seem appealing (Al-Quran, 2022). In this situation, the constant exposure to a wide range of possible employment options and idealized career experiences amplifies the influence of alternative forces, encouraging millennials to reevaluate their existing roles and pursue new career paths.

Platforms like LinkedIn have further transformed the job search process. Millennials no longer need to actively seek opportunities. Instead, offers are delivered to them through recruiter outreach, personalized content, and algorithmically curated job suggestions (McCabe, 2017). According to the author, this real-time visibility reduces both psychological and logistical barriers to job transitions, making frequent job changes not only easier but also more socially accepted.

In addition to job listings, social media is a crucial tool for networking and personal branding. Millennials use these platforms to stay informed about industry trends, evaluate their standing compared to peers, and establish a professional image. Garg and Telang (2017) discovered that peer notifications about job and company transitions can dramatically increase turnover intentions, as employees may feel stuck in their careers. Consequently, social media acts as both a reflection and an impetus, prompting comparisons that can lead to reconsideration and proactive steps.

Additionally, Millennials, as digital natives, often depend on online platforms like Facebook, LinkedIn, and Instagram to evaluate company culture, employee happiness, and compatibility with their lifestyles (Pryor, 2018). Although this level of transparency aids in making informed choices, it may also lead to unrealistic expectations. Professionally crafted posts can warp perceptions, portraying quick promotions, extensive perks, and high-profile positions as standard, setting higher aspirations and diminishing acceptance for conventional or slower career advancement (Pryor, 2018).

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory helps explain these changing perceptions by differentiating between motivators, such as achievement and recognition, and hygiene factors, like salary and company policies. Social media can distort these foundational expectations, making even reasonably good positions seem inadequate when measured against idealized representations. Consequently, there is an increased motivation to seek opportunities that align more closely with evolving definitions of success.

In conclusion, social media significantly shapes and accelerates the professional ideals of millennials, rather than merely reflecting them. It enhances the impact of various motivating factors and normative pressures by showcasing diverse paths as clear, reachable, and appealing. This dynamic is a key driver of the modern trend of job-hopping among millennials.

Expanding on this, the study examines which of the eight motivational forces most strongly predict job-hopping intentions, emphasizing the impact of social media influences on perceptions of available alternatives.

2.6 Country-Specific Labor Market Dynamics

A country's context critically shapes employment practices through differences in employment laws, cultural values, and economic conditions. Labor regulations determine the level of worker protections and employer obligations, while cultural norms influence workplace hierarchies, collaboration, and attitudes toward authority. Economic climate impacts the balance of power between employers and employees, with stronger economies often favoring workers and recessions favoring employers. Understanding these factors is essential, as employment practices cannot be thoroughly analyzed without considering the country's overall environment.

2.6.1 Economic Climate

According to the OECD's Economic Surveys, the COVID-19 epidemic and the increase in inflation have been two significant issues that have hit France in quick succession recently (OECD, 2024). France's real GDP is projected at 0.6% by the end of 2025, almost half of 2024's 1.1% (IMF, 2025). The emergency actions implemented by the government, such as wage subsidies and furlough schemes, came at a substantial financial cost but were essential in saving companies, jobs, and consumer spending power. In contrast to France's more modest performance, the United States has recently experienced stronger economic growth. The U.S. real GDP slowed slightly from 2.9% in 2023 to 2.8% in 2024, driven by "increases in consumer spending, investment, government spending, and exports" (Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), 2024). The International Monetary Fund forecasts a slowdown in 2025, with a real GDP growth of 1.8% (IMF, 2025) but assures that growth remains above recession levels.

While the broader economy is expected to recover, the labor market may face challenges. By the end of 2025, a modest economic recovery is expected in France, supported by disinflation and rising global demand. However, a slight increase in unemployment may occur (OECD, 2024). In 2024, the unemployment rate in France was recorded at 7.3% of the working population, and according to forecasts, this rate could rise to 7.9% by the end of 2025 (Insee, 2025). The United

States' unemployment rate is currently lower than that of France. However, it is projected to rise slightly by the end of 2025. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2025), the rate has remained between 4.0% and 4.2% since May 2024. Economists forecast a slight increase to 4.4% by the end of 2025 (Vanguard, 2025).

Stronger innovation, lower regulatory barriers, and broader acceptance of digital technology are all necessary to improve productivity growth in France, which is now inadequate. Controlling public spending is crucial to allow the opportunity for long-term investments in digitalization, education, and the green transition, even while continuing to support industry and investment (OECD, 2024).

Fiscal and trade policies also play a crucial role in shaping a country's economic outlook. Donald Trump, who resumed office as U.S. president in January 2025, decided to implement new tariffs, 10% on all countries (The White House, 2025), that "account for almost half of the sharp downgrade in the IMF's US growth forecast for this year" according to the IMF's chief economist Pierre-Olivier Gourinchas (2025). Financial market instability, which culminated in a significant stock market crash in April 2025, is one immediate effect of the ignited trade war, the most substantial decline since the COVID-19 crash in 2020. However, stock indices such as the S&P 500 and the Dow Jones have shown modest gains, though their future performance remains uncertain (CNN, 2025).

Overall, while both countries face economic headwinds, France's challenges are more structural, and political and trade-related uncertainties complicate the United States' outlook.

2.6.2 Labor Laws

While the economic and political environments heavily influence each country's labor market structure, labor laws shape the working conditions, job security, and employee rights.

"The sources of employment law in France are international law, EU law, and domestic law. Domestically, the main sources of employment law are the French Labour Code, collective bargaining agreements, employment contracts, and companies' internal regulations" (ICLG, 2025). In the United States, labor law is shaped by federal statutes, such as the Fair Labor Standards Act

(FLSA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSH Act), enforced by agencies under the Department of Labor, but also individual state laws (U.S. Department of Labor, latest version).

2.6.3 Minimum Wage Policies

Key aspects of French contracts include a monthly minimum wage, known as SMIC, of 1,801.80€ (before taxes), a 35-hour workweek (maximum of 48 hours per week or 10 hours per day), and 25 days of paid annual leave, not including public holidays. Additionally, the French Labour and Criminal Codes both sanction discrimination on various grounds such as origin, sex, age, and religion (ICLG, 2025). In contrast, American employers are under the FLSA and are required to pay employees at least the federal minimum wage, currently \$7.25 per hour, though states and localities may set higher minimum wages. The U.S. also mandates overtime pay at a rate of at least one and a half times their hourly wage for any hours worked beyond 40 hours in a workweek (U.S. Department of Labor, latest version). However, some employees, particularly those in executive, administrative, or professional roles, are classified as "exempt" and are not entitled to overtime or minimum wage protections (U.S. Department of Labor, 2023).

This demonstrates a significant structural difference. The United States offers more flexibility but also greater differences between workers based on their occupation and the state they live in, whereas France asserts uniform protection through centralized law.

2.6.4 Termination Policies

Termination procedures differ significantly between the two countries. Terminating an indefinite-term contract “contrat à durée indéterminée” (CDI) in France needs to follow strict legal and procedural rules. This indefinite-term contract is the most common form of employment contract, where the employment is intended to last for an indefinite period unless terminated by the employer or employee. It provides the highest level of job security in the country. Termination occurs for either personal reasons (misconduct or incompetence) or economic reasons (business decline) (ICLG, 2025).

In contrast, employment in the U.S. is often at-will, meaning that employers can terminate contracts without any tangible reason or notice unless there are specific laws or contracts in place that protect the employee (USA.gov, 2025).

Both France and the United States have laws preventing discrimination and termination based on specific employee categories, such as pregnant women or those on maternity/sick leave, and therefore cannot be dismissed without additional procedures (Code du Travail, 2025; U.S. Department of Labor, latest version).

This difference in termination policies reveals different economic ideologies. While the U.S. system places more emphasis on company flexibility and market fluidity, frequently at the expense of their employees' stability, France's legal protections reflect a social model that emphasizes employee security and rights.

2.6.5 Parental Leave Policy

The French labour laws also have an advantageous maternity leave policy. They vary from 16 to 46 weeks, where women return to their jobs or an equivalent one with similar pay. Furthermore, fathers are given three days of birth leave and 25 to 32 days of paternity leave. During this period, both receive an allowance from the French Social Security, not from the employer (Code du Travail, updated 2025; ICLG, 2025). In the United States, there is no federal law regarding paid maternity or paternity leave. However, the FMLA “provides certain employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave per year” and “also requires that their group health benefits be maintained during the leave” (U.S. Department of Labor, latest version). Some states, such as California, New York, New Jersey, and Rhode Island, implemented paid family leave programs providing up to 8 weeks of partial wage replacement or 12 weeks of paid leave at 67% of the employee's salary depending on the state (Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research, 2018).

In contrast to the United States, where the lack of a national paid leave system may worsen gender disparities in career advancement, France's stronger parental leave laws probably help parents, especially mothers, maintain their jobs and maintain a better work-life balance.

2.6.6 Union Representation

Finally, we notice a significant difference between the two countries in the strength of union representation. France has a strong tradition of trade union recognition, which provides great employee representation. The French Constitution protects the “right to strike” if strikes are collective and related to work matters (Code du Travail, updated 2025). In the United States, the

right to strike is protected under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935, but is subject to more restrictions than in France and less protection towards striking employees (National Labor Relations Board, n.d.; Code du Travail, updated 2025).

U.S. labor legislation frequently views striking through a more adversarial lens, balancing worker rights against concerns about corporate continuity. In contrast, France embeds the right to strike as a constitutional guarantee. This disparity reflects broader cultural and political attitudes regarding collective action.

These national differences highlight the significance of understanding motivational influences in different cultural and economic contexts, leading to an exploration of how these motivations might vary between France and the United States.

2.7 Cultural Values and Workplace Norms

Cultural norms play a crucial role in shaping employment patterns and workplace environments and dictate what employees and employers perceive as desirable in a job (Czakowski, 2012).

In France, most workers embrace the cultural *joie de vivre*, the enjoyment of life in English, which is deeply woven into their work-life balance. Their outlook on life supports the idea that people work to live, rather than live to work, contrary to Americans (Okulicz-Kozaryn, 2011). Indeed, French labor laws prioritize employee well-being with several protections such as the 35-hour workweek or five weeks of mandatory paid vacation (Code du Travail, 2025). Furthermore, the French government introduced a new law in 2017 called the *droit à la déconnexion*, the right to disconnect. This law provides employees with the legal right to ignore work-related emails or calls outside of office hours (Code du Travail, 2016). These are intended to protect mental health, avoid burnout, and strengthen the idea that taking time off is necessary for a high standard of living.

This contrasts drastically with the "hustle culture" and "living to work" mentality that is prevalent in the US (BBC, 2023). The American workplace, which has its roots in individualism and meritocracy, rewards long hours, continuous availability, and career ambition (BBC, 2023). Paid vacation is even less generous, and the United States has no legally mandated paid vacation

(U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2023). For fear of falling behind or coming across as less dedicated, many American workers are reluctant to take time off. A poll found that “62% of American workers are worried their bosses would judge them for taking mental health days” (Robinson, 2021).

In summary, the U.S. frequently prioritizes professional success and flexibility, even at the possible expense of inequity and burnout. In contrast, France advocates a model based on the preservation of personal time and collective well-being. Understanding these cultural norms is essential for examining labor market behavior and creating inclusive, equitable workplaces internationally.

In conclusion, the literature review shows that Millennials' tendency to job-hop is influenced by a variety of workplace dynamics, motivational variables, and larger socioeconomic concerns. While well-established theories offer practical frameworks for comprehending voluntary turnover, recent developments such as the influence of social media and preferences for flexibility bring new perspectives to light. In addition to reflecting people's changing career goals, these dynamics present serious organizational issues, such as increased expenses and unstable work environments. Simultaneously, employment practices in France and the United States show how cultural values, labor laws, and economic realities influence workforce experiences in distinct ways. While the U.S. places more emphasis on individualism, labor market flexibility, and employer discretion, France places more emphasis on worker protections, job security, and work-life balance. As a result, employment realities vary by location and industry. By incorporating these insights, a thorough foundation for understanding Millennial turnover within various national employment contexts, as well as talent retention methods catered to a changing labor market, can be found.

2.8 Research Questions

Due to the exploratory and comparative aspects of this study, the research questions below are proposed instead of formal hypotheses:

Research Question 1: Among the eight motivational forces proposed by Maertz and Griffeth (2004), which are the most significant predictors of job-hopping intentions among white-collar professionals aged 25–35?

Research Question 2: How does the significance of these motivational forces vary between young professionals in France and the United States?

3. Methodology and Research Design

3.1 Measures & Procedure

The eight dimensions of Maertz and Griffeth's Voluntary Turnover Model (2004) were implemented into the survey by developing statements related to each of the eight forces. Participants rated each statement (for example, "I feel emotionally attached to my current organization" for affective forces, or "I have good prospects elsewhere" for alternative forces) using a continuous slider ranging from 0 (Strongly Disagree) to 100 (Strongly Agree), with midpoint markers: 25 = Somewhat Disagree, 50 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, and 75 = Somewhat Agree. The values for each question were averaged (either two or three questions by force), resulting in a single value for each force. In this case, a continuous 0–100 slider was better suited to capture nuanced variations in respondents' attitudes, enhancing sensitivity and minimizing ceiling or floor effects.

The intentions to leave were assessed with the question "How often do you think about leaving your current job?" on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Never, 5 = Constantly). In this case, the 1-5 Likert scale was more fitting, as it simplifies the interpretation and ensures greater consistency in responses.

The turnover ratio, a control variable, is determined by the following formula:

$$\text{Turnover ratio} = \frac{\text{total number of jobs} - 1}{\text{total number of years}}$$

Subtracting one job from the total number of jobs worked improves the accuracy of the ratio value, as the participants' first job cannot be considered job-hopping. If respondents had worked less than a year, we expressed it in decimal years.

Two additional control variables were included in the model: age and industry. It is important to note that industry type is a dummy, with *finance* being the dropped reference category.

Demographic questions, including age, country of residence, job title, highest educational attainment, tenure in the current role, and industry, were presented at the beginning to confirm the respondent's qualification for the survey. We included an attention check ("Attention check! Please answer somewhat disagree"), that no respondents failed, and the survey blocks were randomized to avoid order effects. Survey completion times were also analyzed, and all participants took a

reasonable amount of time to provide realistic answers. The questionnaire used for the survey experiment was administered via Qualtrics. The complete questionnaire is available in the Appendix. All participants provided informed consent.

3.2 Participants

The survey's audience consisted of working white-collar professionals in France or the United States with a master's degree, aged between 25 and 35 years old. The survey was published on LinkedIn and sent via email to the target population, and received a total of 197 responses. However, although all participants successfully passed the attention check, 25 individuals started the survey but did not complete it, and two individuals did not meet the requirements, so they were removed from the final sample. This leaves this study with a sample of 170 participants, 86 from France and 84 from the United States. The average age of all participants was 28.45 (SD = 3.29; Range: 25-35), the average number of jobs was 2.52 (SD = 1.13; Range: 1-7), and the average working years was 5.25 (SD = 2.66; Range: 0.25-11). All participants met the necessary criteria. The effective completion rate was 86%, reflecting high engagement and data quality.

3.3 Model Summary

This research uses two Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to assess the main motivational factors driving job-hopping intentions in white-collar professionals aged 25 to 35. Two identical models are employed: one is analyzed using the French data set, and the other using the U.S. data set. The data was analyzed using RStudio. The dependent variable reflects the job-hopping intention of individuals who meet the specified criteria and are employed in the respective country. The independent variables are Maertz and Griffeth's eight forces (2004): affective, calculative, contractual, behavioral, alternative, normative, moral, and constituent. As the models require complete data, missing values (N/A) were converted to 0, allowing 44 observations to remain in the analysis. The model is as follows, adapted for the targeted country:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \textit{job hopping intention}_i \\
&= \beta_1(\textit{affective force}_i) + \beta_2(\textit{calculative force}_i) \\
&+ \beta_3(\textit{contractual force}_i) + \beta_4(\textit{behavioral force}_i) \\
&+ \beta_5(\textit{alternative force}_i) + \beta_6(\textit{normative force}_i) + \beta_7(\textit{moral force}_i) \\
&+ \beta_8(\textit{constituent force}_i) + \beta_9(\textit{previous turnover}_i) + \beta_{10}(\textit{age}_i) \\
&+ \beta_{11}(\textit{industry}_i) + \varepsilon_i
\end{aligned}$$

The results indicate that the models exhibit moderate explanatory power. Table 2 implies that the French model explains 35% of the variance of the dependent variable ($R^2 = 0.35$), while the U.S. model explains 44% ($R^2 = 0.44$). Due to the relatively small sample size and high number of independent variables, the unadjusted R-squared would be inflated. The adjusted R-squared provides a more realistic assessment of model fit: 0.15 for France and 0.26 for the U.S.

The F-statistics confirm that both models are statistically significant at conventional levels, though indicating that 65% and 56% of the variance in job-hopping intentions in France and the United States, respectively, remains unexplained by the models, suggesting additional factors may play an important part. The residual standard errors, 0.90 for France and 0.77 for the U.S., indicate a moderate spread around the predicted values.

3.4 Robustness Checks

To make sure that the results of our OLS regression models are reliable, applicable, and interpretable, we tested for multicollinearity using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) (Woolridge J., 2001). All VIF values were between 1.05 and 4.59, below the threshold of 5, indicating no concerns about multicollinearity (Woolridge J., 2001).

We used HC1 (heteroskedasticity-robust) standard errors to correct for possible heteroskedasticity, which, if present, implies an unequal distribution of residuals in the models. The results and significance levels of the models' variables remained stable, confirming the robustness of both models (Woolridge J., 2001).

Table 2

OLS Regression Results for Job-Hopping Intentions among White-Collar Professionals between 25 and 35, France vs. United States

	Comparison of Motivational Forces on Job-Hopping Intentions	
	<i>Dependent variable:</i>	
	Job-Hopping Intentions	
	France	United States
	(1)	(2)
Affective	-0.03*** (0.01)	-0.01* (0.01)
Calculative	0.02*** (0.01)	0.01** (0.01)
Contractual	-0.001 (0.01)	0.005 (0.005)
Behavioral	-0.01 (0.01)	0.003 (0.01)
Alternative	-0.004 (0.01)	0.003 (0.01)
Normative	-0.003 (0.01)	-0.004 (0.01)
Moral	0.004 (0.01)	-0.01* (0.01)
Constituent	0.01 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.005)
Previous Turnover	-0.24 (0.38)	0.69** (0.28)
age	-0.02 (0.03)	0.06 (0.04)
industry2	-0.37 (0.46)	0.15 (0.31)
industry3	-0.19 (0.48)	0.12 (0.34)
industry4	-0.57 (0.57)	-0.93* (0.47)
industry5	-0.04 (0.41)	0.38 (0.30)
industry6	0.38 (0.52)	-0.63 (0.49)
industry7	-0.03 (0.54)	-0.26 (0.35)
industry8	-0.65 (0.39)	-0.47 (0.40)
industry9	0.61 (0.59)	0.19 (0.48)
industry10	-0.04 (0.55)	-0.18 (0.42)
industry11	-0.24 (0.53)	-0.52 (0.52)
Constant	4.09*** (1.36)	1.15 (1.54)
Observations	86	84
R ²	0.35	0.44
Adjusted R ²	0.15	0.26
Residual Std. Error	0.90 (df = 65)	0.77 (df = 63)
F Statistic	1.77** (df = 20; 65)	2.46*** (df = 20; 63)

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

4. Findings

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Model 1 - France

When predicting job-hopping intentions, the following variables were found to be statistically significant:

The **Affective force** ($\beta = -0.03$, $p < 0.01$) indicates that in France, a stronger emotional connection to the organization significantly lowers job-hopping intentions. This matches the definition provided by Maertz and Griffeth (2004), which describes it as "the motivational drive stemming from feelings induced by the organization and its members." The literature review highlights that French workers embody a "joie de vivre," a concept reflected in labor laws like the 35-hour workweek, five weeks of paid vacation, and the 2017 droit à la déconnexion, which formalizes respect for personal time and strengthens emotional bonds with their employers.

The **Calculative force** ($\beta = 0.02$, $p < 0.01$) indicates that employees' cost-benefit evaluations positively affect their intention to leave. This aligns with research showing that Millennials value financial rewards and accelerated career paths and reflects Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) idea of an internal, forward-looking assessment of one's prospects within the organization, where employees weigh the expected benefits of staying versus leaving.

As no other forces reached conventional significance levels, this indicates that for French millennials, emotional attachment and personal assessments of opportunity are the main drivers of turnover intention.

4.1.2 Model 2 - United States

When focusing on the U.S. population, three forces were statistically significant, along with the control variable.

The **Affective force** ($\beta = -0.01$, $p < 0.1$) in this model is weakly significant, but still aligns with the French model. Stronger emotional bonds, to a certain extent, with the organization reduce job-hopping intentions in the U.S. population.

The **Calculative force** ($\beta = 0.01$, $p < 0.05$) aligns with the French model, indicating that a rational evaluation of the cost-benefit of another potential job influences job-hopping decisions.

However, the significance of this force is lower than France's, implying that this force is less of a motivation for the U.S. job-hoppers.

The **Moral force** ($\beta = -0.01$, $p < 0.1$) shows a negative correlation, indicating that values of loyalty and justice have an impact on reducing turnover in the U.S. (Maertz and Griffeth, 2004).

The **Previous turnover** ($\beta = 0.69$, $p < 0.05$) in this model is moderately significant at the 0.05 level. This demonstrates how a flexible and at-will labor market creates a self-sustaining behavior: American workers are more likely to continue changing jobs after they begin, implying a habitual trend.

It is important to note that *industry 4*, education, is statistically significant, even if weakly ($p < 0.1$), meaning that our target population is less likely to job-hop if working in the education industry. However, a bigger sample size would allow for a deeper understanding of the variable's significance.

Other motivating factors were not significant, suggesting that for young American professionals, the choice to job-hop depends on rational assessments of opportunities and their previous mobility experiences, as well as emotional attachment and loyalty to a certain point.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Which of Maertz and Griffeth's eight motivational forces most strongly predict job-hopping intentions among white-collar professionals aged 25–35?

In both populations, the Affective and Calculative forces are the most reliable indicators of job-hopping intentions. One of the most significant barriers to leaving has been repeatedly found in meta-analytic research to be affective commitment, defined as "the motivational drive stemming from feelings induced by the organization and its members" (Maertz & Griffeth, 2004). This is supported by our data, which shows that in both France ($\beta = -0.03$, $p < 0.01$) and the United States ($\beta = -0.01$, $p < 0.10$), higher emotional attachment is associated with reduced job-hopping intentions.

Similarly, in both samples, a higher intention to job-hop is predicted by Calculative force, which reflects forward-looking cost-benefit analyses regarding opportunities. According to

research, when Millennials are thinking about changing jobs, they consider possible pay increases and career advancement chances (Ng et al., 2010; Viakarina & Pertiwi, 2021). The results of our study demonstrated that pragmatic factors play a significant role in Millennials' mobility decisions. Moreover, in the United States, the Moral force has been found significant ($p < 0.1$), illustrating that an organization's moral and ethical behavior drives the employees' job-hopping intent.

Together, these results support Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) claim that the main causes of voluntary turnover are emotional connection and analytical thinking.

4.2.2 How does the significance of these motivational forces vary between young professionals in France and the United States?

While Affective and Calculative forces are significant in both countries, their relative strengths and the role of additional forces differ across both samples.

In France, institutionalized work-life balance policies, such as the 35-hour workweek and droit à la déconnexion, that strengthen emotional ties to employers are likely to increase affective commitment. The Calculative force also forecasts job-hopping intentions, showing that compensation and advancement opportunities continue to have an impact even in a "work to live" culture. Other factors did not achieve significance, indicating that moral and habitual factors are not very important to French Millennials.

In the United States, there is a greater diversity regarding job-hopping motivations. The Calculative force continues to be predictive, but the Moral force ($\beta = -0.01$, $p < 0.10$) and past turnover behavior ($\beta = 0.69$, $p < 0.05$) both show up as significant. This aligns with Costanza et al.'s research (2012). In at-will markets, where job-hopping increases the likelihood of further movements, the importance of previous job transitions supports the habit-forming mobility dynamic.

In France, effective regulatory supports strengthen the affective ties, whereas in the U.S., increased labor flexibility highlights calculative reasoning and frequent mobility, along with noticeable moral aspects. These distinctions highlight how labor market institutions and cultural practices shape the significance of various motivational drivers.

4.3 Contributions and Implications

This study showcases the strength of Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) eight-force model by integrating it with a comparative approach, effectively capturing universal job-hopping motivators and specific contextual elements, such as the habit-forming job-hopping dynamic. By using the same OLS models on matched samples from France and the United States, it establishes a clear and replicable framework for future research on cross-cultural turnover.

From a managerial perspective, HR leaders in France should enhance affective commitment through programs, initiatives to build reputation, and policies to promote work–life balance. On the other hand, organizations in the United States need to tackle calculative and habitual job-hopping by implementing transparent career path frameworks, competitive reward systems, and ethics-focused leadership programs. Lastly, from a policy standpoint, adopting formal incentives to encourage long-term tenure may help balance the cost–benefit equation and mitigate habitual job-hopping.

4.4 Limitations and Future Research

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that indicate directions for future research:

- The relatively small sample sizes constrain statistical power and may limit the generalizability of our findings.
- The cross-sectional design records intentions at one specific time, limiting causal inference and masking how motivational factors may change throughout a career. Longitudinal studies would more effectively clarify these dynamic interactions.
- Reliance on self-reported measures raises the risk of bias. Future research could incorporate objective data to triangulate job-hopping intentions and behaviors (Hausknecht et al., 2008).
- Emerging variables, such as remote or hybrid work preferences, which are increasingly influential in shaping Millennial mobility decisions, were not included in the models (Raveendra et al., 2024; Rivers, 2018).
- Finally, our comparative framework only encompassed France and the United States. Extending this approach to other cultural contexts and generational cohorts would test the

universality of Maertz and Griffeth's eight-force model and uncover additional contextual moderators.

Addressing these limitations will enhance future research, providing greater insights into the mechanisms behind job-hopping, enabling the creation of more sophisticated talent-retention strategies in various labor markets.

5. Conclusion

This research aimed to investigate the motivations behind job-hopping intentions among white-collar professionals aged 25 to 35, and to compare how these differ between France and the United States. Drawing on Maertz and Griffeth's (2004) eight-force model, we found that affective and calculative forces are the most significant predictors of job-hopping intent across both samples: emotional attachment to one's organization serves to discourage quitting, while proactive cost-benefit evaluations of opportunities encourage it. Moreover, the moral force is found to be significant only in the United States.

An examination of national differences shows that in France, strong labor-market protections and a cultural focus on work-life balance enhance affective commitment, which acts as the dominant force against job-hopping. Meanwhile, U.S. professionals have a more varied motivational framework: although calculative reasoning plays a significant role, past turnover behavior and moral considerations also influence intentions to leave.

This research underscores the significance of affective, calculative and moral forces, while also demonstrating how institutional and cultural contexts influence various motivational drivers. These findings broaden the scope of existing turnover theories and provide recommendations: organizations in France should enhance emotional engagement through initiatives focused on culture and work-life balance, while U.S. companies need to tackle both the practical calculus and habitual mobility habits by offering clear career pathways, competitive incentives, and leadership grounded in ethics. Additionally, the study reveals that the interplay of motivational factors heavily depends on the structures of national labor markets and cultural standards.

6. Annexes

APPENDIX A – SURVEY EXPERIMENT

1. Screening Questions

1. Are you between the ages of 25–35 years old? (*If “No,” terminate survey.*)
2. Do you currently work either in France or the United States? (*If “No,” terminate survey.*)

2. Demographics & Background

1. What is your age? (*Select number.*)
2. In which country do you currently live and work? (*Select country.*)
3. What is your highest level of education completed?
4. What industry do you work in? (Check all that apply.) (*Finance, Technology, Healthcare, Education, Consulting, Government/Public Sector, Media, Manufacturing, Retail, Non-Profit, Other*)
5. What is your current job title or role? (*Open-ended response*)
6. How many years have you been working in your current job? (*Open-ended response*)

3. Job-Hopping Behaviour

1. How many years have you been working in your professional field since completing your master’s degree? (*Open-ended response*)
2. How many different jobs (excluding internships) have you held since starting your professional career? (*Open-ended response*)
3. Have you ever voluntarily left a job? (*If “Yes,” answer 4; if “No,” skip to 5*)
4. If yes, how long did you stay in that role before resigning? (*Less than 6 months, 6–12 months, 1–2 years, 3+ years, I have never quit a job*)
5. What was your main reason for leaving your last job? (Select the most relevant option.) (*Higher salary/opportunity elsewhere, Career growth/development, Work-life balance, Poor management/work culture, Relocation, Job instability/layoffs, Other*)
6. Have you ever resigned from a job without having another position secured?
7. If yes, what were your reasons? (e.g., burnout, career break, personal reasons) (*Open-ended response*)

8. When accepting a job, have you ever set a planned departure timeframe? (*Yes, within less than 6 months, Yes, within 6–12 months, Yes, within 1–2 years, No, I did not plan my departure when I accepted the job*)
9. How often do you think about leaving your current job? (*Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Constantly*)

4. Motivational Forces for Job-Hopping

Instructions: To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements? (*Scale: 0-100*)

Affective Forces (Emotional Comfort/Discomfort & Psychological Attachment)

“I stay in a job because of strong workplace relationships.”

“A positive company culture makes me less likely to leave.”

These questions capture emotional responses to the workplace, where comfort leads to staying and discomfort motivates quitting.

Calculative Forces (Rational Cost-Benefit Analysis of Staying vs. Leaving)

“I am hesitant to switch jobs due to employment laws and benefits.”

“My decision to leave a job is heavily influenced by salary or benefits.”

“A strong severance package would make me feel more secure about quitting.”

These focus on how people weigh financial and career-growth benefits before deciding to quit.

Contractual Forces (Psychological Contract & Obligation to Stay)

“I have stayed in a job longer than planned due to a sense of loyalty to the company.”

“I have considered quitting due to unmet expectations regarding promotion, benefits, or job security.”

Behavioural Forces (Cost of Leaving Due to Past Investments)

“I have stayed in a job because I had already invested time, effort, or skills into the company.”

“I considered quitting but decided against it because I had spent too much time there.”

Alternative Forces (Confidence in Finding Better Opportunities Elsewhere)

“I frequently explore job openings on LinkedIn or job platforms.”

“I believe switching jobs is the best way to increase my salary.”

“I keep my résumé updated in case a better opportunity arises.”

Normative Forces (Social & Cultural Expectations About Job Stability)

“In my country, job stability is valued more than career growth.”

“Leaving a job too quickly is viewed negatively by my peers.”

“My family, friends and/or colleagues influence my career decisions.”

Moral/Ethical Forces (Stability vs. Job-Hopping as a Personal Value)

“I believe that persistence in a job is a virtue, even if I’m unhappy.”

“I feel that switching jobs frequently is bad for my professional image.”

“I prefer to stay in a job unless there’s a very strong reason to leave.”

Constituent Forces (Attachment to Individuals Rather Than the Company)

“I have stayed in a job because I didn’t want to leave my team or manager.”

“If my closest colleagues left, I would strongly consider leaving as well.”

5. Social Media & Stay-Factors

1. Have you ever discovered new job opportunities through social media?
2. How often do you explore job opportunities after seeing your peers announce job changes online? (*Frequently, Occasionally, Rarely, Never*)
3. What factors would make you stay at a job longer? (Select all that apply.) (*Higher salary, Better work-life balance, Clear career progression opportunities, Positive company culture, Flexible work arrangements (e.g., remote work, 4-day work week), Strong leadership and management, Job stability and security, Other*)
4. Would you be more likely to stay at a company if they offered greater flexibility (e.g., remote work, 4-day work week)?
5. Which factor plays a bigger role in your decision to stay at a company? (*Career progression, Salary, Both equally*)

6. Force Statements

Below are eight statements. Please read each carefully and rank them accordingly.

1. “I stay because I feel a strong sense of belonging with my colleagues and workplace culture.”
2. “I stay because the financial benefits (salary, bonuses, retirement plans) outweigh the risks of leaving.”
3. “I stay because I feel a sense of loyalty and commitment to the company.”
4. “I stay because I have invested significant time, skills, and effort into this job.”
5. “I stay because I don’t currently see better opportunities elsewhere.”
6. “I stay because job stability is highly valued in my culture and peer group.”
7. “I stay because I believe in persistence and long-term commitment to an employer.”
8. “I stay because I don’t want to leave my team or manager.”

Disclaimer

This thesis was edited with Grammarly to eliminate grammatical and syntax errors and ensure sentences are properly phrased in English. DeepL was also used to translate the sources and the abstract.

7. Bibliography

- Al-Quran, Marwan. (2022). Traditional media versus social media: challenges and opportunities. *Technium: Romanian Journal of Applied Sciences and Technology*. 4. 145-160. 10.47577/technium.v4i10.8012.
- Bacon, Frank & Mackey, Alana. (2017). Signaling with Stock Issues and Repurchases: A Test of Semi-Strong Form Market Efficiency. *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES*. 29. 34-44.
- BBC Worklife. (2023, April 17). *Hustle culture: Is this the end of rise-and-grind?* BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20230417-hustle-culture-is-this-the-end-of-rise-and-grind>
- Chaitra, R., AshokKumarR, S., & Murthy, T. R. (2016). A Study On Work Life Balance Of The Employees At Bosch Ltd, Bangalore. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 61–68.
- CNN. (2025, April 24). *U.S. stock market bottoming out: What investors need to know*. <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/04/24/investing/us-stock-market-bottom/index.html>
- Czakowski, D. (2012). *The influence of cultural factors on the employment market: An analysis of the relationship between cultural values and employment outcomes*. Kazimierz Pułaski University of Technology and Humanities in Radom. <https://kpsw.edu.pl/pobierz/re2023-25-38.pdf>
- Decembrele, B. (2018, October 11). The job-hopping generation: Young professionals are on the move. LinkedIn Official Blog. <https://blog.linkedin.com/2018/october/11/the-job-hopping-generation-young-professionals-are-on-the-move> (stlouisfed.org)
- Gourinchas, P.-O. (2025, April 22). *The global economy enters a new era*. International Monetary Fund. <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2025/04/22/the-global-economy-enters-a-new-era>
- Griffeth, R., & Hom, P. (2004). The development of a causal model of voluntary turnover. *Innovative Theory and Empirical Research on Employee Turnover*.
- Gusvita, S., Pohan, V. G. R., & Hadiyani, S. (2023). Job Hopping Intention on Millennial Employees. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, 36, 172–176.
- Hamel, G. (2014). The Effects of Turnover on Productivity. *Azcentral*.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). The motivation to work. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hirono, R. (2001). Industrial and Technology Policies. *Industrial Policy, Innovation and Economic Growth: The Experience of Japan and the Asian NIEs*, 85.
- Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques (Insee). (2025). *Chômage - France*. https://www.insee.fr/fr/outil-interactif/5367857/tableau/50_MTS/52_CHO

- International Monetary Fund. (2025). *France: Real GDP growth (percent change)*.
https://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/NGDP_RPCH@WEO/FRA?zoom=FRA&highlight=FRA
- International Monetary Fund. (2025). *United States and the IMF*.
<https://www.imf.org/en/Countries/USA>
- Kong, H., Wang, S., & Fu, X. (2015). Meeting career expectation: Can it enhance job satisfaction of generation Y? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 147–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-08-2013-0353>
- Kuron, L. K., Lyons, S. T., Schweitzer, L., & Ng, E. S. (2015). Millennials' work values: differences across the school to work transition. *Personnel Review*, 44(6), 991- 1009. doi:10.1108/PR- 01-2014-0024
- Liu, X., & Batt, R. (2010). How supervisors influence performance: A Multilevel Study of coaching and group management in technology-mediated services. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(2), 265–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01170.x>
- Meenakshi, S. P., Subrahmanyam C. V, V., & Ravichandran , K. (2013). The Importance of Work-Life-Balance. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 14(3), 31–35.
- National Labor Relations Board. (n.d.). *The right to strike*. U.S. Government. Retrieved April 12, 2025, from <https://www.nlr.gov/strikes>
- Ng, E. S., Schweitzer, L., & Lyons, S. T. (2010). New generation, great expectations: A field study of the millennial generation. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9159-4>
- Noonari S, M. I., Shah ST, A. M., & Panhwar GM, P. M. (2015). Economic Analysis of Poultry Egg Production in Quetta district balochistan. *Journal of Fisheries & Livestock Production*, 03(03). <https://doi.org/10.4172/2332-2608.1000137>
- O’Connell, M. (2010). Employee Turnover & Retention: Understanding the True Costs and Reducing them through Improved Selection Processes. *Industrial Management article*, 2.
- OECD (2024), *OECD Economic Surveys: France 2024*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/bd96e2ed-en>.
- Okulicz-Kozaryn, A. (2011). Europeans work to live and Americans live to work (Who is happy to work more: Americans or Europeans?). *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12(2), 225–243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9188-8>
- Pryor, Sarah M., "Millennials and the Increasing Use of Social Media: Impact on the Employee Life Cycle" (2018). Student Publications. 667.
https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/667
- Rajiv Garg, Rahul Telang (2017) To Be or Not to Be Linked: Online Social Networks and Job Search by Unemployed Workforce. *Management Science* 64(8):3926-3941.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2784>

- République française. (2025). *Code du travail* (version consolidée au 29 avril 2025). Légifrance. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/texte_lc/LEGITEXT000006072050/
- Rivers, D. L. (2018). *A grounded theory of Millennials job-hopping* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/5936>
- Robinson, B. (2021, May 13). *American workers are afraid to take time off, new study finds*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bryanrobinson/2021/05/13/american-workers-are-afraid-to-take-time-off-new-study-finds/>
- Rubenstein, Alex & Eberly, Marion & Lee, Thomas & Mitchell, Terence. (2017). Surveying the forest: A meta-analysis, moderator investigation, and future-oriented discussion of the antecedents of voluntary employee turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 71. 10.1111/peps.12226.
- Salelatu, M. K. (2019). The survivors: Self-determination and how it helps youngsters to face the challenges at the Work Place. *K@ta Kita*, 7(2), 157–164. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.7.2.157-164>
- Sánchez Abril, P., Levin, A., & Del Riego, A. (2012). Blurred boundaries: Social media privacy and the twenty-first-Century employee. *American Business Law Journal*, 49(1), 63–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1714.2011.01127.x>
- Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 42(7), 625–638. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678904200705>
- Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research. (2025, April 22). *Easing the burden: Why paid family leave policies are gaining steam*. Stanford University. <https://siepr.stanford.edu/publications/policy-brief/easing-burden-why-paid-family-leave-policies-are-gaining-steam>
- The White House. (2025, April 2). *Fact sheet: President Donald J. Trump declares national emergency to increase our competitive edge, protect our sovereignty, and strengthen our national and economic security*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/04/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-declares-national-emergency-to-increase-our-competitive-edge-protect-our-sovereignty-and-strengthen-our-national-and-economic-security/>
- U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2025, March 27). *Gross domestic product, 4th quarter and year 2024 (third estimate), GDP by industry, and corporate profits*. <https://www.bea.gov/news/2025/gross-domestic-product-4th-quarter-and-year-2024-third-estimate-gdp-industry-and#:~:text=Real%20GDP%20increased%202.8%20percent,Imports%20increased>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2025, April 4). *The employment situation — March 2025*. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/empisit.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division. (n.d.). *Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)*. Retrieved April 12, 2025, from <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/flsa>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2023). *Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)*. <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/flsa> (dol.gov)

USA.gov. (2025, March 24). *Termination guidance for employers*.
<https://www.usa.gov/termination-for-employers>

Vanguard. (2025, April 28). *What next for the global economy and markets in 2025*. Vanguard.
<https://www.fr.vanguard/professionnel/analyses/what-next-for-the-global-economy-and-markets-in-2025>

Wooldridge, J. M. (2001). *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*. MIT Press.

Zhang, Y., Straub, C., & Kusyk, S. (2007). Making a life or making a living? *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 14(3), 174–195.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600710775739>