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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Employee turnover is a challenge to all organisations, regardless of their size, industry or location. High employee turnover rates have been linked to factors such as high labour mobility due to international competition for talent, an organisation’s inability to match high salary offers from competitors, as well as employee dissatisfaction with management style. These factors are also likely to be at play within State-Owned Enterprises.

Based on this background, this study aimed to investigate whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover intention at a South African State-Owned Enterprise. In order to meet this aim a quantitative survey was conducted. The survey consisted of a web-based questionnaire that included the T-P Leadership Questionnaire (measuring autocratic and laissez-faire management styles) and the Turnover Intention Scale (measuring employee’s intention to leave the organisation). The sample consisted of 378 respondents.

The data was analysed using Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression analyses. The results indicate a significant positive, but low, relationship between autocratic management style and high turnover intention ($r = .19; p < .01$). The relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention was also significantly positive correlation of $r = .29 (p < .01)$. Autocratic and laissez-faire management styles explained 9.0% of variance in turnover intention ($R^2 = 0.09, F = 18.70, p < 0.0005$).

Human resources practitioners and line management should consider the relationship between management style and employee turnover when developing retention strategies. It is further recommended that the specific State-Owned Enterprise involved in this study should consider the reasons why employees leave, together with reasons why employees remain with the organisation when developing talent retention strategies. Such an approach could proactively address employee retention.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Chapter One provides an introduction to the research problem addressed by this study. In particular, it provides information regarding the problem statement rationale, the study’s objectives, the current level of knowledge, the research design, the contribution of the study to the body of knowledge and the summary of the research design and methodology. The chapter concludes with the layout of subsequent chapters.

1.2 Background to the problem

Employee turnover is a major problem for all organisations, as loss of employees leads to loss of skills and knowledge. Due to the negative consequences of employee turnover, managers are often pressured to influence employees to stay (Han & Jekel, 2011). The pressure to retain employees increases because the employment relationship is voluntary and employers are often not certain if employees will stay (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011).

Various external factors have been linked to high employee turnover within organisations. Globalisation has been identified as one of the factors that accounts for high employee turnover as well as employee intention to leave an organisation (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2012). In addition to globalisation, lax immigration and emigration laws and the emergence of careers without boundaries have increased labour mobility in countries such as China and India (Tung, 2008). This high labour mobility increases competition for talent internationally, which leads to high turnover levels (Farndale, Scullion, & Sparrow, 2010). Organisations find it challenging to overcome these external factors, which also include high salary offers from international and local competitors (Stanz & Greyling, 2010).

In addition to the global challenges related to employee retention, South African companies are also faced with skills shortages and managers need to develop strategies to attract and retain talented individuals (Kerr-Phillips & Thomas, 2009). In
the South African context skills shortages have been linked to high turnover rates (McGrath & Akojee, 2007). The term skills shortages refers to instances where the supply of jobs in specific skills categories is exceeded by the availability of relevant skilled workers (Overbey, 2013). Ideally a high demand for skills should decrease unemployment as it makes it easier for people to obtain jobs. However, the shortage of skills contributes to unemployment because different markets exist for various skills types and levels and unemployed people are imperfect substitutes for addressing the shortages (Coelli & Wilkins, 2008). Even in instances where organisations succeed in employing the right people, these employees often do not remain with the organisation (Bufe & Murphy, 2004).

The South African government has attempted to address the current skills shortage in South Africa by implementing various initiatives. These initiatives initially involved the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (AsgiSA) and the Joint Initiative Priority Skills Acquisition (JIPSA). The AsgiSA’s mandate was to identify constraints in the economy and suggest interventions to increase long-term growth by six percent per year and address the nation’s challenges as an emerging economy (McGrath & Akojee, 2007). In an effort to achieve AsgiSA’s objectives, JIPSA was assigned to direct the implementation of the partnership between government, trade unions and the business sector to accelerate provision of important skills (Maumbe & van Wyk, 2011).

Government has also signed the National Skills Accord and the Accord on Basic Education and Partnerships with schools, business and trade unions (National Skills Authority, 2012). These Accords include a commitment to place trainees in State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) and in the private sector, the effective utilisation of the Skills Development Fund to support prioritised skills, a budget of over R6 billion for skills development and education, and annual compulsory skills development targets for SOEs (National Skills Authority, 2012). Despite the initiated skills programmes, South Africa still experiences skills shortages and unemployment (Maumbe & van Wyk, 2011).

Due to the skills shortage, organisations also experience high employee turnover as employees who are viewed as high performers tend to move from one company to the next as they are attracted by multiple organisations (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009).
Various internal organisational factors appear to influence employees’ decisions to remain with or leave a specific organisation. In an analysis of the reasons why high performers leave organisations, it was established that high performers want flexibility in the work environment (Nxele, 2008). Conversely, most organisations lack flexibility and high performing employees often leave such organisations (Akdemir, Erdem, & Polat, 2010). The departure of high performing employees compromises the organisation because such people take their skills, knowledge and experience with them (Long, Thean, Khairuzzaman, Ismail, & Jusoh, 2012). Frank, Finnegan and Taylor (2004) argued that employees are more likely to stay at an organisation if they have harmonious relationships with their line managers. The style of management employed by the manager seems to influence an employee’s intention to leave or stay with an organisation (Nassar, Abdou, & Mohmoud, 2011).

Employee turnover is thus a complex phenomenon, linked to external factors such as globalisation and the skills shortage as well as to internal factors such as management style. Within the South African context, various government initiatives aimed at addressing the skills shortage have failed to alleviate the difficulties created by this shortage, which includes high employee turnover. This study focuses on employee turnover within a particular State-Owned Enterprise in South Africa, and this enterprise is discussed in more detail in the sections that follow.

1.3 State-Owned Enterprises

State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) are wholly or partially owned by the government. These enterprises are critical for addressing energy, mining, telecommunications, transport, forestry, financial services, defence and infrastructure needs in the country (Republic of South Africa, 2008). Government achieves some of its social objectives through SOEs (Business Unity South Africa, 2011).

Government requires SOEs to play an important role in economic growth and societal contribution, creation of jobs and provision of resources (Khongmalai, Tang, & Siengthai, 2010). SOEs should also develop and implement plans to transform human resources and procurement processes to comply with the Employment Equity Act (EEA) and the Broad Based Black Empowerment (BBBE) Policy (Presidential SOE Committee, 2011).
In accordance with the policies and legislation, government encourages the private sector to partner with SOEs in socio-economic development where the private sector provides assistance such as additional funding for infrastructure development (Republic of South Africa, 2012). SOEs prioritise skills programmes for job creation and employee development and retention (Khongmalai, Tang, & Siengthai, 2010).

To provide a context in which to study about the relationship between turnover intention and management style, one SOE was selected as the research company. A brief profile of the company is provided in the next section.

1.4 Company profile

The SOE for this study is the monopoly electricity producer in South Africa, with government as the sole shareholder. The utility was founded in 1913 and its primary mandate is to establish and maintain the country’s electricity supply to local municipalities, government departments, ports, railways and industry in general to allow the SOE to realise economic growth.

The SOE has approximately 45,000 employees, and has experienced staff turnover of less than 10% for the past three years. Voluntary turnover accounts for an estimated 50% of the total turnover (SOE Human Resources Sustainability Report, 2013, p. 1). The organisation loses employees mainly to the mining, banking and logistics sectors. The cost of replacing employees who resign, training new recruits, and paying the remaining employees overtime for the stopgap work they perform all impact on the organisation’s bottom line. Thus the effort to retain employees is one of the SOE’s priorities.

The organisational structure consists of several functions, referred to as the Enterprise Development Group, the Human Resources Group, the Sustainability Group, the Commercial and Technology Group, the Office of the Chief Executive Division and the Finance Group. The organisation’s value chain processes (Group Capital, Generation, Transmission, Distribution and Customer Service) are supported by the Strategic and Services Functions. The value chain processes and the enabling functions are strengthened by adherence to policies and procedures and compliance to legislation pertaining to safety, health, environment and quality. These policies and procedures are monitored and improved through audits.
1.5 Motivation for and rationale of the study

Employee turnover is costly for organisations (Ongori, 2007), with the expense of employees’ recruitment and retention estimated to be between 50% and 200% of their annual package (Vijayalakshmi & Balanagagurunaathan, 2012, p. 2). Depending on the employment level, other costs associated with employee turnover include increased workload on the remaining employees, lowered morale, loss of intellectual capital and loss of productivity and customers (Forgas, 2009). Conversely, successful employee retention improves sales, market value, profitability and customer service (Simons & Hinkin, 2001).

Employee turnover impedes an organisation’s accomplishment of business goals and objectives (Long et al., 2012). Failure to achieve these organisational imperatives has a long-term detrimental impact on the organisation, which is greater than the financial costs involved (Long et al., 2012).

Based on these challenges, it would appear that focusing on employee intention to stay could reduce employee turnover and the financial and non-financial turnover implications for organisations, as employers would know in advance what motivates employees to remain with an organisation (Boushey & Glynn, 2012). Employers’ efforts to retain employees are weakened by the job market, which has evolved to the extent that it is easy for employees to decide who to work for, while employers focus on economic downturn and cost-cutting (Deloitte, 2011). Employees also evaluate the benefits they receive as members of an organisation and assess the extent to which the organisational value is competitive (Heger, 2007). When employees view their organisations as being less competitive than other organisations, they either disengage or leave the organisation and the profitability of the organisation is negatively impacted (Heger, 2007).

Another challenge facing organisations is that employee turnover increases because management and staff hold differing views about the reasons for employees to stay at an organisation. Vos and Meganck (2009) established that managers’ and employees’ responses differed in their evaluation of what employees value in motivating them to stay at a company. The study reported that employees value career growth and advancement opportunities, social environment, and job content...
and, conversely, managers assume that employees value training, career perceptions and remuneration and benefits (Vos & Meganck, 2009).

Researchers also hold different views about whether there is a relationship between employee turnover intention and management style. Grissom (2012) established a positive relationship between management style and employee turnover. Forest and Kleiner (2011) reported that management style influences employee intention to stay, and Bull (2010) confirmed that leaders who are able to adopt different management styles as the situation dictates, experience low subordinate turnover. In a study investigating situational leadership and turnover intentions among hospital employees, a positive association was noted between an autocratic management style and turnover intention (Bull, 2010). In contrast, Sellgren, Ekvall and Tomson (2007) and Wells and Peachey (2011) reported a significantly negative correlation between management style and turnover intention. For instance, in a study of leadership behaviour, satisfaction leadership and turnover intentions Wells and Peachey (2011) reported a significantly negative relationship between the predictor (leadership) and dependent (turnover intention) variables.

1.6 Problem statement

The research problem is stated as follows: it is unclear whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover intention. Organisations experience employee turnover and research suggests that this is linked to external factors such as a dearth of skilled employees, current and anticipated shortages of skills due to retirement, the changing expectations held by new employees, and opportunities that attract people to move between jobs, disciplines and industries (Chhabra & Mishra, 2008). Staff turnover is a challenge for organisations as it impacts organisational performance (Davidson, Timo, & Wang, 2009). Organisations are therefore tasked both with finding employees with the right skills and managing them in such a way that they will remain with the organisation. Organisations often tend to take action only at the stage when employees indicate their intention to leave, hence they are unsuccessful at retaining employees (Branham, 2005). Establishing the motivations behind employee intention to leave could help to identify employee needs and allow for the implementation of appropriate remedial strategies while employees are still willing to work for the organisation. Given this background, this
study aimed to determine whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover at a South African SOE.

Previous studies that explored the relationship between management style and intention to leave an organisation have produced contradictory results. Dixon and Hart (2010) found a negative relationship between Path-Goal leadership styles and turnover intention. Wells and Peachey (2011) surmised that there was a negative relationship between management style and turnover intention. Tremblay (2010) established that there was a relationship between management style and turnover intention, albeit one moderated by perceptions of fairness and trust. Furtado, Batista, and Silva (2011) concluded that a style of management that is characterised by persuading and sharing influences employees to remain with the organisation.

Management tends to link employee intention to leave the organisation to employee personal traits and lack of career planning, thereby not realising that the employee’s decision to stay or leave is influenced by the total work environment (Cavalcanti, Abreu, Cunha, & Rebouças, 2013). Rhule (2004) asserted that managers tend to blame factors such as a demanding labour market, and not management style, for an inability to retain employees. However, according to Chhabra and Mishra (2008), if managers change their management styles to correspond to employee expectations and needs, they will retain their employees. A number of variables that impact turnover intention are discussed later in the literature review.

1.6.1 Research objective

The primary objective of the study is to investigate whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover intention at a State-Owned Enterprise.

The research objective leads to the formulation of the hypotheses to be tested.

1.6.2 Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study are:

$H_0$: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.
H\textsubscript{a1}: There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{02}: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{a2}: There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{03}: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{a3}: Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{04}: Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{a4}: Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

These hypotheses are based on the motivation and rationale for the study, which are presented below.

### 1.7 Current level of knowledge

Managers need to be aware of employees’ intentions to leave in order to strengthen their efforts to reduce employee turnover. Companies are likely to have low turnover rates during an economic downturn, and, therefore, less money is spent on recruitment (PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2012). Employers, however, face the challenge of looking after their employees, even during a recession, to avoid losing them when the economy improves. Van Schalkwyk (2010) stated that employees may stay in their current jobs because they are uncertain about whether they will be able to secure alternative employment.

In the face of uncertainty, the importance of employees as a resource for a competitive advantage compels companies to invest in the retention of employees (O’Reilly & Pfeffer, 2000). Duggan and Horton (2004) confirmed that other sources of
competitive advantage, such as market value, are becoming less important than human resources and the manner in which they are managed. For talent to contribute to competitive advantage, it must be unique, inimitable, and defy substitution by competitors (Horobet et al., 2008).

The success of an organisation cannot be imitated if it is based on effective people management, as such a practice cannot be replicated by competitors (Pfeffer, 2005). One of the ways to gain competitiveness through people is for managers to understand what employees require in order to remain with an organisation (Vos, Meganck, & Buyens, 2006; Bakuwa, Chasimpha, & Masamba, 2013). When employees view organisational efforts to retain them as being inadequate, they may leave (Rosser, 2004).

Managers often find it challenging to deal with the complexity of turnover intention as it relates to a network of other variables. For instance, Branham (2001) reported that issues that influence turnover include poor remuneration and benefits, stress from overwork and work-life imbalance, breach of psychological contract, lack of person-job-fit, limited growth and advancement opportunities, lack of intrinsic motivation, less than optimal working environments, and loss of trust and confidence in senior leaders. If these factors are addressed the study may contribute to the SOE and the service providers.

1.8 Contribution of the study

The study makes a practical contribution in that human resources service providers at the SOE may gain insight into the relationship between employee turnover intention and management style. The organisation’s ability to retain employees is important for a stable workplace, good organisational performance, reduced costs and increased productivity (Alatawi, 2013). The information may guide human resources practitioners at the SOE in facilitating retention strategies. The information may also add value to line managers’ understanding of different management styles and their possible link to employee turnover intention. The leadership of the organisation may use the findings to devise strategies to retain their employees and reduce their turnover rate. The findings may contribute to the review and formulation of retention policies and strategies at the SOE.
In addition, from a research perspective this study contributes to the existing literature by the further investigation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between employee turnover intention and management style.

1.9 Summary of research methodology

The study is based on the positivism. Positivism enables the researcher to address the research aim objectively (Welman, Kruger, & Mitchell, 2005). However, while a distinctive feature of positivist research is that the findings should be generalisable to settings outside the particular research context (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). The findings of the present study are not broadly generalisable beyond the organisation of study.

A quantitative approach was selected to test the hypotheses and to establish whether there is a relationship between management style and turnover intention. A census sampling strategy was selected. A population of 4,042 managerial level employees across all divisions of the SOE was targeted. Three hundred and seventy-eight employees responded to the questionnaire. The findings are reported by means of descriptive and inferential statistics.

1.10 Outline of the remaining chapters

The remaining chapters are outlined below.

In Chapter Two, the key concepts of the study, viz. turnover intention, retention, and management style, are defined and discussed. The chapter focuses on competition for skills, reasons why employees remain with organisations and reasons why employees leave organisations.

In Chapter Three the research methodology used in the study is discussed. The research philosophy and research approach are identified and their strengths and weaknesses are discussed. The characteristics of the sample as well as sample selection and the methods of data collection and data analysis are described. The reliability of the measurement instruments (the T-P Leadership Questionnaire and the Turnover Intention Scale) is also addressed. Ethical issues adhered to in the study are noted.
In Chapter Four the findings are reported and the reliability of the results is discussed.

In Chapter Five the findings of the study are interpreted and discussed within the context of previous studies.

In Chapter Six the findings are summarised and the contribution of the study to the body of knowledge is discussed. This chapter also covers the limitations of the study and recommendations for the SOE studied as well as for future research are provided.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous chapter addressed the background to the study and the profile of the organisation selected for the study. This chapter focuses on the literature dealing with employee turnover, competition for skills, reasons for remaining with organisations, reasons for leaving organisations and management style related to turnover intention. This chapter therefore explores the theoretical foundation of the study.

2.1 Employee turnover

The term employee turnover refers to the phenomenon where employees enter and leave an employment environment over a period of time (Msomi, 2010). Turnover may be conceptualised as either dysfunctional or functional (Watrous, Huffman, & Pritchard, 2006). Turnover is dysfunctional when high performers leave, but is functional in instances where poor performers leave as they can be replaced by high performers (Becker & Cropanzano, 2011). Turnover can also be involuntary or voluntary (Msomi, 2010). Involuntary turnover is referred to as the process in which the organisation decides on behalf of the employee that he or she should leave or stay (Watrous et al., 2006). Conversely, voluntary turnover occurs when an individual deliberately chooses to leave the organisation (Weller, Holtom, Matiaske, & Mellewigt, 2009). Allen, Bryant and Vardaman (2008) suggested that organisations should address turnover by focusing mainly on voluntary turnover, as this is the more detrimental form of turnover.

Voluntary turnover is viewed as detrimental as it is likely to lead to organisational dysfunction (Mobley, 1992). Voluntary turnover is linked to consequences such as managers’ having to use scarce resources (such as money) and remaining employees having to perform extra duties until management fills the vacant position (Singh & Loncar, 2010). Theron, Barkhuizen and du Plessis (2014) argued that these detrimental consequences can be avoided if managers curb voluntary turnover. According to Muteswa and Ortlepp (2011) managers are able to curb voluntary turnover by addressing issues such as job-fit, enhancing relations between managers and employees, career advancement, and meaningful work. The next section
discusses competition for skills as one of the factors that has been linked to voluntary turnover.

### 2.2 Competition for skills

Competition for global talent is increasing due to a number of factors such as increased labour mobility (Tung, 2008) and high remuneration packages offered by international companies (Stanz & Greyling, 2010). Labour mobility across countries leads to international competition for the same talent (Tung, 2008). Competitiveness and sustainable growth are influenced by emigration, and lax emigration and immigration laws accelerate employee relocation to other countries (Tung, 2008). As a result, the concept of a boundary-less career has emerged and employees are increasingly willing to change jobs across international boundaries in search of more intrinsically satisfying careers (Tung, 2008). The movement of labour across borders is also aggravated by the growing number of countries permitting dual citizenship (Fatehi, Veliyath, & Derakhshan, 2008) and people are increasingly able to move between two countries. These global factors are particularly relevant for highly skilled talent, and organisations struggle to retain individuals with high skills levels (Yahya & Kaur, 2010).

In order to combat these trends, people must be prioritised as important assets and accordingly, this could decrease the skills shortage and increase competitiveness for organisations (Pfeffer, 2005). However, Teagarden, Meyer and Jones (2008) argued that, in some instances, even if managers prioritise people, they may fail to increase competitiveness of their organisation because the supply of literate professional staff may not possess high skills levels. Some graduates are not suitably trained to meet the demand for high skills levels (Yahya & Kaur, 2010) and as a result, governments sometimes provide extra funds for the retraining of graduates in order to meet the needs of employers (Harris, 2007). However, highly skilled employees often have high expectations of their employers, and failure to meet such expectations may encourage them to consider job offers from competitors, impacting the organisation’s competitive edge (Pollner & Lane, 2008).

As a strategy to gain competitive advantage, some organisations make use of market mapping and employer branding as ways of attracting and retaining highly skilled employees (Farndale, Scullion, & Sparrow, 2010). Although market mapping and
employer branding may be applied and people are available in the market, imperfect substitutability may be a challenge due to barriers to skills acquisition (Coelli, & Wilkins, 2008). In an effort to address imperfect substitutability, some companies include their customers in interview panels during recruitment processes because customers are in close contact with front line employees and possibly have insight into what makes a good employee (Pfeffer, 2005).

Recruitment is seen as symbolic of an organisation’s style (Bufer & Murphy, 2004). For example, an intense selection process leads the prospective employee to perceive the organisation as performance-oriented, and to understand that much is expected of him or her and that people are important to management (Pfeffer, 1994).

The imperfect substitutability of talent in the market has led to some companies segmenting their talent according talent needs, the same way and with the same commitment and care that top marketing professionals segment their customer base (Pollner & Lane, 2008). Cardy, Miller and Ellis (2007) developed an employee equity model based on a customer equity model to illustrate the contribution of employees to sustainable organisational performance and profit levels.

![Diagram](image-url)

**Figure 2.1.** Components of the employee equity model (Cardy, Miller, & Ellis, 2007, p.142).
The equity model consists of three components viz. value equity, brand equity and retention equity (see Figure 2.1). Each of these components is discussed in the following sections.

### 2.2.1 Value equity

Value equity refers to the employees’ views of the benefits of working for an organisation in relation to their contribution to the organisation; in other words, employees evaluate what they receive compared to what they give (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). An organisation builds value equity among staff members by maximising its provision of what employees expect from the organisation and, at the same time, reducing what the organisation is likely to lose (Damodaran, 2005).

A primary strategy for value equity growth is competition on price (Cardy et al., 2007). Based on this strategy, the extent to which employees are remunerated influences the way they evaluate the benefits of working for the organisation (Galizzi & Lang, 1998). Furthermore, compensation practices such as performance bonuses, flexible remuneration packages and allocations of shares influence how employees assess whether or not their remuneration and benefits are commensurate with their own contribution (Cardy et al., 2007). When employees perceive their equity compensation as not being commensurate with their own contribution, they are more likely to leave the organisation (Damodaran, 2005). Griffeth and Gaertner (2001), in their study of equity and turnover processes, found that employee salary and incentives increase employee turnover intention if they are perceived to not be equivalent to their contribution. La Var Harline (2012) agreed that the provision of incentives in the form of equity is one of the strategies used by to retain employees. However, Randall and Mueller (1995), in a study of registered nurses, argued that perceptions of inequity do not influence employee turnover intention as employees who earned less than their peers remained in the organisations they studied.

### 2.2.2 Brand equity

The way employees perceive and feel about the organisation is a reflection of brand equity (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). Employees’ subjective views of the organisation are formed by the way they perceive the organisation’s reputation, the extent to which employees are respected, an association between certain emotions
Adoption of a positive brand equity concept can strengthen employees' psychological contracts and influence them to stay with the organisation (Cardy et al., 2007). Organisations may improve brand equity by awarding and recognising employees for their contribution to the success of the organisation (Nelson, 1994). In customer equity theory, enhanced brand equity increases customer attraction and retention and it is likely that the same principle applies to employees (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). In this regard, Paradiso (2005) reported that an established brand can contribute to the reduction of employee turnover. Suikannen (2010) investigated employer branding and employee retention and found that employer brand promotes the image of a good company to work for and employees' association with their employer brand encourages them to not leave the organisation. However, employer branding may fail to encourage employees to remain with the organisation unless employers create appropriate structures that facilitate employee brand knowledge (King & Grace, 2009).

### 2.2.3 Retention equity

The relationships that are established between the organisation and the employee as well as the organisation's efforts to maintain those relationships form an important part of retention equity. Organisations can enhance retention equity through formal relationship interventions such as new employee orientations, on-boarding and teamwork interventions (Black & Ashford, 1995). Team-work promotes employees' perceptions that they are important to the organisation and may prevent them from leaving the organisation (Brunetto et al. 2013). However, it is not only formal relationships that contribute to employee turnover intention, but informal associations, such as advice-giving, supplement the formal relationships (Soltis, Agnessens, Sasovova, & Labianca) and accordingly, Brunetto et al. (2013) emphasised the importance of relationships in a work setting. However, it is argued that management may disappoint young employees by seeking to build long-term relationships in situations where a transactional approach would have been adequate (Villanueva & Hanssens, 2007). This may result in managers' attempts to retain employees through incentives, funding employee development costs, and salary and
benefits increases (Glen, 2006), but sometimes such incentives may increase costs beyond what is economically reasonable (Reicheld & Teal, 2001).

Black and Ashford (1995) argued that, in addition to equity, there are other reasons why employees remain with organisations. These reasons are discussed in the following section.

2.3 Reasons for remaining with organisations

According to Cardy and Lengnick-Hall (2011), one of the ways to ensure employee retention is to make the organisational environment as accommodating as possible. Factors that lead to an accommodating organisational environment include remuneration, perceived organisational support, empowerment and recognition of performance, work challenges, developmental opportunities and effective communication (Ghosh, Satyawadi, Joshi, & Shadman, 2013).

2.3.1 Remuneration

When reviewing remuneration as a retention factor, managers need to take into account five distinct areas that contribute to employees’ pay satisfaction. These areas are the level at which employees are remunerated, salary increase, benefits, remuneration structure and incentive bonuses (García, Posthuma, Mumford, & Quiñones, 2009). Leaders are encouraged to review their subordinates’ remuneration in order to encourage them to stay in the organisation (Petaschncik, 2008). Perceived fairness in determining remuneration has been linked to employee intention to remain in an organisation (Griffeth & Gaertner, 2001; Stanz & Greyling, 2010).

Singh and Loncar (2010), argued that employers in an effort to achieve fairness in remuneration, they may spend between 70% to 80% of their budgets on salaries and benefits and that this may lead to no return on their investments. Milkovich and Newman (2008) cautioned that, while retention of employees may save organisations the high costs of turnover, the profitability of organisations should not be compromised in the process.
2.3.2 Perceived organisational support

Perceived organisational support is the degree to which employees are convinced that an organisation represented by leaders and managers appreciates their efforts and is concerned about their welfare, (Koustab & Sangeeta, 2011). It is important for the line manager to support the work of employees, to be passionate about their welfare, and to partner with them to build what is missing into their jobs (Kim, 2012). A study focusing on the role of support at work revealed that employees whose managers are supportive remain in the organisation (Zeytinoglu, Denton, & Plenderleith, 2011) but Mignonac and Richebe (2013) found that employers’ efforts to retain employees are only successful if employees do not perceive the offer of support as resulting from underlying motives.

In addition to the relationship with line managers, the psychosocial support received from peers in the workplace increases employees’ engagement and reduces intention to leave the organisation (Koustab & Sangeeta, 2011). Employees may want to stay in organisations because their peers are friendly and supportive (Koustab & Sangeeta, 2011). In a study of 13 911 employees across sectors that included education, financial institutions, mining and government, Van Schalkwyk, Els and Rothmann (2010) found that supportive peers influenced fellow employees to remain in the organisation. In support, Trybou, De Poucq, Paeshuyse and Gemmel (2013) concluded that perceived social support, regardless of where it originates, has an impact on employee retention.

2.3.3 Empowerment and recognition

Empowerment-enhancing practices, sharing information and being involved in the decision-making process all enhance employee intention to stay with an organisation (Gardner & Wright, 2011). Ghosh et al. (2013) confirmed that employees remain in the organisation when they are empowered to make decisions because they view themselves as belonging to the organisation. Van Schalkwyk, Du Toit, Bothma and Rothmann (2010) asserted that when employees are given the freedom to do things their way, they assume accountability for the resultant outcomes and remain in the organisation.
When employees are not acknowledged for their performance beyond job expectations, they are more likely to search for new job opportunities (Knudson, 2013). Chew and Chan (2008) postulated that employees are more likely to remain in the organisation when they know that their efforts, contributions and capabilities are meaningfully recognised. In order to be meaningful, recognition has to be individualised, deserved and specific, otherwise employees may feel unappreciated regardless of management efforts (Rath, 2004). However, Rosser (2004) argued that the availability or lack of availability of recognition has a greater impact on intention to stay than on intention to leave. In order to avoid demotivating high performers, the commitment that management displays in recognising good performance should be of the same level as that used in dealing with non-performance (Sirotta, Mischkind, & Meltzer, 2006).

### 2.3.4 Work challenges and developmental opportunities

Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to stay in the organisation than those who are dissatisfied (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2012). Challenging work through factors such as projects and additional job assignments satisfies employees (Zaghloul, Al-hussaini, & Al-bassam, 2008).

Samuel and Chipunza (2009) confirmed that employees are challenged when employers enhance the jobs through training and development opportunities as part of their company-facilitated career growth plans. Participation in developmental programmes improves employees’ skills and performance and they are therefore more likely to stay with the organisation (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009) because they perceive their leaders as being supportive of their development (Kraimer, Seibert, Wayne, & Liden, 2011).

Maurer and Lippstreu (2008) argued that, although managerial support for employee development influences employees to remain in the organisation, individuals respond differently to learning opportunities. These authors suggested that people who are learning-oriented respond more positively to development opportunities than do those with high performance orientations. Maurer and Lippstreu (2008) further argued that performance-orientated individuals view learning as unnecessary as they focus on the demonstration of the competence they currently possess.
2.3.5 **Effective communication**

When managers communicate effectively, employees' understanding of their contribution to organisational success is enhanced (AbuKhalifeh & Som, 2013). Employees feel valued when they receive feedback, are given an opportunity to provide feedback (Ruck & Welch, 2012), and are updated on organisational changes (Holton, 2009). When employees are confident that they are informed and that their input is valued, they are encouraged to stay with the organisation because they view themselves as important stakeholders (Truss, Soane, Wisdom, & Burnett, 2006). Employees value performance-related feedback and upward feedback (Ruck & Welch, 2012) and view leaders who communicate effectively as being supportive, understanding of their roles and knowledgeable about their development (Ruck & Welch, 2012).

2.4 **Reasons for employee turnover**

The reasons why employees remain with organisations that were discussed in the previous section need to be understood in conjunction with the reasons why employees quit, as the employees often have different reasons for staying and leaving.

Turnover starts with employee dissatisfaction. Employee dissatisfaction then leads to thoughts of leaving, searching for a job, assessment of additional opportunities and deciding to leave the organisation (Taylor et al., 2006). Mobley’s model of employee turnover outlines the steps to turnover as follows: first, dissatisfaction with the job; second, thoughts of leaving; third, assessment of the cost of leaving; fourth, intention to search; fifth, search for alternatives; sixth, comparison of alternatives with current job; and, seventh, decision to leave or stay (Wittmer, Shepard, & Martin, 2014). However, Clausen and Borg (2010) argued that employees will not necessarily behave in the step-by-step causal manner outlined in this model because they apply their minds in various ways when they consider leaving. Wittmer et al. (2014) confirmed that the participants in their study did not follow the turnover steps outlined by the model as, it is possible for the employer to persuade the employee to stay in the organisation (Hausknecht et al., 2009). However, Branham (2005) argued that the possibility of a manager gaining renewed commitment from the employee during the period between employees' decisions to leave and the actual departure is low.
In addition to models relating to the process of deciding to leave, models also exist that categorise an employee’s degree of intention to leave. Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012) categorised employees who stay at or leave an organisation into four groups, defined as enthusiastic stayers, enthusiastic leavers, reluctant stayers and reluctant leavers. Enthusiastic stayers remain in the organisation because they are willing to be part of the organisation without pressure to leave or stay (Hom et al., 2012). Enthusiastic stayers exhibit good performance, are committed and positive. They are most likely to leave the organisation through retirement, death or an unsolicited offer (Becker & Cropanzano, 2011). A study of 404 employees across various industries found that enthusiastic stayers are embedded in organisations and are willing to participate in efforts to establish strategies that would retain them in the organisation (Rosen, Stiehl, Mittal and Leana, 2011). An additional study conducted in the USA by Woo and Allen (2014) supported this conclusion and found that embedded stayers are motivated by relationships with others, feel obliged to perform their duties and tend to remain with the organisation.

Reluctant stayers, the second group identified by Hom et al. (2012), would like to leave but perceive barriers to their departure. They aim to achieve the minimum acceptable performance levels and have negative attitude (Hom et al., 2012). Although employee turnover negatively impacts organisations, retaining reluctant stayers can also lead to dysfunction, as they may exhibit destructive behaviours such as sabotage behaviour (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978). Enthusiastic leavers, the third group identified by Hom et al. (2012), also referred to as dissatisfied leavers, are determined to leave and they include poor, average and good performers. The final group, reluctant leavers, leave because they are compelled to do so (Hom et al., 2012).

Although these four groups or categories are seen as distinct, employees may transit from one profile to the next over a period of time. For example, an individual may progress from being an embedded stayer to an enthusiastic leaver due to changes in organisational factors such as relationships within the organisation (Woo & Allen, 2014).

In addition to describing the steps involved in deciding to leave an organisation, as well as identifying various categories of employees in relation to intention to leave, it
is also possible to highlight specific factors that influence turnover. It should be noted
that turnover intention is a complex phenomenon that is influenced by a number of
variables. These variables include poor remuneration and benefits, stress from
overwork and work-life imbalance, breach of psychological contract, lack of person-
job fit, limited growth and advancement opportunities, lack of intrinsic motivation, a
less than optimal working environment, and loss of trust and confidence in senior
leaders (Branham, 2001). These variables are discussed in the sections below.

2.4.1 Remuneration and benefits

Milkovich and Newman (2010) postulated that employees want their remuneration to
be commensurate with what they contribute through their knowledge and skills.
Employees compare themselves to those who are doing the same job both inside
and outside the organisation, and equity is achieved when the input-output ratio
equals that of the referent (Singh & Loncar, 2010). In instances where output is
perceived to be lower than input, employees perceive themselves to be under-
rewarded and are likely to decrease the input by being absent from work or leaving
the organisation (Singh & Loncar, 2010). Chao, Chen and Song (2013) reported that
under-rewarding causes dissatisfaction and leads to employee turnover.

Managers must re-evaluate their employees’ salaries on a regular basis in order to
ensure that they remain competitive (Petaschnik, 2008). Organisations should
consider the five dimensions of pay satisfaction, namely remuneration level, salary
raises, benefits, remuneration structures and incentive schemes, when reviewing
remuneration (García, Posthuma, Mumford, & Quiñones, 2009). However, Stanz and
Greyling (2010) argued that factors other than remuneration also lead to turnover.
These factors include poor working conditions, job insecurity and lack of
developmental opportunities (Schaufeli, Wilmar & Hu, 2010).

2.4.2 Work-life balance

Work-family conflict can be influenced by the amount of time an employee devotes to
one role at the expense of another role. Symptoms, such as fatigue experienced due
to one role, can influence other roles (Lièes, Schwind & Wagner, 2007). Disharmony
can also occur when behaviours demanded by one role are incompatible with
expectations in the other role (Haar, Roche, & Taylor, 2012).
Achieving a good work-life balance benefits both the organisation and its employees as it reduces stress, reduces absenteeism and lowers employee turnover (Chimote & Srivastava, 2013). A study of Dutch government employees found that poor work-life balance increases employees’ stress levels and influences them to leave the organisation (Deery & Jago, 2008). Conversely, a study of private bank employees reported only an insignificant relationship between work-life balance and turnover intention (Javed, Khan, Yasir, Aamir, & Ahmed, 2014). In support of this finding, a study of 114 participants revealed that the evidence for a direct link between work-life balance and turnover intention is questionable (Riley, 2006). Lazar, Osioian and Ratiu (2010) argued that family life has to be balanced so that personal problems do not negatively influence an employee’s performance.

Family-friendly policies and practices are beneficial to employees and organisations as they address the impact of work-family balance on employee retention (Vanderpool & Way, 2013). In addition to the availability of family-friendly policies and programmes, managers should support employees when they opt for work-life balance programmes, and human resources managers should encourage the use of such programmes (McCarthy, Cleveland, Hunter, & Grady, 2012). In support of these suggestions, a study conducted in a large New Zealand organisation reported that the unavailability and failure to implement work-life programmes in the organisation resulted in turnover (Smith & Gardner, 2007). Despite these findings, employee turnover may remain high in some organisations because these organisations cite costs, dependence on the working hours of other businesses and non-formalisation of work-life balance practices as barriers to work-life balance implementation (Gabriel, 2012).

### 2.4.3 Psychological contract

A psychological contract breach occurs when employees perceive the employer as not fulfilling their unwritten promises regarding promotions or when other job related factors not formalised in contracts (Chin & Hung, 2013). A breach of psychological contract can also occur when employers effect changes in the work environment due to economic pressures; these changes may result in employees becoming negatively affected, disillusioned and disengaged (Murray, 2010). When employees believe that organisations have failed to meet their obligations, employees are less likely to be
committed to the organisation and more likely to resign (Bellou, 2008). Smith and Gardner (2010) reported a significant relationship between psychological contract (especially in relation to changes in the work environment) and employee turnover intention. Conversely, Bal, Cooman, Mol and Ahmed (2013) argued, in the study of 240 employees in Netherlands, that the impact of psychological contract is not relative. For instance employees with low tenure are more likely to leave the organisation when psychological contract is breached, unlike employees with high tenure (Bal et al., 2013).

Wang (2010) postulated that employees leave organisations if the difference between the expectation levels when entering the organisation and current satisfaction levels is high. In addition, employees also leave organisations when the satisfaction gap between experiences at the current company and experiences at the previous company is large (Wang, 2010). Discrepancies between what the employee expects to give and receive and what the organisation expects to give and receive results in a breach of the psychological contract (Bellou, 2008).

### 2.4.4 Person-job-fit

Various forms of poor person-job-fit may lead to employee intention to leave. For example, when an employee is not the right person for the job or his or her strengths are not used on a daily basis, he or she may consider other job alternatives (Singh & Dixit, 2011). Another form of poor fit is experienced when employees’ predispositions, values and expectations are not met by the amount or type of work allocated to them (Wang, Zhan, Mccune, & Truxillo, 2011). An additional form of poor fit occurs when employees who are over-qualified for the jobs allocated to them utilise their skills less in their job roles. This negatively impacts their commitment to stay in the organisation (Kalleberg, 2008). Pavlish and Hunt (2012) found that employees become stressed, frustrated and alienated and consider leaving when they are performing a job that does not exercise their levels of skill. However, in contrast to this finding, a Japanese study conducted by Takase, Nakayoshi and Teraoka (2012) found that employee intention to leave is based on high demands and unrealistic performance expectations and not on an existing mismatch between the employees and their jobs. For instance, new graduates experience transitional shock as they enter the workplace and are unprepared for the transition from the
protected academic environment to the unusually demanding professional environment (Duchscher, 2009).

### 2.4.5 Growth and advancement opportunities

Turnover increases when there are few growth opportunities and employees are not able to participate in advancement decisions (Capelli, 2008). According to Kim (2012), employees should evaluate the organisation’s provision of fair career advancement opportunities before they consider leaving the organisation. An employee’s understanding of his or her own career advancement is critical because the employee’s intent to leave the organisation is based on the employee’s continuous assessment of the current company’s career advancement opportunities against those of alternative companies (Zhao & Zhou, 2008). An employee’s job status, current salary scale and title also influence voluntary turnover (Zhao & Zhou, 2008). A study based on 12,545 insurance employees and 49 empirical studies on career advancement and voluntary turnover, concluded that employee dissatisfaction emanating from remuneration level and promotions leads to turnover intention if these issues are not effectively addressed (Nyberg, 2010; Feldman, 2009).

Internal promotions within the organisation can be viewed as formal recognition of performance, especially if they are accompanied by a salary increase, more challenging work, increased accountability, higher status and increased independence (Tan, 2008). However, in an attempt to cut costs, employers may delay job creation and promotion and employees may leave the organisation for better career opportunities (Branham, 2005).

### 2.4.6 Intrinsic motivation

Motivation is usually divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation is related to tangible rewards and satisfaction (Kuvaas, 2010) and motivation is not derived from the activity itself but from the extrinsic outcomes to which the activity leads (Palliam, 2012). In contrast, intrinsic motivation relates to the spontaneous satisfaction derived from the activity itself (Khan, 2014). Extrinsic motivation is related to the three lower levels of needs (physiological, safety and love/belonging) and intrinsic motivation links to the two upper levels of needs (self-esteem and self-actualisation) (Ozguner & Ozguner, 2014).
Although people with high self-esteem and self-actualisation are intrinsically motivated, Kuvaas (2010) argued that organisations should facilitate environments that support intrinsic motivation in order to reduce turnover intention levels. In support of this view Hsu (2012) investigated a sample of 256 sets of employees and managers and reported that employees who are not intrinsically satisfied are more likely to leave the organisation. Further, a Turkish study of hospitality employees found that intrinsic motivation may reduce the levels of employees’ intentions to leave as employees perform duties to derive pleasure from these activities (Babakus, Yavas, & Karatape, 2008).

### 2.4.7 Work environments

The term ‘optimal work environment’ relates to the favourableness of the work environment (Mohindru & Pankaj, 2013). An optimal work environment is often linked to the quality of the relationship between the staff and the work environment, as well as ethical fit (Coldwell, Billberry, Meurs, & Marsh, 2008). Coldwell et al. (2008) postulated that when employees perceive an ethical misfit between themselves and the organisation they lose identification with the organisation and leave. Employees also lose identification with the organisation and leave the organisation when cooperation and cohesiveness decrease in a work environment (Cullen, Parboteeah & Victor, 2003). A study using a sample of nurses reported that employees’ perceptions that co-workers are not cooperative, and that managers do not support and value them, are likely to result in turnover intention (Nowak, Holmes, & Murrow, 2010). A further study indicated that employees’ perceptions that they are not valued, are sometimes created by lack of regular communication and leads to employee turnover (Press Ganey Associates, 2008).

### 2.4.8 Trust and confidence in senior leaders

Branham (2005) postulated that when employees have problems with their managers, their complaints are principally about conflicts with their superiors and a lack of trust in their leaders. In support of this finding, Muteswa and Ortlepp (2011) contended that employees may decide to leave an organisation due to poor relationships with their immediate managers.
Stagnitti, Schoo, Dunbar and Reid (2006) confirmed that a manager-subordinate relationship that displays caring behaviours such as listening, respecting, supporting, negotiating, trusting and accepting may increase the likelihood of an employee’s decision to stay. Conversely, managers who apportion blame, complain, threaten, criticise, and punish employees are linked to high employee intention to leave (Stagnitti et al., 2006). According to Petaschncik (2008) poor relationships are worsened by the fact that, in some instances, people are promoted to managerial positions solely because they performed well in their previous positions but they do not necessarily have any specific managerial skills or experience.

In line with objective of the study the next section presents a number of management styles to explore the possible relationship between management style and employee turnover intention.

### 2.5 Management styles and functions of managers

The discussion focuses on management style, but it is acknowledged that managers are required to exercise some leadership functions.

#### 2.5.1 Functions of managers

Trask, Rice, Anchors and Liliehom (2009) described the functions of managers as planning, organising, leading, staffing and controlling. Managers set goals and specify ways in which they will be accomplished (planning) and organise resources important for performing different functions (organising) (Robbins, Judge, Odendaal, & Roodt, 2009). Other functions include directing and inspiring subordinates to accomplish organisational goals (leading), attracting, acquiring, developing, retaining and terminating employment of employees (staffing) (Trask et al., 2009). Finally, managers monitor performance, compare performance against the set goals and take appropriate action to correct if necessary (controlling) (Robbins et al., 2009).

#### 2.5.2 Managerial styles: Blake and Mouton

Managers apply specific management styles to promote the functions outlined above. A number of leadership styles for managers are identified in the literature and eight of these are discussed in this study as they relate to high level management style categories (concern for people and concern for results) (Fisher, 2009). Blake and
Mouton developed a Management Grid, which is a way to illustrate the degree to which a particular management style reflects concern for people and concern for results, as well as combinations of these two extremes. In the grid, concern for results is illustrated on the horizontal axis and concern for people is illustrated on the vertical axis (Blake & Mouton, 1985). The numbers 1 and 10 represent the lowest and the highest levels of a dimension (concern for results or concern for people) respectively. The first number refers to the manager’s concern for production or task and the second to the manager’s concern for people. The nine points constitute different managerial styles.

![Managerial Grid](adapted from Blake and Mouton, 1985).

Figure 2.2 depicts the different management styles identified by Blake and Mouton (1985), on the task-oriented leadership-people-oriented leadership continuum. These management styles and their relationships with other styles are discussed below. However, it should be noted that the list of management styles discussed here is not exhaustive.

Managers who show concern for results are task-oriented, and are focused on production and achievement (Sahin, 2005). The manager is more focused on helping subordinates to accomplish goals (Ogbeide, 2011) than on nurturing them. The manager focuses on efficiency and punishes insubordination whenever it occurs (Holloway, 2012). The manager is autocratic and makes decisions alone, without involving others (Schmid, 2006).
Task-oriented managers perform best in situations that demand high or low control and influence or in extremely favourable or unfavourable situations (Athanasaw, 2007). Task-oriented management is related to the directive or autocratic style of management, where the leader focuses on formal activities such as organising, planning, and controlling (Havig, Skogstad, Kjekshus, & Romoren, 2011). The directive style of management will improve staff morale if the task to be performed is unclear (Kurfi, 2009) as these managers are good at initiating structure (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, & Oostenveld, 2010).

Cummings et al. (2010) reported that people-oriented management styles are superior to task-oriented management styles in relation to productivity and employee intention to stay. However, certain task-oriented management styles, when integrated with relational management styles, appear to further increase the managers’ effectiveness (Cummings et al., 2010). A study of 50 participants in 28 organisations confirmed that effective managers integrate task-oriented and people-oriented management styles (Bahari, Azarnia, Piri, & Babaeei, 2012).

People-oriented managers are concerned with human relations, and believe that if people are cared for they will be encouraged to accomplish work objectives (Holloway, 2012). Such managers are democratic and consult with staff before making decisions. The people-oriented manager may even make decisions jointly with subordinates (Kurfi, 2009). This supportive style of management creates a climate that promotes the well-being of the team, and motivates subordinates if the task is frustrating (Athanasaw, 2007). Relational-oriented management styles are appropriate in moderate situations (da Cruz, Nunes, & Pinheiro, 2011).

Effective managers focus on both tasks and people, while the least effective managers focus on neither the task nor the people (Politis & Politis, 2009). On the spectrum involving people-oriented and task-oriented management, different styles have been characterised, namely authority-compliance, country club, impoverished, middle-of-the-road and team management.

### 2.5.2.1 Authority-compliance management style

The authority-compliance manager is concerned with results and not people and believes that people need to be coerced, controlled and punished to deliver results
Authority-compliance management style is related to autocratic management style, a style in which the manager takes decisions without consulting others (Angus-Leppan, Metcalf, & Benn, 2009).

Autocratic management style is linked to an active transactional management style as in both instances standards are set and employees are punished for non-adherence to such standards (Zhu, Sosik, & Riggio, 2012). A study based on a review of past literature reported a relationship between autocratic, bureaucratic, and authority compliance management styles (Murari, 2011). Employees prefer an autocratic management style in situations where the workplace is bureaucratic (Hofstede, 1997; Merritt, 2000). The authority-compliance management style is appropriate in situations where the manager does not view input from others as being important as the manager’s decision would remain the same regardless of the input (Burger & Els, 2008). The manager with a an authority-compliance management style uses positional power and enforces strict control measures over subordinates (Trask et al., 2009).

### 2.5.2.2 Country club management style

A manager with this management style is concerned about people and ensures that subordinates are comfortable and that the work environment is friendly (Gatfield, 2005). The Country Club management style is related to the missionary management style, and focuses on a harmonious work environment in which the manager is not inclined to enforce rules (Limbare, 2012). The difference between the Country Club manager and the people-oriented manager is that the Country Club manager does not invoke rules (Gatfield, 2005).

The Country Club management style is characterised by a low focus on task (Fisher, 2009). However, Bahari et al. (2012) argued that a low focus on tasks may not enhance organisational performance. Country Club management style is linked to an altruistic management style that is concerned with the welfare of people (Jain & Premkumar, 2010). The altruistic management style relates to a humanist management style that is subordinate-oriented and people are prioritised as the organisational goal (Trask et al., 2009).
2.5.2.3 Middle-of-the-road management style

The middle-of-the-road management style can be described as ‘Organisation Man’ management as the manager is neither committed to people nor to task (Pheng & Lee, 1997). This manager attempts to compromise between a concern for people and production without significant success (Miller, 2011) and endeavours to maintain the status quo (Zafar, 2011).

This manager plans and sets goals retrospectively, bases them on what worked in the past and gives precedence to these goals (Fisher, 1989). This manager is diplomatic, not innovative and works within the procedures of the organisation. Regardless of the manager’s adherence to organisational procedures, decisions are made based on informal discussions and information is misrepresented in order to appear right to others (Schoel, Bluemke, Mueller, & Stahlberg, 2011).

2.5.2.4 The impoverished management style

Managers who evidence an impoverished management style apply minimum effort to get the work done, are less concerned with people and are lazy (Einarsen, Aasland, & Skogstad, 2007). The impoverished management style is related to the laissez-faire manager, who leaves decision-making to subordinates (Kurfi, 2009), and is aimless and directionless (Sogunro, 2004).

The impoverished management style is linked to the deserter management style where the manager is neutral, does not serve the interests of subordinates or superiors, avoids changes and adheres to the parameters of the current situation (Limbare, 2012). Managers who display an impoverished management style are stagnant and they are satisfied with just belonging to the organisation (Zafar, 2011).

2.5.2.5 The team-oriented management style

The team-oriented manager accomplishes work through people commitment and facilitating successful harmonisation of the interdependence between team members (Blake & Mouton, 1985). The manager delegates roles to others and focuses on achieving a common goal (Javidan, Dorfmana, Luque, & House, 2006). This style is related to the developer management style as members of the team participate in the decision-making (Limbare, 2012). The developer management style shares
knowledge with subordinates and thrives on discovering and developing talent (Limbare, 2012). The developer management style is linked to a coaching management style where the leader prioritises mentoring and coaching the subordinates to enhance their performance (Goleman, 2000).

The downside of the developer management style is that the manager may focus on people development and fail to concentrate on or react to changes in the market (Griffin, 2006). The team-oriented manager is at one extreme of the continuum with the highest task and people orientation, and the impoverished manager operates at the other end of the continuum with low levels of both task and people concern.

2.5.2.6 Autocratic management style

Managers with an autocratic management style apply traditional command and control procedures and perceive work performance as being driven by controlling and disciplining people (Mullins, 2010). Autocratic managers believe that people have to be pushed to work. According to Kurfi (2009), Theory X, which is related to an autocratic management style, postulates that there are managers who presume that people naturally do not enjoy working, and avoid it whenever possible. This presumption leads them to adopt a dictatorial approach to people management. A study of Thai employees found that when managers adopt a dictatorial management style, employees become dissatisfied and leave the organisation (Yukongdi, 2010).

According to Azaare and Gross (2011), autocratic managers blame, shout at and punish their subordinates publicly, and stifle the development of those who report to them. They seem to be disinterested in their subordinates’ welfare, and only care about those in more senior positions (Cowsill, 2008) and the achievement of goals (Pop & Pop, 2008).

The autocratic management style is characterised by efficiency and achievement of results. An autocratic management style is related to task-oriented management, directive management, and authority-compliance management. Managers who display task-oriented, directive and authority compliance management styles focus on the achievement of goals, and any people relations efforts are perceived as time-consuming (Sabanci, 2008). The manager determines ways and milestones for goal
accomplishment, rewards compliance in the performance of duties and punishes disobedience (Giltinane, 2013).

Autocratic management is appropriate when directing inexperienced employees who are sufficiently motivated and when providing role and task clarity where there is ambiguity (Lorinkova, Pearsall, & Sims, 2013). Fox (2006) argued that autocratic management style is ineffective as some employees perceive themselves as valued when managers consult with them before making decisions, particularly on matters that affect them. Naadeem (2012) added that lower-level employees, in particular, stay with the organisation when their inputs are considered and respected. Due to these factors Welch, Welch and Langford (1998) regarded an autocratic management style as ineffective and inefficient, regardless of its appropriateness in some situations. However, Schoel et al. (2011) argued that autocratic managers may not be liked, but they are considered to be effective because they create sound structures

An autocratic management style suits a structured environment with universal rules and performance standards (Limbare, 2012, Chen, 2006). Schoel et al. (2011) in a study of 150 participants in German universities, reported that an autocratic management style creates structure. Agbim (2013) and (Ahmad, 2011) confirm that management style influences the environment and not vice versa. However, according to Silverthorne (2001), the degree to which the working environment is structured, determines the leader’s style of management. In support of Silverthorne (2001), a study of 9 400 male employees of commercial airlines in 19 countries found that in controlled work environments such as airlines, an autocratic management style may be appropriate as it focuses on emergency operating procedures (Merrit, 2000). Similar findings were reported by Brennen (2002) and Goodnight (2004), who suggested that an autocratic management style is appropriate in structured environments such as airlines, power plants operations, and the military.

Managers that operate in structured environments prefer one-way communication (Harris, 2007). Due to the dictatorial nature of the autocratic management style, information flows from the top down, and information is thus viewed with suspicion by employees. In rare instances where managers may accommodate some bottom-up
Regardless of the limitations of autocratic management style, the style facilitates quick decision-making, as a result, it is appropriate in crisis situations (Cook & Hunsaker, 2010). Since employees are excluded from decision-making by autocratic managers, they may feel dis-empowered and consider leaving the organisation (Donoghue & Castle, 2009). Conversely, Rast, Hogg and Giessner (2012) investigated a sample of 215 employees and found instances where employees prefer to remain with managers who display an autocratic management style probably because their jobs are unclear or they are new in their jobs. Managers with an autocratic management style do not trust others and focus on short-term accomplishments (Limbare, 2012). However, subordinates may underperform in the absence of their managers (Giltinane, 2013). When working under autocratic management, employees are not provided with opportunities to engage in meaningful work and creativity (Forest & Kleiner, 2011). Since the transactional nature of the autocratic management style is a barrier to creativity, employees may be inclined to decide to terminate their services with the organisation (Abualrub & Alghamdi, 2012). Kleinman (2004) and Dotse and Asumeng (2014) reported a significant positive association between transactional management (an autocratic type of management style) and turnover intention with \( r = .26, p = .03 \) and \( r = 0.24; p = 0.01 \) respectively. However, Wells and Peachey (2011) established a significant negative relationship \( r = -0.33; p < 0.01 \) between a transactional (autocratic) management style and employee intention to leave the organisation. Abualrub and Alghamdi (2012) and Ertureten, Cemalcilar and Aycan (2012) confirmed that the negative relationship between an autocratic management style and intention to remain with the organisation is statistically significant \( r = -0.01; p < 0.81 \) and \( r = -0.20; p < 0.01 \) respectively. The latter is, however, a weak significance of only four percent common variance. These contradictory findings necessitate the need for further research on the relationship between management style and turnover intention.

Following the arguments about autocratic management style, the following hypotheses are postulated:
H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

Hₐ₁: There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

2.5.2.7 Laissez-faire management style

The laissez-faire management style is one where the manager is non-committal, and allows others to make decisions independently (Zamora, 2011). The laissez-faire management style is also referred to as non-leadership, as it is characterised by avoidance of responsibility (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Non-leadership also manifests in the manager’s frequent absenteeism and lack of involvement, even during critical times (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & Engen, 2003). The laissez-faire manager’s absence and oblivion with regard to both productivity and people results in a lack of commitment from the manager and increased turnover by subordinates (Levac, 2013). However, Fox (2006) argued that the freedom given to the team does not imply that the manager does not care, and subordinates should not make decisions that are supposed to be taken by the manager.

Another phenomenon that is associated with this management style is that there is no distinction between manager and subordinate, as subordinates are given total freedom to choose their own objectives and monitor their own work (Kurfi, 2009). The manager occupies the position physically but does not carry out the duties (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007). Ballard (2012) further asserted that the laissez-faire leader’s failure to exercise authority, unwillingness to decide and lack of direction are ineffective, and thus such managers fail to retain employees.

The laissez-faire management style is related to the impoverished leadership style. Leaders who display these two leadership styles do not give direction to their subordinates, are inactive, tolerate postponement and uncertainty and leave judgement to subordinates. The manager does not act proactively and state clearly what is expected of others (Overbey, 2013).
The destructiveness inherent in the laissez-faire management style results in conflict, lack of employee recognition and increased staff turnover (Skogstad et al., 2007). Ballard (2012) confirmed that the laissez-faire style of management has an impact on employees’ intention to leave the organisation. Both Bernhard and O’Driscoll (2011) and Ballard (2012) reported a significant positive relationship between laissez-faire management style and turnover intention \((r = 0.30; p < .01)\) and \((r = 0.55; p < 0.001)\) respectively. The former has a low common variance of 9%, the latter a high common variance of 25%. Ballard (2012) reported that a laissez-faire management style significantly predicts turnover intention \((\beta = 5.106)\), indicating that employees who perceive their managers to display a laissez-faire management style are more likely to leave their organisations. The departure may be caused by the manager’s lack of response to their problems (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Overbey (2013) adds that employees may leave the organisation because the manager fails to manage neither high nor non-performance.

In contrast to these findings, Levac (2013) argued that there is a significant negative association \((r = -0.66; p = 0.00)\) between a laissez-faire management style and employee intention to remain in the organisation. Levac (2013) emphasises that employees prefer to stay in the organisation because they are empowered to solve problems. Overbey (2013) confirmed that the more the manager displays a laissez-faire management style, the more employees prefer to remain in the organisation \((F = (1.111) = 20.01; p < 0.001)\) as subordinates prefer less supervision with a significant negative prediction of laissez-faire management style on turnover intention making employees more likely to stay.

The arguments relating to the relationship between laissez-faire management style and turnover intention lead to the formulation of the following hypotheses:

**H₀₂**: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

**Hₐ₂**: There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

This leads to a question of whether autocratic and laissez-faire management styles predict employee turnover intention and results to the following hypotheses:
H\textsubscript{03}: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{a3}: Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{04}: Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H\textsubscript{a4}: Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

However, in addition to the types of leadership already identified in this section there is also a counter-argument that leadership is actually situational (Gimm, 2010). Situational leadership is discussed in the next section.

2.5.3 Situational leadership

According to Forest and Kleiner (2011), each management style has its own advantages and various leadership styles can be used to achieve organisational goals. Therefore, Gimm (2010) maintained that managers should be knowledgeable and skilled enough to apply management styles that are appropriate to a particular situation.

Different management styles should be applied in accordance with the maturity of the subordinates (commitment and competence) (Hur, 2008). Thompson and Vecchio (2009) asserted that subordinates who are low on competence but high on commitment can benefit from a directive management style, while subordinates who are low in competence and commitment would be appropriately led by coaching. An individual whose competence is moderate to high and whose commitment varies might benefit from a supportive leadership style, while the employee who is high on competence and commitment can benefit from a delegating management style (Gimm, 2010). It is important to vary the management style employed, as different management styles could encourage employees’ commitment, creativity and innovation (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002).

Adapting the management style employed is important when employees’ needs and intentions differ from those of their superiors (Arvidsson et al., 2007). A subordinate’s
unique characteristics, needs as well as the goals set by a specific manager are therefore critical in determining the appropriate type of management style for the situation (Hur, 2008). However, in opposition to these arguments Limbare (2012) argued that managers should focus more on organisational needs than on the needs of individuals.

A number of management styles were discussed, emanating from the literature. For the purpose of this study, the focus is on two management styles, namely the autocratic management style and the laissez-faire management style. Previous studies reported contradictory results regarding the relationship between autocratic management style or laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention as result further research may be important.

2.6 Summary: Chapter Two

In Chapter Two, the concepts that are related to turnover intention, as well as the factors that influence employees to either stay or remain with the organisation were discussed. The literature review then highlighted various management styles, based partly on the model provided by Blake and Mouton’s Management Grid. In addition, the concept of situational leadership was discussed. The next chapter presents the research design of the study and the methodology chosen for the testing of the hypotheses.
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The previous chapter focused on the literature related to turnover intention and management style. This chapter outlines the research philosophy, approach, design and methods used to investigate the research problem presented in Chapter One. The chapter also discusses reliability and validity, data analysis and ethical concerns.

3.1 Research philosophy

The study was based on a positivist philosophy. The positivist approach is based on a philosophical approach known as logical positivism (Welman, Kruger, & Mitchell, 2005). This philosophical approach views social reality as an external objective reality (Bryman & Bell, 2011) where the researcher is external, objective and independent of influence from interactions with the participants (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009) and where the values of the researcher do not influence the study (Blumberg, Cooper, & Schindler, 2008). A further distinctive feature of positivist research is that findings should be generalisable to settings outside the particular research context (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). A final distinctive feature of positivist research is that it starts with an hypothesis or question and then ‘tests’ reality using empirical observation (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

From an epistemological perspective, positivism holds that scientific knowledge is based on laws identified through formal measures and direct observations (Moore, 2010). Knowledge is thus believed to be an observable phenomenon that provides credible data and facts, and is free of the opinions of others (Maylor & Blackmon, 2005). In this approach, the phenomenon is reduced to basic elements (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Methods based on this philosophy focus on uncovering relationships and causality that apply to all people at all times (Welman et al., 2005). However, Buchanan and Bryman (2009) argued that a positivist philosophy reduces the world to a series of discrete events or occurrences that can only be identified through the senses and experiences of individuals and which can be represented in the form of empirical observations.
3.2 Research approach

Research designs are procedures followed by the researcher to gather, analyse, interpret, and report data in a research study (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Research designs give direction to the method the research employs and provide the logic that will be followed to interpret data at the end of the study. In contrast, research methodology specifies the approaches and tools that will be utilised for research (Mouton, 2011). Empirical research can be approached using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed research methods.

![Figure 3.1. Research approaches based on Kumar (2011); Welman, Kruger and Mitchell (2005).](image)

From the approaches represented in Figure 3.1, a quantitative approach was selected for this study to establish whether or not a statistically significant relationship exists between turnover intention and management style. A quantitative research strategy was considered suitable to address the research question and the objectives of the study.

A research strategy defines the type of study being conducted and its purpose (Page & Meyer, 2005). A research strategy develops hypotheses or research questions from existing theories, and the hypotheses or questions are then tested and confirmed, or refuted in whole or in part (Saunders et al., 2009). The type of
quantitative approach-based research strategy used in this study focused on testing theories through the quantification of data during the collection and analysis phases (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

Quantitative methods involve research techniques designed to collect, analyse and interpret data in order to obtain numeric results (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The purpose of quantitative research is to evaluate objective data through complex, structured methods in order to confirm or disprove hypotheses or research questions (Welman et al., 2005). Quantitative research does not directly deal with everyday life, but rather with an abstraction of reality, as the researcher attempts to understand the facts of the research investigation from an outsider’s perspective (Welman et al., 2005).

Despite the numerous advantages of using a quantitative method, there are also several limitations linked to the method. One of the limitations of quantitative research is that the use of statistical analysis may contribute to loss of data richness (Babbie, 2007). Bryman and Bell (2011) criticised the quantitative approach, suggesting that it does not differentiate people and social environments from nature. In this regard, Kumar (2011) noted that there are complex conceptual areas to be studied in the context of people’s lives. The approach is further criticised for not showing the link between research and everyday life as it relies on instruments or on controlling situations to determine results (Bull, 2010). Creswell and Clark (2011) confirm that the quantitative analysis of connections between variables creates the distinct view that ‘social life’ exists independently of people’s lives. Bull (2010) argued that measurement processes in the quantitative approach are artificially precise and accurate because the relationship between the measures developed by social scientists and the actual concepts is heavily based on assumptions. The quantitative approach to research gives little recognition to differences and specifics, as the emphasis is placed on universal generalisation (Tashakori & Teddlie, 2010).

Given the above discussion, quantitative research was an appropriate approach to address the research hypotheses. Research hypotheses are formulated below.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.
H_{a1}: There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

H_{a2}: There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

H_{03}: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H_{a3}: Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

H_{04}: Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

H_{a4}: Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

In the next section the sampling and data collection processes are outlined.

3.3 Sampling and data collection process

The researcher sampled the respondents in the SOE of study and collected data. The sampling and data collection processes are discussed in the next sections.

3.3.1 Population and sample

This study made use of a census sampling approach. A census sampling approach enumerates all members of the target population with the respondents having the choice to either participate in the survey or not. The use of census sampling yields a high response rate (Fricker & Schonlau, 2002). Bothma and Roodt (2013) confirmed that census-based sampling is an accurate sampling approach when compared to normal random sampling because it enumerates the entire target population as a sample in order to increase the response rate. However, Bartlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2001) argued that many studies using census sampling yield low response rates.
All members of a population of 4042 first level, middle and executive managers in the SOE were included in the study. Although these employees occupy managerial levels, they are also managed by senior and top level managers. In order to apply the census sampling method, an email was sent to the population. A total of 378 managers responded to the questionnaire, and these managers thus formed the sample, which represented 9.4% of the target population.

3.3.2 Data collection process

A survey strategy was adopted in order to collect a large amount of data from a large population within a short period of time (Blumberg, Cooper, & Schindler, 2008). Survey questionnaires are used to collate data at a low cost (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Self-administered questionnaires were selected because of the possibility of interviewer bias; respondents are more likely to be honest when they are assured of anonymity (Kumar, 2011). However, Mouton (2011) postulated that the use of a self-administered questionnaire may lead to errors such as sampling error, questionnaire error, high refusal rates, high non-responses, respondents effects, data capturing error and inappropriate selection of statistical techniques. A low response rate may result in a non-response error and compromise adequate generalisation of the findings (Sivo, Saunders, Chang, & Jiang, 2006).

An online questionnaire consisting of two sub-sections, with one section measuring management style (autocratic and laissez-faire) and the other establishing employee intention to leave, was used in this study. The T-P Leadership Questionnaire (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1974), which consists of 35 items, was used to measure the degree to which the management style adopted by a leader was autocratic or laissez-faire. The questionnaire contains a five point Likert-scale, ranking behaviours as occurring: always, frequently, occasionally, seldom and never. The internal reliability of the T-P Leadership Questionnaire is not reported upon by the original authors (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1974). However, the questionnaire was validated in other studies that used it for leadership assessment. The T-P Leadership Questionnaire was used in a study by Sabri (2007) relating to Jordanian managers' leadership styles, and a reliability coefficient of .76 was obtained. In the study by Deluga (1988) on the politics of leadership: The relationship between leadership, and subordinate influence, using the T-P Questionnaire, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients of .75 was reported.
The 15-item Turnover Intention Scale was developed by Roodt (2004) and was not validated by the original author. However, the scale has been validated in later studies conducted by Jacobs (2005), Martin and Roodt (2008) and Burger (2014). Jacobs (2005) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .91 and Martin and Roodt (2008) reported a reliability coefficient of .90 for the 15-item scale. A 6-item version of the scale was validated by Bothma and Roodt (2013), who reported a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .80 with item loadings ranging between .73 and .81. Reliability, factorial validity and criterion-predictive validity were confirmed (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). Burger (2014) reported an internal consistency measure of .86 and argued that a high composite reliability of 15 item Turnover Intention Scale and other subscales implied that there was sufficient convergent validity. The psychometric properties of the two measuring instruments are, therefore, considered to be satisfactory.

For the actual data collection process, an e-mail was sent to the respondents which included the link to the online questionnaire. A cover letter stating the purpose of the study, requesting voluntarily participation and guaranteeing anonymity was attached. The respondents were informed that the survey consisted of three sections. Sections A and B were designed to determine respondents’ perceptions of their managers and their intention to remain in the organisation. Section C comprised demographic questions. The respondents were also given an estimation of the time it could take to complete the questionnaire and were requested to select answers that are considered to be most applicable to them. The questionnaire is included at the end of the dissertation as Appendix A.

3.4 Data analysis

Quantitative data analysis is the systematic evaluation of data in order to reveal interrelationships between variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). The researcher analysed data using descriptive and inferential statistics (Creswell & Clark, 2009). The data analysis process followed is depicted in Figure 3.2.
Using SPSS, the descriptive statistics of the respondents’ demographic variables (gender, age, qualification, position level, tenure and division) were acquired and presented in a tabular format. The means and the standard deviations were calculated for management styles to establish which management style (autocratic or laissez-faire) had the highest mean. The Cronbach’s Alpha was validated before the data were analysed by means of inferential statistics. Cronbach’s Alpha is a generally accepted method to test reliability (Christmann & Aelst, 2006). However, Sijtsma (2009) argued that Cronbach’s Alpha is not a robust measure of internal consistency because internal consistency and homogeneity are used synonymously and an internally consistent test is psychologically interpretable but it does not mean that all items are factorially similar.

Inferential statistics were computed to accept or reject the research hypotheses. The significance of the relationship between the variables in the study, namely turnover intention and management style, were analysed using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient of +1 represents a perfect correlation and 0 indicates that there is no correlation (Field, 2013). Bird (2009) stated that correlations are suitable to assess associations between variables.
Multiple Regression Analysis was also conducted to establish whether the independent variables (autocratic and laissez-faire management styles) significantly predicted turnover intention (the dependent variable). Following the completion of the analysis (the results of which are presented in Chapter Four), the results are discussed in relation to the literature and existing theories. Finally, the results are interpreted in light of the research hypotheses. These discussions are contained in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

### 3.5 Ethical considerations

Ethics involves acceptable behaviour and ways of conducting research morally and responsibly (Blumberg et al., 2008) and researchers balance the gathering of empirical information with the rights of participants (Neuman, 1997). At the defence of proposal of this study, research ethics was considered and clearance was given by the research panel. Permission to collect data from the company was requested from the relevant authorities before the study was initiated. The request clearly stated the purpose of the study and the type of access needed.

In keeping with ethical requirements the researcher ensured that the respondents’ briefing message was fair, honest and open about the intent of the study and disclosed the methods to be used in the study (cf. Leedy, 1997). In the covering letter, the respondents were briefed about the research objectives prior to the study, and were informed that the study’s findings would be made available upon request. The brief included provisions relating to the respondents’ right to privacy, confidentiality and integrity.

Respondents were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous and they indicated their choice to participate by clicking through to the online questionnaire. Respondents were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed as it was not possible to identify individual respondents.

The results obtained from the analysed data are presented in the subsequent chapter.
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter outlined the research philosophy, approach, design and methods used to investigate the research problem presented in Chapter One. Reliability, data analysis and ethical concerns were also discussed.

This chapter presents the results of the study. These results are used to address the hypotheses of the study.

The hypotheses of this study are:

$H_{01}$: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

$H_{a1}$: There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

$H_{02}$: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

$H_{a2}$: There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

$H_{03}$: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

$H_{a3}$: Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

$H_{04}$: Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

$H_{a4}$: Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.
4.2 Descriptive statistics

The descriptive statistics of the respondents’ demographic variables including gender, age, qualification, position level, tenure and division.

4.2.1 Division

Table 4.1 Distribution of respondents by division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and Risk</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Chief Executive</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Affairs</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Energy</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Capital</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 indicates that the largest proportions of respondents worked in the Human Resources, Technology and Finance Divisions (16.4%, 12.2%, and 11.6% respectively). The respondents in other divisions accounted for the remaining 59.6%: Generation (3.2%), Distribution (1.1%), Transmission (8.7%), Group Capital (8.7%), Strategy and Risk (2.6%), Primary Energy (3.2%), Commercial (10.3%), Information Technology (5.3%), Corporate Affairs (1.1%), Customer Service (7.4%), Office of the Chief Executive (4.5%) and Sustainability (3.7%).
4.2.2 Qualification

The largest number of respondents (137 of 378) hold an honours degree (36.2%) as the highest educational qualification. Five respondents (1.3%) hold doctoral degrees, 97 (25.7%) Master’s degrees, 84 (22.2%) bachelor’s degrees, six (1.6%) college certificates and four (1.1%) Grade 12 National Certificates. Of the 378 respondents, 45 did not indicate their qualifications.

4.2.3 Position level

The sample consisted of 223 (59%) first-level manager respondents, 119 (31.5%) middle management level respondents and 36 (9.5%) senior management level respondents. All the respondents indicated their positional levels.

4.2.4 Tenure

The organisational tenure of the respondents ranged from less than a year to more than 30 years. Three respondents had been with the organisation for less than a year (0.8%). A total of 52 respondents had 1-5 years of tenure (13.8%), 109 respondents had 6-10 years of tenure (28.8%), 125 respondents had 11-20 years of tenure (33.1%), and 60 respondents had 21-30 of tenure (5.9%). Finally, 29 respondents had organisational tenure of more than 31 years 7.7%. Generally, more than 50% of the respondents had worked for the organisation for more than ten years.

4.2.5 Gender

The sample consisted of 378 respondents, 216 (57.1%) men and 162 (42.9%) women.

The energy sector is dominated by men, which is consistent with the high number of men who responded to the survey.

4.2.1 Age

The respondents’ ages ranged from 25 to 65 years. The breakdown of age, categorised in years, was as follows: 81 respondents (21.4%) were aged between 25 and 35, 156 respondents (41.3%) were aged between 36 and 45, 94 respondents
(24.9%) were aged between 46 and 55, and 41 respondents (10.8%) were aged between 56 and 65.

The average age of the respondents was 43. The mode and the median were the same at 42 years. The number of respondents was 372 as six of the respondents did not indicate their ages.

4.3 Reliability and validity

In order to address the research hypotheses, the questionnaires were validated. Questionnaires developed in other countries and cultures are often not compatible with the South African context as the scales are developed and normed for a particular country or a specific group of people (Ray, 1979). The T-P Leadership questionnaire (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1974) was not validated in a South African culture and though the Roodt (2004) Turnover Intention questionnaire was developed in South Africa, it was not validated. For this reason, the reliabilities of the questionnaires were determined by means of Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor analyses on both the T-P Leadership questionnaire (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1974) and the Turnover Intention Scale (Roodt, 2004). In the T-P questionnaire, two factors were evident (autocratic management style and laissez-faire management style).

Principal Factor Analysis with Varimax Kaiser Normalization rotation of the T-P leadership questionnaire showed two factors (autocratic leadership management style and laissez-faire management style). Item 19 was reversed due to the negative phrasing in the questionnaire. Factor items that cross-loaded with the difference between items more than .35 or loaded less than .35 were eliminated (Kalisch, Lee, & Salsa, 2010). Thirteen items were deleted resulting in the rotated two-factor solution reported in Table 4.2. The deleted items were 21, 27, 14, 33, 17, 35, 29, 1, 11, 16, 18, 13, and 20. The factors were identified as autocratic and laissez-faire management styles and the Cronbach’s Alphas are indicated in table 4.2.
Table 4.2 Exploratory Factor Matrix for the T-P Leadership Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1: Autocratic $\alpha=0.89$</th>
<th>Factor 2: Laissez-Faire $\alpha=0.92$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i27</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i33</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i7</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i35</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i25</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i29</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i6</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i8</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i13</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i5</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.i19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i32</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i20</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cronbach’s Alphas were acceptable, respectively .89 and .92 for autocratic and laissez-faire. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the two-factor model showed reasonable fit indices approaching the .90 level and RMSEA close to zero, as suggested by Hair, Black and Anderson (2010). The fit indices are: Bentler-Bonett non-normed Fit Index (.88), Comparative fit Index (.89), Bollen’s Fit Index (.89) and Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .07. Factor 1, Autocratic, explained 34.17% of the total variance and Factor 2, Laissez-Faire, and explained 15.71% of the total variance.
Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Turnover Intention Scale (Roodt, 2004) indicated a single factor with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .87. Item 46 did not load satisfactorily and was deleted from the Turnover Intention Scale. Item loadings of the Principal Factor Analysis of the one factor solution are indicated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Turnover intention Exploratory Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>α = .87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i36</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i41</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i50</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i42</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i37</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i39</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r.i38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i45</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i49</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 38 was reversed as it was negatively worded. The one factor explained 37% of the variance, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .87. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Turnover Intention showed a reasonable fit (Hair et al., 2010): Bentler-Bonett non-normed Fit Index (.82); Comparative Fit Index (.83); Bollen’s Fit Index (.83); and Root Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .11.

Table 4.4 contains a summary of the Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficients for the three variables (Autocratic, Laissez-Faire and Turnover Intention).
Table 4.4 Reliability Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-FAIRe</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autocratic management style indicated a Cronbach’s Alpha of .89. Laissez-faire, showed a Cronbach’s Alpha and factor loading of .92. The Turnover Intention Scale produced one factor (Turnover Intention) with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .87. Cronbach’s Alpha varies between 0 and 1 and a Cronbach’s Alpha that is nearing 1.0 indicates an item with high internal consistency (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The Cronbach’s Alpha values of .89, .92 and .87 indicated acceptable internal consistency as Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) recommended that a satisfactory alpha be set at > .70.

4.4 Descriptive statistics for management style and turnover intention

Descriptive statistics of the three variables (turnover intention, autocratic management style and laissez-faire management style) are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 Descriptive statistics for management style and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
<th>Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.80</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>40.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-6.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that the respondents scored a mean ($\bar{X} = 56.80$) for autocratic management style, ($\bar{X} = 40.76$) for turnover intention and ($\bar{X} = 20.39$) for laissez faire management style. The mean of autocratic, 56.80 is close to the expected mean of 50.00. Laissez-faire’s mean of 20.39 is lower than the expected mean of
37.5. Turnover intention’s mean of 40.7 is close to expected mean of 37.5. Inspection of the histograms of skewness and kurtosis showed that, variables were normally distributed. The skewness and kurtosis are at acceptable levels as they fall within ranges of -2 and 2 and -4 and 4 respectively (Pallant, 2007).

The next section presents the inferential statistics used to address the research hypotheses.

### 4.5 Inferential statistics

Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) and Multiple Regression were computed to test the hypotheses. The common variances were interpreted according to Mukaka (2012, p, 71) as reported in Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6** Rule of thumb for interpreting correlation coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of correlation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90 to 1.00</td>
<td>Very high correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 to .90</td>
<td>High correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .70</td>
<td>Moderate correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .50</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00 to .30</td>
<td>Negligible correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5.1 Pearson Product Moment Correlation

In addressing hypotheses one and two, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) was computed to report on the relationship between management styles and turnover intention, as illustrated in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7** Pearson Product Moment Correlation (2-tailed) N = 378

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Laissez-faire</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**H01**: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.
\( H_{a1} \): There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

Table 4.7 shows a significant correlation between employee turnover intention and an autocratic management style \((r = .19; p < .01)\) with a low significant common variance of 3.61%, according to Mukaka’s (2012) correlation coefficient interpretation in Table 4.6. For this reason, hypothesis 1 \((H_{a1})\) is accepted and the null hypothesis \((H_{01})\) is rejected.

\( H_{02} \): There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

\( H_{a2} \): There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

Employee turnover intention evidences a significant correlation with laissez-faire management style \((r = .29; p < .01)\) with a significant high common variance of 8.4, according to Mukaka’s (2012) correlation coefficient interpretation indicated in Table 4.6. For this reason, hypothesis 2 \((H_{a2})\) is accepted and the null hypothesis \((H_{02})\) is rejected.

### 4.5.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

Hypothesis 3 was addressed by means of Multiple Regression Analysis, with the prediction of turnover intention based on autocratic and laissez-faire management styles as independent variables. The findings are reported in Table 4.8.

\( H_{03} \): Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention

\( H_{a3} \): Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention

\( H_{04} \): Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

\( H_{a4} \): Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.
Table 4.8 Multiple Regression coefficients with turnover intention as the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.091$

$F = 18.70$

With turnover intention as the dependent variable ($R^2 = .09$, $F = 18.70$, $p < .0005$), as shown in Table 4.8 autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles explained 9.0% of the variance. Only laissez-faire management style had a potentially meaningful correlation with turnover intention ($\beta = .26; p < .0005$). Partial correlation indicates that autocratic leadership does not make a unique significant contribution to turnover intention as it contributes only .77% to the variance in turnover intention. Laissez-faire makes a unique and significant contribution of 6.5% to the variance in turnover intention. A total of 1.83% of the variance is attributed to the variance of these two management styles with turnover intention as the criterion variable. This finding leads to the acceptance of $H_{a4}$ and the rejection of $H_{04}$ as laissez-faire management style made a significant contribution to the variation in turnover intention. $H_{03}$: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention as result $H_{a3}$ is rejected and $H_{03}$ is accepted.

4.6 Summary: Chapter Four

This chapter reported the results of the study. Chapter 5 focuses on the discussion, interpretation and the implications of the findings.
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter Four the results were reported and in this chapter (Chapter Five) the results are discussed and interpreted.

5.2 Descriptive statistics

Analyses were conducted to compute the means (\(\bar{x}\)) and standard deviations (SD) of the variables. The variables measured were prevalence of the behaviours of autocratic and laissez-faire management style, and employee turnover intention. The results indicated that the mean (\(\bar{x} = 20.4\)) of laissez-faire management style (SD = 8.6) was lower than the mean (56.8) for autocratic management style (SD = 14.7). This indicates that the respondents viewed their managers’ management style as autocratic rather than laissez-faire. The mean (\(\bar{x} = 40.76\)) for turnover intention was low (SD = 10.9), indicating that the respondents are likely to want to stay in the organisation despite the presence of autocratic managers. These findings contradict the findings of Donoghue and Castle (2009), who found that managers with an autocratic management style tend to exclude employees from decision-making which may lead them to consider other job offers.

Inferential statistics were computed to address the research hypotheses.

5.3 Correlational and regression analyses

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation (\(r\)) value is within the -1 to +1 range and -1 is interpreted as a perfect negative correlation, +1 a perfect positive correlation and zero as no correlation (Zikmund, 2013). Common variances of the correlations were interpreted according to Mukaka’s (2012) criteria as reported in Table 4.6.
H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

Hₐ₁: There is a significant relationship between an autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

The results indicated a significant correlation between employee turnover intention and an autocratic management style \( (r = 0.19; p < 0.01) \) but with a practically low common variance of 3.61% according to Mukaka (2012). For this reason, hypothesis 1 \( (Hₐ₁) \) is accepted and the null hypothesis \( (H₀₁) \) is rejected.

This finding could be attributed to the nature of the business of the SOE. The organisation produces electricity and has to comply with legislation such as the Environmental Act, the Nuclear Energy Act, and the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Therefore, the work environment is structured and rule-based one. An autocratic management style is appropriate in structured environments such as airlines, power plants operations, and the military (Brennen, 2002; Goodnight, 2004). In a study of 9400 male commercial airlines in 19 countries, it was reported that in controlled work environments such as airlines a management style such as the autocratic management style that focuses on checklists, operating manuals and emergency operating procedures style may be appropriate (Merrit, 2000). The organisation investigated in the current study adopted the airline cockpit metaphor for the description of their operations because of the rigid rules applied in the generation of electricity. However, Agbim (2013) and (Ahmad, 2011) argued that management style influences the environment and not vice versa.

A manager with an autocratic style of management could be appropriate for this SOE’s type of work environment, as these managers, who are also managed by senior and top level managers, may be uncertain about the organisation’s operations and need guidance from their managers. Lorinkova et al. (2013) confirmed that an autocratic management style is appropriate when directing inexperienced employees who are sufficiently motivated, as the management style provides role and task clarity where there is ambiguity. Therefore, possible crisis situations due to an insufficient electricity supply and strict compliance requirements in electricity
generation may encourage these managers to expect an autocratic management style from their seniors.

The autocratic management style is suitable for quick decision-making, but employees perceive themselves as valuable to the organisation when they are consulted before decisions are made on matters that affect them (Fox, 2006). Exclusion from decision-making disempowers employees and they may consider job opportunities outside the organisation (Donoghue & Castle, 2009). Ghosh et al. (2013) emphasised that employees choose to remain in the organisation when they are empowered to make decisions because they view themselves as part of the organisation.

The finding that employees may remain with the organisation when they perceive their managers as being autocratic, is supported by Sellgren et al. (2007), and Wells and Peachey (2011) who reported a significantly negative correlation between management style and turnover intention. Abualrub and Alghamdi (2012) confirmed that the association between an autocratic management style as a type of transactional management style and the intention to remain with the organisation is insignificant. Kleinman (2004) confirmed a significant positive relationship between active transactional management as a type of autocratic management style and employees' intention to remain with the organisation. Conversely, Dotse and Asumeng (2014) and Ballard (2012) found a significant positive association between autocratic management style and employee turnover intention.

There are contrasting views about the effectiveness of an autocratic management style, and the link between this management style and employee intention to leave. The results of this study provide support for the research that suggests that an autocratic management style is not linked to high employee intention to leave. It is suggested that this might be because this style of management is appropriate to highly structured and hazardous environments, such as those characteristic of power production. In the paragraphs below, the relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention is discussed in relation to the following two hypotheses:

H02: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.
$H_{a2}$: There is a significant relationship between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention.

Employee turnover intention evidences a significant correlation with laissez-faire management style ($r = 0.29; \ p < 0.01$) with a significant high common variance of 8.4%, according to Mukaka (2012). For this reason, hypothesis 2 ($H_{a2}$) is accepted and the null hypothesis ($H_{02}$) is rejected. This finding is supported by Ballard (2012) and Bernhard and O'Driscoll (2011) who reported that laissez-faire management style is positively related to turnover intention, indicating that if employees perceive their managers’ styles as laissez-faire, they are more likely to leave the organisation. However, Levac (2013) argued that there is a significant negative association between a laissez-faire management style and employee intention to remain in the organisation.

A laissez-faire management style is characterised by relinquishment of responsibility, failure to follow up, ignorance of problems (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008), and a lack of involvement and unavailability even during critical times (Eagly et al., 2003). The leader’s absence and obliviousness could result in the subordinate’s lack of commitment and turnover (Levac, 2013). Despite Fox’s (2006) argument that the subordinates’ freedom does not imply that the subordinates make decisions that should be made by the manager, a laissez-faire management style could demotivate employees and encourage them to leave the organisation.

The determination of the relationships between management styles and employee turnover through Pearson Product Moment Correlations was followed by an investigation of whether autocratic and laissez-management styles predict employee turnover intention. The hypotheses are stated below:

$H_{03}$: Autocratic management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.

$H_{a3}$: Autocratic management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention

$H_{04}$: Laissez-faire management style does not significantly predict employee turnover intention.
Hₐ₄: Laissez-faire management style significantly predicts employee turnover intention.

The findings indicate that autocratic and laissez-faire management styles explained 9.0% of variance in turnover intention (\(R^2 = 0.09\), \(F = 18.70\), \(p < 0.0005\)). Only laissez-faire management style had a potentially meaningful correlation with turnover intention (\(\beta = .26\); \(p < 0.0005\)). These findings indicate that alternative hypothesis (Hₐ₄) is accepted and H₀₄ is rejected as laissez-faire makes a unique contribution to turnover intention. The alternative hypothesis (Hₐ₃) is rejected as the autocratic management style contribution is low.

Ballard (2012) supported the view that laissez-faire management style predicts turnover intention. The departure of employees when a manager displays a laissez-faire management style could be due to managers being perceived as not serving the interests of their subordinates or superiors (Limbare, 2012). Ballard (2012) further asserted that laissez-faire leaders’ failure to exercise authority and unwillingness to decide and provide direction causes them to be ineffective, which in turns leads to them failing to retain employees.

Conversely, Overbey (2013) reported that a laissez-faire management style was linked to a significant negative prediction of intention to leave the organisation. It is argued that even though the laissez-faire manager does not proactively take action and state clear expectations to subordinates, employees choose to remain in the organisation as they prefer to perform duties their own way (Overbey, 2013).

It would seem that preference for a laissez-faire management style is not ideal for some of the unique operations involved in State-Owned Enterprises. However, SOEs are also undergoing transformation as they focus on job creation, skills development, capacity building, community-based initiatives, and partnerships with the private sector and Further Education and Training institutions. Despite this transformation, a laissez-faire management style is still not ideal for the SOE in this study as it lacks direction, feedback and communication, components which are vital to the functioning of this organisation.
It is therefore suggested that in order to address autocratic management style challenges, SOEs should balance the managers’ concern for task completion with concern for the development of people in order to achieve the effective accomplishment of organisational goals and maintenance of employee welfare. Otherwise, the SOE’s employee turnover and skills shortages may impact on organisational effectiveness. Cummings et al. (2009) recommended that certain task-oriented management styles, when integrated with relational management styles appear to be effective and it is suggested that this type of management style should be adopted.

Laissez-faire management style evidences a significant relationship to employee turnover intention in some studies (Ballard, 2012). However the SOE’s operating environment requires structure and compliance to legislation and hence managers may prefer an autocratic management style to ensure safe working conditions.

In Chapter Six, the focus is on an overview of the chapters, a review of the empirical findings, the contribution made by the study, its limitations and recommendations are made to the SOE and areas for further research are noted.
CHAPTER 6   CONCLUSION

6.1   Introduction

The previous chapter focused on the discussion and interpretation of the findings, as well as confirmation and rejection of the hypotheses. The discussion and interpretation focused on addressing the research objective and hypotheses. Chapter Six presents a consolidation of empirical findings and discusses the contribution of the study as well as the limitations. Recommendations to the organisation and areas for further research are made.

6.2   Contribution of the study

The research objective of the study was to investigate whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover intention at a State-Owned Enterprise. The findings indicate that both autocratic and laissez-faire management styles correlate with turnover intention. However, only the laissez-faire management style contributed significantly to the prediction of turnover intention. The relationship between employee turnover intention and an autocratic management style \( r = 0.19; p < 0.01 \) had a low significant common variance of 3.61% as interpreted by Mukaka’s (2012) rule of thumb. The relationship between laissez-faire management style \( r = 0.29; p < 0.01 \) had a significant high common variance of 8.4% (interpreted according to Mukaka, 2012). Both autocratic and laissez-faire management styles explained 9.0% of the variance in turnover intention \( R^2 = 0.09, F = 18.70, p < 0.0005 \). However, only the laissez-faire management style contributed significantly to the prediction of turnover intention \( \beta = .26; p < 0.0005 \).

The study makes a practical contribution in that human resources service providers in the SOE may gain insight into the relationship between employee turnover intention and management style. The organisation’s ability to retain employees is important for reducing costs and increasing productivity. The findings also serve as a guide to human resources practitioners in the facilitation of retention strategies.

6.3   Results linked to the research hypotheses

The findings of this study both confirm and contradict results reported in previous studies. This is because respondents and their contexts differ substantially from
study to study. The primary objective of the study was to investigate whether a relationship exists between management style and employee turnover intention at a State-Owned Enterprise. A total of 9.0% of the variance in turnover intention was attributed to autocratic and laissez-faire management styles.

In general, organisations experience substantial employee turnover and, as a result, potential indirect and direct costs to the businesses remain high (Forgas, 2009). It is therefore important for organisations to retain good employees to remain competitive (Alatawi, 2013). One of the factors that can be taken into account when developing retention strategies is the management style employed, as the way a managers manages an employee is critical to the employee’s decision to remain with the organisation.

The present study revealed that a significant relationship does exist between employee turnover intention and management style in the SOE studied, with a low significant common variance of 3.61% with autocratic management style \( (r = 0.19; p < 0.01) \) and a significant high common variance of 8.4% with laissez-faire management style (common variances interpreted according to Mukaka, 2012). Although only laissez-faire management style significantly contributed to the prediction of turnover intention \( (\beta = .26; p < 0.0005) \). Previous studies, (Branham, 2005) have reported that employees do not prefer autocratic management styles and that this management style is linked to employee intention to leave. However, this study established that employees stay in the organisation even if their managers display autocratic management styles. This may be because autocratic managers are viewed as results-oriented and standards- and rules-based as a result employees remain focused (Ogbeide, 2011).

The SOE under study is required to adhere to strict rules and procedures for the execution of critical duties, such as performing maintenance on live-lines. A strict, rule-bound environment such as this one requires managers to drive production, exercise overtime and set operational standards. These requirements may explain why these managerial level employees chose to remain in the organisation under an autocratic style of management.

The current study’s objective was also to explore whether a significant relationship exists between laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention. The
relationship between a laissez-faire management style and employee turnover intention was found to be significant. While employees need empowerment to perform their duties, they also expect managers to guide and give them feedback. Therefore a manager who is neither production nor relation-oriented and who fails to carry out his or her duties as required by the position is inappropriate and ineffective. This means that, in the context of this SOE, employees would rather leave the organisation than work in an environment that lacks discipline when there is pressure to meet customer needs.

6.4 Recommendations to the SOE

The SOE operates in a structured environment with strict rules and standards and the employees therefore appear to prefer an autocratic style of management. In support of this suggestion Silverthone (2001) postulated that the degree to which the working environment is structured determines the manager’s style of management. Mumford et al. (2002) confirmed that managers create standardised structures and apply rules in line with the work environment. Therefore, jobs that have to be accomplished following strict rules like electricity generation are achieved properly when the management style involves centralisation of decision making and rigid adherence to procedures (Chen, 2006).

Accordingly, the organisation should consider people who prefer structure when they recruit, in order to reduce employee turnover. This approach to recruitment can be implemented through interviews and psychometric assessments. Such an approach to recruitment could help management to establish a culture-fit and is likely to lead to employee retention.

It is also recommended that the SOE should consider the reasons why employees leave, together with reasons why employees remain with the organisation when developing retention strategies. The Human Resources Centre of Expertise Department of the SOE should integrate the findings of this study into the building of the profile of their preferred kind of leadership. This approach may enable the organisation to focus their leadership development efforts on building the leaders they need to retain. Such an integrative approach to development and implementation of strategies, plans, policies and procedures could facilitate proactive
employee retention and senior and top level managers are not surprised by the sudden departure of managerial employees.

The practitioners should take note that a laissez-faire management style is indicated as a predictor of turnover intention when formulating and reviewing retention policies and strategies. This information may add value by improving line managers’ understanding of the potential link between management style and employee turnover intention.

The findings may also enable top management of the organisation under study to brand their managers and equip them to vary their management styles as situations require. As indicated by Chhabra and Mishra (2008), if managers change their management styles to correspond to employees’ expectations and needs, they could retain employees. Nassar et al. (2011) confirmed that the style of management employed by the manager seems to influence an employee’s intention to leave or stay in an organisation. It is important to vary the management style employed, as different management styles could encourage employee commitment, creativity and innovation (Mumford et al., 2002). Adapting the management style employed is important when these managerial level employees’ needs and intentions differ from those of their superiors (Arvidsson et al., 2007). The SOE’s leadership could vary their management style from autocratic to participative when negotiating employee development. The manager might change from a participative management style to an autocratic management style when a task is ambiguous. These measures could potentially reduce the turnover intention of employees.

6.5 Limitations of the study

The findings of the present study cannot be generalised to other organisations as the study was conducted at only one SOE. Conversely, a distinctive feature of the quantitative approach used in the study, is that research results should be generalisable settings outside the particular research context (Remler & Van Ryzin).

Only managerial-level employees were included in the study, implying that the findings cannot be generalised to all of the employees of the organisation. The findings could have been influenced by the participation of only managerial-level employees in the study. Managers may have preferred to stay with the organisation
under an autocratic management style as it is possibly the type of style they also display. If non-managerial employees were involved in the study the findings might have been different as it is possible that they would have preferred to be consulted by their managers. Research suggests that lower-level employees in particular stay with the organisation when their inputs are considered and respected (Nadeem, 2012).

The sample included both the Line Functions and the Strategic and Services Functions, and that could skew the findings, as the respondents in Line Functions may view the impact of management styles on employee turnover differently compared to those in the Strategic and Services Functions.

A total of 378 employees responded to questionnaire out of the target population of 4042 employees, indicating a fairly low response rate. Of the 4042 e-mail recipients, more than 250 e-mails were returned with messages indicating that the recipients were out of office for various reasons. This constituted 6% of the non-response rate. Respondents experienced difficulties in accessing the questionnaire during certain times of the day and that could also have contributed to the low response rate. A low response rate can result in a non-response error and compromise adequate generalisation of the findings (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The language used in some of the items in the T-P leadership questionnaire may have affected the respondents’ comprehension of what each item entails, as the items were not translated into South African English. For instance, item 7, which use the unfamiliar word ‘needles’ had to be deleted. This limitation was partially addressed through the validation of the questionnaire before the data analysis. The original author of the T-P Leadership questionnaire did not identify the instrument’s psychometric properties, though other researchers did.

Only two managerial extremes, the autocratic and laissez-faire management styles, were studied, to the exclusion of the moderate management styles. This means that the styles evaluated were not necessarily comprehensively representative of the styles potentially exercised by the respondents. The selected management styles practical significance of the correlations with turnover intention was low.

Recommendations for further research are outlined in the next section.
6.6 Recommendations for further research

Further research should include more than one SOE in a similar study to increase the generalisation of the findings beyond one organisation. The study should focus on controlling extraneous factors such as demographic variables and confounding managerial variables. These are variables that could influence turnover intention but that are unrelated to management style.

Some of the items in the T-P leadership questionnaire should be translated into South African English and then validated to ensure that there is no confusion in understanding the meaning of items. The ability to understand and engage with items’ meanings increases appropriate responses to the items (Colosi, 2005).

6.7 Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of the study in order to enhance the understanding of the results derived of the study. Recommendations that could be considered for further research on management style and turnover intention were discussed. Recommendations made to the SOE, limitations and the contribution of the study were also discussed.

Reduction of turnover of talented employees has both financial and non-financial benefits to the organisation (Boushey & Glynn, 2012). Sales, market value and profitability increase and the overall performance of the organisation improves as organisations focus on retention of good employees (Simons & Hinkin, 2001). The retention of critical talent is important to businesses’ continual growth and success (Sirota, Mischkind, & Meltzer, 2006).
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APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

You are requested to kindly participate in this survey. The survey is conducted to enable the researcher to obtain data for the completion of a Master's degree. Participation is voluntary and anonymous. All responses will be handled in a strictly confidential manner. Once you have completed the questionnaire you will be able to view your score.

Once the dissertation is completed a copy will be made available to the Eskom library and you can access it to study the high level findings and recommendations.

The survey consists of three sections: Section A and B seek to investigate why people leave organisations and Section C includes demographic questions; The survey is expected to take you approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please read each question or statement carefully and select answers that are most applicable to you. Thank you in advance for completing the questionnaire.

Section A

The following items describe aspects of leadership behaviour. Please respond to each item according to the way you view your manager. Circle whether the manager behaves in the described way: always, frequently, occasionally, seldom, or never.

My manager:

Acts as the spokesman of the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Encourages overtime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Allows team members complete freedom in their work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. Encourages the use of uniform procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Permits subordinates to use their own judgement in solving problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Stresses being ahead of competing groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Speaks as a representative of the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Needles members for a great effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Tries own ideas in the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Lets the subordinates do their work the way they think best

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Would work hard for a promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Tolerates postponement and uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Would speak for the group if there were visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Turns the subordinates loose on a job and lets them go on with it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Settles conflict in the team when it occurs in the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gets swamped by details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Represents the team at outside meetings, and stresses being ahead of competing groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Decides what should be done and how it should be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Pushes for increased production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Lets some members have authority which he keeps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Things would usually turn out as he/she had predicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Allows the team a great degree of initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Assigns subordinates to particular tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. Is willing to make changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Asks the team to work harder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. Trusts the subordinates to exercise good judgement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Schedules the work to be done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. Does not like to explain his/her own actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. Permits the team to set its own pace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. Urges the team to beat its previous record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. Acts without consulting the group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34. Asks that team members follow standard rules and regulations
SECTION B

Please answer the questions in this section reflecting on the past 9 months experiences.

1. How often have you considered leaving your job?

| Never | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | Always |

2. How frequently do you scan newspapers in search of alternative job opportunities?

| Never | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | All the time |

3. To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs?

| To no extent | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | Always |

4. How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?

| Never | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | Always |

5. How often are your personal values at work compromised?

| Never | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | Always |

6. How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?

| Never | 1......2.......3.......4.......5....... | Always |

7. How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level, should it be offered to you?
8. How often do you look forward to another day at work?

Always  1......2......3......4......5......  Never

9. How often do you think about starting your own business?

Never  1......2......3......4......5......  Always

10. To what extent do family responsibilities prevent you from quitting your job?

To no extent  1......2......3......4......5......  To a very large extent

11. To what extent do the benefits associated with your current job prevent you from quitting your job?

To no extent  1......2......3......4......5......  To a large extent

12. How frequently are you emotionally agitated when arriving home after work?

Never  1......2......3......4......5......  Always

13. To what extent does your current job have a negative effect on your personal well-being?

Never  1......2......3......4......5......  Always

14. To what extent does the “fear of the unknown”, prevent you from quitting?

To no extent  1......2......3......4......5......  To a large extent
15. How frequently do you scan the Internet in search of alternative job opportunities?

| Never | 1.......2.......3.......4.......5....... | All the time |

Section C

Biographical and demographic information.

1. What is your gender?

| Male          | Female |

2. What is your age?

3. What is your highest qualification?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>Honours degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your band grade?

| MPSG 14 to 16 band | MPS 17 to 18 band | E band |

5. How long have you worked in Eskom?

| Less than one year | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to years 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In which Division/Group do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division/Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy and risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the chief executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>