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ABSTRACT

Contemporary organisations are more interested in understanding employees’ cognitive intention to quit the organisation rather than dealing with the costly and disruptive consequences of actual turnover. This understanding will, to a large extent, assist organisational managers in developing strategies that are capable of effectively reducing the rate of employee turnover to a manageable proportion. In order to achieve a meaningful understanding of employees’ cognitive intention to quit, it is imperative for organisational managers to develop a knowledge of the complex relationship that exists between antecedents of intention to quit and an individual employee’s turnover intention. Based on extant literature, this study investigated the relationship between employees’ turnover intention and selected psychological constructs, i.e. transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support (POS), organisational justice, organisational trust, psychological contract violation and affective organisational commitment. In order to establish these relationships, an empirical study was conducted among various levels of employees in selected public, private and parastatal organisations located in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape and Gauteng provinces of South Africa. A theoretical model depicting the relationships among the investigated constructs was developed and a number of hypotheses were formulated based on the theoretical model of the study.

The study employed a survey research design using a quantitative research strategy. Data were collected from a non-probability and conveniently sampled 232 employees across the organisations that were surveyed. A standardised measurement instrument consisting of all the variables under investigation was used and administered personally and online.

The postulated relationships were empirically tested using various statistical methods. Reliability analyses were conducted on all the measurement scales and adequate reliability was established. The content and structure of the measured constructs were investigated by means of exploratory factor analysis. A Partial Least Square (PLS) based Structural Equation Modelling was used to test the relationships between the constructs. On the basis of the multiple regression results, the two most important predictors of intention to quit are organisational justice and psychological contract violation. Organisations that want to minimise employee turnover should therefore start
with practical interventions promoting organisational justice and decreasing psychological contract violation.

While the results of this study have mostly confirmed findings of previous studies, it also established some new and interesting directions in the relationships between certain constructs (e.g., trust and perceived organisational support) and intention to quit.

The structural model indicates both less complex and more complex paths consisting of the following possible sequences to predict employee turnover: Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through POS, through affective organisational commitment to impact intention to quit; Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit; and transformational leadership through psychological empowerment through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit.

The findings of the present study represent an incremental and meaningful contribution to existing literature on employee retention and intention to quit by providing insights into the nature of the relationships amongst these constructs. The study also provides practical implications that could assist management in adopting strategies that enhances retention of its workforce.

The limitations and recommendations of the study provide a useful guide for future research consideration.
OPSOMMING

Kontemporêre organisasies stel toenemend belang in die oorsaak van die kognitiewe voorneme van werknemers om die organisasie te verlaat, eerder as die duur en ontwrigtende gevolge van werknemersomset. Sodanige begrip sal waarskynlik bestuurders in organisasies help in die ontwikkeling van strategieë om werknemersomset na meer hanteerbare vlakke te laat daal. Ten einde hierdie begrip te ontwikkel is dit noodsaaklik vir bestuurders om die kompleks verband tussen werknemers se voorneme om te bedank en die uiteindelike besluit van individuele werknemers om werklik te bedank, beter te verstaan. Hierdie studie ondersoek die verband tussen die voorneme van werknemers om te bedank en sielkundige konstrukte soos transformasionele leierskap, sielkundige bemagtiging, waargenome organisatoriese ondersteuning, organisatoriese geregtheid, organisatoriese vertroue, sielkundige kontrakskending en affektiewe organisasiebetrokkenheid. Ten einde hierdie verwantskappe te ontled, is ’n empiriese studie onder werknemers in geselekteerde openbare, private en semi-staatsorganisasies in die Wes-Kaap, Oos-Kaap en Gauteng provinsies van Suid-Afrika gedoen. ‘n Teoretiële model wat die verwantskappe tussen die konstrukte uitbeeld, is ontwikkel en ’n aantal hipoteses is op grond van die teoretiële model geformuleer.

Die studie berus op ’n kwantitatiewe opname en maak gebruik van nie-waarskynlikheid, gerieflikheidsteekproefneming. Daar was 232 respondentes, wat beide persoonlik en aanlyn genader en geadministreer is. ‘n Gestandaardiseerde meetinstrument wat al die veranderlikes behels wat ondersoek is, is gebruik om die data in te samel.

Die verwantskap tussen konstrukte is getoets met behulp van verskeie statistiese metodes. Betroubaarheidsontledings is uitgevoer op alle metingskale en voldoende betroubaarheidsvlakke is gevind. Die inhoud en struktuur van die konstrukte is deur middel van verkennende faktorontleding ondersoek. ‘n “Partial Least Squares” (PLS) metode gebaseer op structurele vergelykingsmodellering is gebruik om die gepostuleerde verwantskap te toets.

Die twee belangrikste voorspellers van die voorneme om te bedank is bepaal met behulp van meervoudige regressie-analise. Die twee veranderlikes is organisatoriese geregtheid en
sielkundige kontrakskending. Organisasies wat werknemersomset aan bande wil lê, moet derhalwe begin met intervensione wat fokus op die bevordering van organisatoriese geregtigheid en die vermindering van sielkundige kontrakskending.

Terwyl die resultate van die studie grootliks vorige bevindings bevestig, het dit ook ’n paar nuwe en interessante rigtings in die verwantskappe tussen sekere konstrukte (bv. organisatoriese vertroue en waargenome organisatoriese ondersteuning) en voorneme om te bedank geïdentifiseer.

Die strukturele model dui beide minder en meer komplekse paaie aan wat bestaan uit die volgende moontlike reekse om werknemersomset te voorspel: Transformasionele leierskap deur organisatoriese geregtigheid, deur waargenome organisatoriese ondersteuning, deur affektiewe organisatoriese betrokkenheid om die voorneme om te bedank, te beïnvloed; Transformasionele leierskap deur organisatoriese geregtigheid, deur vertroue en deur sielkundige kontrakskending om die voorneme om te bedank, te beïnvloed; asook transformasionele leierskap deur middel van sielkundige bemagtiging, deur vertroue, deur sielkundige kontrakskending om die voorneme om te bedank, te beïnvloed.

Die bevindinge van die studie bied ‘n betekenisvolle bydrae tot bestaande literatuur oor werknemer retensie deur middel van die verskaffing van insigte oor die komplekse wisselwerking tussen die voorspellers van werknemersomset. Die studie bied ook praktiese implikasies wat bestuur in organisasies kan help met die ontwikkeling van strategieë wat die behoud van die werkmag kan verbeter. Die beperkings en aanbevelings van die studie bied ook nuttige riglyne vir toekomstige navorsing in die veld.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction and background

When employees leave an organisation, either voluntarily or involuntarily, the impact can be substantial; more so when such withdrawal is voluntarily motivated. The dynamic nature of employment relationships has altered the willingness of employees to remain in one organisation for a long time, and for an employer to assume a long-term employment relationship with individual employees (Lee, 2001). This change in the psychological contract between employees and employers has resulted in a reduction in employees’ show of loyalty and long-term commitment to their organisations and this tendency thus accounts for individual employee’s turnover intentions (Gabriel, as cited in D’Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008). Employers are often left with the challenge of managing the effects of turnover when employees subsequently turn their turnover intentions to actual turnover. The after effects of turnover could be significant and include loss of valuable and, in most cases, difficult to replace institutional memory; high cost of recruiting and training new employees; diminished morale; and the psychological and social effects that remaining employees may experience (Dess & Shaw, 2001; Scott, Connaughton, Diaz-Saenz, Maguire, Ramirez, Richardson, Shaw, & Morgan, 1999). Documented evidence suggests that it most often is employees in the category of the highly skilled and talented who quit an organisation voluntarily, rather than those whose skills and experience are in less demand in the labour market (Tanova & Holtom, 2008). The resultant effect on individual organisations of high rate of turnover is the potential negative outcome on the level of productivity, customer service delivery and, ultimately, the organisation’s predetermined goals.

Over time, researchers (e.g., Hom & Griffeth, 1995) have made several attempts to understand the link between turnover and some of its antecedents. These antecedents include variables such as demographic and personal characteristics, job satisfaction, organisational and work environments, job content, organisational commitment, ease of movement, job costs, and intrinsic motivation. Other models (e.g., Jablin, 1987; Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978) have similarly depicted intention to quit as the primary antecedent of actual turnover. These studies have therefore emphasised the importance of understanding the term ‘intention to quit’ in an effort to predict and possibly avoid turnover and its negative
impacts on organisations. A meta-analysis conducted by Allen, Bryant and Vardaman (2010) attribute 45% of actual turnover in organisations to turnover intent. The terms ‘turnover intention’ and ‘intention to quit’ are often used interchangeably in management literature (Balogun, Adetula & Olowodunoye, 2013) and often refers to a situation in which individuals think seriously about quitting their current jobs (Omar, Anuar, Majid & Johari, 2012). Because of the costly and destructive effect that a high turnover rate has on organisational processes and survival, it is imperative for managers to devise proactive, rather than reactive mechanisms for dealing with turnover tendencies before full manifestation thereof (Tan, Tan & Tiong, 2007). This can be achieved by introducing measures that are able to enhance commitment, build relationships and increase employee participation in organisational decision-making processes and involvement in the realisation of predetermined organisational goals. The ultimate goal of a deliberate employee involvement programme is to empower them and increase their loyalty to and identification with the organisation.

Employee turnover has been exacerbated by increasing dynamics in the global labour market. The resultant effect of the rapidly changing world of work has heightened global competition, which has immensely facilitated easy movement of talented employees across the global labour market. Another enhancing feature of turnover is the tacit endorsement of targeted head-hunting and attraction of key employees by competitor organisations which has become an acceptable practice in contemporary strategic human resource management (Cappelli, 2000). Despite the amount of research focussed on employee turnover in the past (e.g., Abassi & Hollman, 2000; Bliss, 2007; Booth & Hamer, 2007; Inversion & Pullman, 2000), the issue still continues to dominate as a major problem confronting human resource (HR) practice today. However, researchers are gradually shifting attention from actual turnover and are now directing research focus at the antecedents of turnover, thus culminating in growing research interest in the field of Organisational Psychology in employees’ ‘intention to quit’.

In general terms, ‘intention to quit’ is simply referred to as an employee’s intention to leave his or her present organisation with a view of moving to another (Cho, Johanson & Guchait, 2009). In specific terms, intention to leave is “the subjective estimation of an individual regarding the probability of leaving an organisation in the near future and this is considered as the last part of a sequence in the withdrawal cognition process” (Mowday et al., as cited in Cho, Johanson & Guchait, 2009, p. 375). This job phenomenon is regarded as a conscious thought process during which an individual evaluates his or her present job situation and at
the end of this consideration decides whether to continue in or leave the present organisation (Sager, Griffeth & Hom, 1998). This thinking and decision process is considered to be an initial step in the turnover process (Fox & Fallon, 2003; Sager et al., 1998). Previous studies have variously and consistently come to the conclusion that actual turnover is not the first action taken by an employee, but is often preceded by an intention (to leave). Previous studies have shown clearly that behavioural intention to leave is consistently related with turnover (Fox & Fallon, 2003; Mobley, 1982) and that intention to quit probably represents the most important stage before an individual finally decides to actually quit an organisation (Chiu & Francesco, 2003; Fox & Fallon, 2003). These explanations therefore highlight the importance and need to emphasise the study of intention to quit in management research.

1.2 Justification for studying intention to quit

Managers are better informed and prepared to address turnover using retention management mechanisms when they have a feeling that an employee is in the process of quitting the organisation (Posthuma, Campion, Masimova & Campion, 2013). Contemporary literature in Organisational Psychology suggests that the intention to quit of frustrated employees has a more damaging effect, both on the organisation and on individuals, than the actual turnover (e.g., Korkki, 2013; Picoult, 2010). It is against this understanding that researchers find it expedient to focus attention on predicting turnover intentions rather than turnover since organisations have a better chance of changing behaviour by implementing improvement in the work environment before the actual manifestation of turnover and its attendant consequences for other workplace behaviours (Bergman, Payne & Boswell, 2012; Mitchell, MacKenzie, Styve & Gover, 2000). According to the theory of reasoned action, the behavioural intentions are the best predictor of behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Organisation researchers have found it more useful to concentrate their attention on the study of turnover intention as a final outcome variable because of the ability to accurately measure the construct (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). This shift in attention among researchers is profoundly informed by the difficulty involved in gaining access to people who have already left to determine their reason for quitting an organisation (Firth, Mellor, Moore & Loquet, 2004). Besides the difficulty in accessing former employees, administrative records are sometimes closed to outside researchers or may be incomplete, thus making a post-mortem evaluation of turnover an almost impossible task to achieve (Mitchell et al., 2000).
In an attempt to further advance the necessity of studying intention to quit rather than actual turnover, Dalessio, Silverman and Schuck (as cited in Lambert & Hogan, 2009, p. 98) succinctly summarise that:

More attention should be given to the direct and indirect influences of variables on intention to quit as opposed to the actual act of turnover. From the employer’s standpoint, intention to quit may be a more important variable than the actual act of turnover. If the precursors to intention to quit are better understood, the employer could possibly initiate changes to affect this intention. However, once an employee has quit, there is little the employer can do except assume the expense of hiring and training another employee.

Dalessio, Silverman and Schuck’s submission is consistent with extant literature which suggests that intention to quit remained the best predictor of voluntary turnover in organisations (e.g. Van Breukelen, Van Der Vlist & Steensma, 2004). Considering the variety of evidence provided by extant literature, as discussed above, it can reasonably be concluded that addressing the antecedents of turnover intentions remains an effective way of reducing actual turnover (Dess & Shaw, 2001).

1.3 Overview of previous models of turnover intentions

Most of the notable models from Organisational Psychology research are concentrated on the what (content) and how (process) of turnover (Maertz & Campion, 2004), and the causative nature of both (Boswell, Boudreau & Tichy, 2005). Prominent models of turnover and turnover intentions developed in previous studies focused attention mainly on the causative effects of constructs such as job dissatisfaction and job embeddedness (Felps, Mitchell, Herman, Lee, Holtom & Harman, 2009). On the other hand, other models were developed using job-related attitudes such as job satisfaction; job commitment (e.g. MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978); economic factors (e.g., Martin, 1979); and demographic factors (e.g., Blankertz & Robinson, 1997; Jinnett & Alexander, 1999; Winterton, 2004). These variables are considered not to have explained the turnover intention of employees adequately. One reason that has been provided for the shortcoming of existing models is the doubt about their precision in predicting voluntary turnover (Boswell et al., 2005; Hom, Mitchell, Lee & Griffeth, 2012; Maertz, 2012; Russell, 2013). Most existing turnover research is predicated on the inducements-contributions framework provided by March and Simon (1958), which posited that the most important theoretical antecedents of
turnover are the perceived ability of employees to move in the labour market. Other studies are based on Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino’s (1979) articulation of the constructs of turnover intentions such as job dissatisfaction and levels of alternatives, respectively (Hom et al., 2012; Russell, 2013). On the basis of the above, it could reasonably be deducted that most of the existing turnover intention models were commonly developed and operationalised on variables such as job dissatisfaction, availability of alternative jobs and limited other work and non-work factors Rothausen, Henderson, Arnold & Malshe, 2015).

Mobley’s (1977) model explained the process by which a dissatisfied employee arrives at a decision to leave the organisation. One of the intervening variables that mediate the effect of job satisfaction on resignation, according to Mobley’s model, is an employee’s evaluation of the existing job in relation to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The model presents a sequence of withdrawal processes whereby individuals who experience job dissatisfaction consider quitting the organisation. This consideration is followed by the cost-benefit analysis of searching for an alternative job and quitting the present job. It then follows that the dissatisfied individual will most likely embark on job search if the result of the cost-benefit analysis is reasonably favourable. A successful search for an alternative job leads the individual to further compare the utility of the present job with the available alternative. If the result of job comparison is in favour of the alternative job, the intention to quit the present job becomes active and this subsequently culminates in the actual turnover. Mobley et al. (1979) subsequently expanded Mobley’s earlier model to include more turnover antecedents such as a number of individual and labour market variables which influence job satisfaction and the evaluation of possible alternatives in relation to both intention to quit and actual turnover. In providing a further empirical explanation of Mobley’s model, Thatcher and Stepina (2001) developed the utility approach to the study of employee turnover intention. The utility framework views turnover as a function of the relative quality of different job alternatives (Mobley et al., cited in Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Mobley and colleagues assume that positive evaluation of a job increases its propensity for utility and correspondingly decreases both turnover intention and actual turnover. According to Blau et al. (cited in Thatcher & Stepina, 2001, p. 286), evaluation of alternatives refers to “the individual’s valuation of the rewards offered by different alternatives and his/her appraisal of the chances of being able to realise each alternative”. Even if an employee wants to leave an organisation, individuals evaluate the inherent utility derivable from the alternative job before quitting or
searching for a new position, and the extent of such utility have profound effects on turnover intention (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000).

This process view of turnover by Mobley et al. is based on Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action, which emphasises the importance of behavioural intentions in understanding actual behaviour. Mobley’s model has been criticised for consisting of numerous cognitive constructs, some of which may not be useful and are unnecessary, and for failing to add possible value to understanding the employee turnover decision-making process (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Lee and colleagues further argued that the model failed to account for the influence of variables such as cultural value dimensions, organisational commitment and perceived organisational and supervisory support in the turnover process.

Other models of turnover intentions included the one developed by Martin (1979), which integrated and expanded contextual models of employee turnover intentions that included available job opportunities in the environment, demographic and job satisfaction (mediating) variables. Winterton’s (2004) conceptual model of labour turnover and retention considered antecedents such as job satisfaction, commitment, labour market opportunities and ease of mobility. MacIntosh and Doherty’s (2010) model emphasised job satisfaction and organisational culture. The model highlighted the necessity to establish a person-organisation fit based on organisational culture that is associated with lower intention to quit.

In an attempt to provide a scientific understanding of why people quit or stay in an organisation, the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM), in 2006, conducted a study on the Psychological Factors for Reducing Turnover of Employees (Tan, Tan & Tiong, 2007). The study was predicated on three broad factors, namely: demographic, organisational and attitudinal. The study listed demographic factors, including an employee's age, gender, marital status, and the number of children. Organisational factors included an employee's length of service with the organisation, salary, and the total number of employees in the organisation. Variables considered as attitudinal factors were job satisfaction, work-related stress, as well as the level of commitment to the organisation. Findings of the study indicated that married individuals with only one child, who experienced less stress, had worked for a longer period of time and received better salaries, would report less tendency of leaving the organisation. The study could not establish any link between loyalty and both organisational position and size, but found a negative relationship between organisational commitment and
intention to quit (Tan, Tan & Tiong, 2007). Regardless of the predictive ability of the mathematical model, it could only be useful as a framework for understanding the relationship between employee loyalty and turnover intention (Tan, Tan & Tiong, 2007).

A model of turnover intention of correctional staff that was proposed by Lambert in 2001 was tested by Lambert and Hogan (2009). The model was based on theory and empirical evidence as depicted in Figure 1.1. The variables used in the study were classified under two broad headings: demographic/personal characteristics and work environmental variables - with external employment opportunities, job satisfaction and organisational commitment having a direct relationship with intention to quit. The model proposed that employees with negative opinions on variables related to the work environment are more likely to experience lower job satisfaction and organisational commitment, thus resulting into a high propensity to leave the organisation. In contrast, the model predicted a lower turnover intention by employees with positive perceptions of the work environment variables (Lambert & Hogan, 2009).
1.3.1 Personal or demographic characteristics and intention to quit

The personal characteristics variables identified in Lambert’s (2001) model include gender, age, tenure, position, educational level, and race. Lambert predicted both direct and indirect relationships (through job satisfaction and organisational commitment) between these individual variables and an employee’s turnover intentions. A vast amount of extant literature suggests that the rates of turnover intent and actual turnover among female employees are higher than among their male counterparts (Camp, 1994; Lambert, 2006; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Tipton, 2002). The reason for this assertion could be the biological and traditional role of women in bearing children and fulfilling other domestic responsibilities (Camp, 1994; Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Women, again, are most often expected to quit their jobs without
considering opportunities for alternative employment in order to relocate with their spouses during job transfers. This marital responsibility was aptly demonstrated in an empirical study conducted by Tan, Tan and Tiong (2007), which failed to establish a significant relationship between gender and intention to quit on its own until marital status was included in the analysis.

Studies (e.g., Lambert, 2006; Mitchell, MacKenzie, Styve & Gover, 2000) have provided empirical evidence to establish a positive relationship between the educational level of employees and turnover intentions. This relationship is best explained in terms of availability of better opportunities for promotion and status positions for highly educated employees than for their less educated colleagues (Lambert, 2006). However, while Glisson and Durick (as cited in Scott et al., 1999) found that educational level significantly predicted commitment, it failed to predict job satisfaction. These findings validate Lambert’s (2001) model which predicted that job satisfaction and commitment mediate the relationship between some demographic variables and intention to quit.

A logical assumption is the propensity for younger employees to more frequently hop from one organisation to another compared to their older colleagues. The explanation for this behavioural tendency is that, unlike younger employees, the cost associated with leaving is high and prospects of an alternative job is low, thus compelling older workers to remain in their present organisation (Lambert, 2001). Research furthermore indicates that older people are more engaged with their work, have long-term financial obligations to their employers and have stable family lives (Camp, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2000). In support of the above-mentioned literature, various authors (e.g., Byrd, Cochran, Silverman & Blount, 2000; Camp, 1994; Mitchell et al., 2000; Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997; Tipton, 2002) have found negative relationships between age and turnover intentions.

There is support in the literature for the argument that employees who have worked in a particular organisation for several years are unlikely to leave, because of factors such as emotional attachment to colleagues; extensive social networks; position in organisation hierarchy; long service awards; and enhanced pension funds (Lambert, 2006; Tan et al., 2007). The above literature was supported by earlier research by Hawkins (1998) and Colbert and Kwon (2000) that found a statistically significant positive relationship between tenure and organisational commitment. The authors reported that employees with a longer tenure
had a higher degree of organisational commitment than those who had shorter tenure. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) argue that, although there seems to be empirical evidence to positively link tenure and organisational commitment, the operationalisation of this linkage was not clear. The findings of other studies, however, are clear. For example, research outcomes (e.g., Bryd et al., 2000; Camp, 1994; Kiekbusch, Price & Theis, 2003; Lambert, 2006; Robinson et al., 1997; Stohr, Lovrich, Monke & Zupan, 1994; Tipton, 2002) have variously reported negative relationships between tenure and intention to quit. The authors commonly argued that the younger generation of employees do not want to have a life-long career commitment with a single organisation and therefore do not plan to remain with an organisation for a long period of time.

Sectoral studies conducted among correctional staff found non-White employees being recorded high on both turnover intentions and actual turnover (Ford, 1995; Jacobs & Grear, 1977; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Mitchell et al., 2000). A replication of the study in South Africa would perhaps produce a similar outcome as Black senior employees exhibit high rates of turnover in pursuit of career development (Nzukuma & Bussin, 2011).

1.3.2 Work or task environment variables and turnover intentions
These environmental variables are crucial determinants of employees’ job satisfaction and organisational commitment which, in turn, influence turnover intent. Some of the work environment variables considered in the Lambert and Hogan’s (2009) model include role ambiguity; role conflict and role overload; input into decision making; organisational fairness; and risk associated with a job. Although these variables do not impact turnover intentions directly, they nevertheless influence the construct indirectly through job satisfaction and or organisational commitment (Cullen, Link, Wolfe & Frank, 1985; Lambert, 2003; Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2002a).

There are jobs which are characteristically perceived as risky by employees. Such jobs (e.g., policing, mining, nursing, security, etc.) are associated with less job satisfaction and commitment (Cullen et al., 1985). The tendency is therefore high that employees in these job categories will constantly search for alternative jobs that they consider less dangerous. Cullen et al. (1985) and Lambert, Hogan, Paoline and Clarke (2005) provided empirical support for the above argument by reporting a negative correlation between job dangerousness and job satisfaction and organisational commitment among correctional services employees.
Role conflict mostly occurs when an individual is accountable to more than one authority at a time and receives conflicting instructions, thus making effective task performance difficult (Invancevich & Matteson, cited in Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Role ambiguity involves lack of clarity or insufficient information on how to complete a particular task (Minda, 2000), while role overload occurs when an employee is required to do too many tasks than what is manageable (Triplett, Mullings & Scarborough, 1996). Employees who suffer from role conflict, role ambiguity, or role overload are likely to form a negative impression about their managers and to regard their organisation as unsupportive. This impression impacts negatively on the individual employee’s job satisfaction and reduces commitment to the organisation. The views expressed above have been empirically validated by various researchers (e.g., Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Lambert et al., 2005; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link & Wolfe, 1991) who variously reported that role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload had significant negative impacts on the job satisfaction and organisational commitment of employees.

Employees experience lack of belongingness when they are excluded from the decision-making process in the organisation (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Employees should be involved in decisions that affect their wellbeing, employment and work environment, as this can potentially impact employees’ job satisfaction and enhances organisational commitment; literature has variously reported positive relationships between participation in the decision-making process and both job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Stohr, Lovrich, Monke & Zupan, 1994; Wright, Salyor, Gilman & Camp, 1997).

Positive perception of all dimensions (distributive, procedural, relational) of organisational justice by employees promotes satisfaction with the job and commitment to the organisation. Empirical studies such as by Lambert (2003) and Lambert, Hogan and Barton (2002) provide support by affirming that organisational fairness positively shaped job satisfaction of correctional service employees.

One would ordinarily expect that external job opportunity, which is considered as a pull factor (Sherratt, 2000) could activate turnover intentions and actual turnover, particularly during economic prosperity when jobs are available relatively easily. This expectation was empirically validated by Kiekbusch et al. (2003) and Trever (2001) who recorded a direct positive association between external job opportunity and higher degree of turnover intentions. This research outcome reflects the economic rationality of individuals who
compare jobs and often opt for a better paying alternative (Lambert, 2001). Concurring, Sherratt (2000) argues that the attraction of a new job or availability of alternative jobs is a potential pull factor that causes employees to withdraw from a particular organisation. Sherratt (2000) further argued that a push factor such as dissatisfaction with the present job can also motivate an employee to seek alternative employment.

Contrary to the empirical evidence presented above, Lambert and Hogan (2009) failed to find a statistically significant relationship between availability of alternative jobs and turnover intentions among correctional employees. In a preceding study, Camp (1994) similarly found no association between unemployment rate and actual turnover among correctional staff. It is important, however, to note that Lambert and colleague acknowledged the possibility that both studies (i.e. Camp and Lambert & Hogan) failed to completely capture the concept of external employment opportunity, as the concept indeed does have a direct positive impact on turnover intent, but failed to achieve a statistically significant proportion. Based on this inconclusive evidence, the authors recommended additional research in order to correctly determine the type of relationship between external employment opportunity and turnover intentions.

1. 3.3 Job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intentions

Job satisfaction, which is seen as a push factor (Sherratt, 2000), has long been documented in the literature as an important variable in explaining turnover intentions. Job satisfaction is an expression of the individual employee’s feelings, emotions and attitudes towards his or her job (Riggio, 2003; Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 2004). Such feelings include positive and negative aspects of the job and these have a profound impact on employees’ experience of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Riggio); this has consequences involving withdrawal behaviours and the turnover decision (Saari & Judge, 2004). While Ramoo, Abdullah and Piaw (2013) found a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions, a number of studies established inverse relationships between job satisfaction and intention to quit (Byrd et al., 2000; El-Jardali, Jamal, Abdallah, & Kassak, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2000; Robinson et al., 1997) and employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs will most likely think of leaving the organisation (Shields & Ward, 2001). However, other studies established an indirect association between job satisfaction and turnover intentions, but by impacting through an antecedent such as organisational commitment rather (Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999).
Organisational commitment reflects employees’ firm belief in and identification with the values and goals of an organisation and their willingness to remain and exert effort in order to assist the organisation achieve the stated goals (Dey, 2012; Ezirim, Nwibere, & Emecheta, 2012). The literature indicates that committed employees, unlike uncommitted employees, are less likely to leave their organisations (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). On the strength of this literature, it is expected that there will be a negative relationship between organisational commitment and turnover intentions (Adenguga, Adenuga, & Ayodele, 2013). However, an empirical study by Faloye (2014) failed to establish a significant negative association between organisational commitment and turnover intention, while a similar study by Ezirim et al. (2012) reported a significantly negative association between organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Based on extant literature and the Lambert and Hogan (2001) model of turnover intent, it can be concluded that job satisfaction and organisational commitment are strong antecedents of turnover intention with both variables impacting directly or indirectly on the turnover intention of an employee.

1.3.4 Selected variables of the study
Previous models of turnover intentions discussed in section 1.2 were mostly developed on the basis of the framework provided by March and Simon (1958) and Mobley et al. (1979). In an effort to provide better understanding of the reasons that lead to employees’ turnover decisions, researchers have conceptualised various studies using a combination of both behavioural and attitudinal variables that could possibly explain linear relationships with turnover intentions. Some of the dominant variables that have been tested in past research include job-related attitudinal factors such as job satisfaction/dissatisfaction; job embeddedness; stress; job and organisational commitment. Others include economic and demographic factors; environmental factors; ease of job mobility; job opportunity in the labour market; organisational culture; job content; and the utility approach. These variables are considered to have failed in adequately explaining and predicting employees’ turnover intentions and voluntary turnover (Boswell et al., 2005; Hom et al., 2012; Maertz, 2012; Russell, 2013). These shortcomings have therefore informed the need to adopt an aggregated approach using selected variables that are considered crucial to the turnover intention of employees. Such a category of variables are different from those used in previous studies reviewed above and they include perceived organisational support; transformational leadership; psychological empowerment; organisational justice; psychological contract
violation; and organisational trust. The literature has been reviewed to firmly establish linear relationships between the latent variables and intention to quit (see Chapter 2). The linear relationships are depicted in the conceptual model of this study (see Figure 2.1). The intention of this aggregated model is to provide a more comprehensive framework that provides a theoretical explanation of an employee’s intention to quit his or her organisation.

1.4 Research problem
The literature has presented evidence to establish that employee turnover is costly, destructive and time consuming, especially when high-ranking employees are involved. Turnover has both direct and indirect costs. The direct financial costs, according to Weisberg and Kirschenbaum (cited in Scott et al., 1999) include the loss of the performance and expertise of the employee; recruitment costs; and training of newly hired employees. It is estimated to cost about 150% of a departing employee’s annual salary to fill the vacant position (Ramlall, 2003) and even costs more when an executive employee is involved due to the high costs associated with executive search. There are also direct costs for overtime to cover vacant positions; administrative time to rearrange schedules; and obtaining approval to hire new employees. The indirect costs of turnover include the loss of social networks; loss of organisational memory; increased use of inexperienced and/or tired employees; insufficient staffing resulting into burnout; and decreased morale (Scott et al., 1999).

There is statistical evidence to establish a high rate of employee turnover in South Africa over time. A report by P-Corporate Services (2001) suggests a turnover trend of 7% in 1997, 14% in 2001, and estimated at 15% in 2008 (Samuel & Chipunza, 2009). The Hay Group (as cited in Sharman, Alper & Wolfson, 2006) similarly reported an estimated turnover rate of 25% while Khoele and Daya (2014) indicated 22% per annum between 2007 and 2010 in a sectoral study in South Africa. The problem of high turnover rates is not peculiar to South Africa, rather, it cuts across various organisations and sectors globally. China records a progressive turnover rate that climaxted at 26.3% in 2011 (AmCham. White Paper, as cited in Wong, Wong & Tong, 2014). Citing the United States of America (USA) Bureau of Labor statistics, Trussell (2015) reported that an average of 2.2% of the total private industry workforce had quit their jobs during the month of January, 2015, while the average loss in the professional and business services was 2.8%. It is estimated that an organisation loses up to USD$100,000 (approximately ZAR15m) for every managerial and other category of employee that quit their jobs (Trussell, 2015). Similarly, in the year 2012, more than 20,000 professionals, including medical personnel and academics, cutting across various institutions
of higher learning in Africa, turned over their jobs for better paid employment in countries such as the USA, Canada, Germany and the United Kingdom, among others (Agency Reporter, cited in Abubakar, Chauhan & Kura, 2014).

Further statistics regarding the financial implications associated with turnover suggest that it costs an organisation an estimated 150% and 60% salary equivalent respectively to replace individual knowledge and casual workers who leave (Larsen, 2003). This report is consistent with similar research findings in South Africa by Sherman et al. (2006) who estimated the replacement costs of voluntary turnover of professional and non-tenure employees at an equivalent of 18 and 6 months’ salaries respectively. Statistics provided by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in the US indicated progressive turnover rates of 50% in December, 2003 to 61% in December, 2006 and declining to 56% in June, 2008 (Guchait & Cho, 2010). An annual sectoral turnover rate in India was reported at between 30-50% (Batt, Doellgast & Kwon, 2005). The statistics provided above firmly establish the universality of turnover as a global phenomenon.

The literature suggests that a pragmatic and effective way of reducing the high rate of turnover is by identifying factors that trigger or motivate individuals to quit their organisations (Carmeli, Gilat & Weisberg, 2006). A number of previous studies that have built both conceptual and empirical models of turnover have demonstrated compelling relationships between turnover intentions and actual turnover (Chandrashekaran, McNeilly, Russ & Marinova, 2000; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992). It is when these behavioural intentions are understood that managers can take appropriate remedial action to prevent the manifestation of actual turnover.

1.4.1 Research question
The research question specifies the exact information the researcher needs. Research questions involve the researcher’s translation of problems into the need for inquiry. Research questions are crucial because they guide the literature review to be undertaken by the researcher. Furthermore, research questions also guide the decisions about the kind of research design to employ; the kind of data to be collected; the analysis of data; and the interpretation of the results (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Based on the research problem, as stated above, the research question for this study was:
1. To what extent do the selected antecedents of intention to quit influence individual employee’s intention to quit an organisation?

Providing answers to this research question was expected to provide us with a better understanding of the complexity of the selected constructs, as they influence employees’ intention to quit.

1.5 Research objectives
A research objective is the researcher’s version of a business problem. Objectives explain the purpose of the research in measurable terms and define standards of what the research should accomplish (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In an attempt to address the research problems and provide an answer to the question initiating the research, the following research objectives were stated for the present investigation:

**Primary objectives:**

1) To identify and evaluate the relationships that exist between selected variables that are antecedents (predictors) to employees’ intention to quit;
2) To conceptualise these predictor variables within the framework of a structural model; and
3) To conduct an empirical study in order to establish the relationships between the selected antecedents of intention to quit of employees in various organisations.

**Secondary objectives:**

The primary objectives were to be achieved through the following secondary objectives:

1) To review existing literature on selected antecedents of intention to quit in order to achieve the first primary objective; and
2) To validate the conceptualised structural model of the selected antecedents of intention to quit using Structural Equation Modelling to achieve the second primary objective; and
3) To design a research methodology that could be followed in the conduct of the empirical study.

1.6 Motivation and significance of the study
It is evident from the preliminary literature review above (section 1.3) that most of the previous studies and models of turnover and turnover intention were developed mainly by
using variables of job attitudes (e.g., organisational commitment and job satisfaction); demographic variables (e.g., age, marital status, tenure, career mobility); external factors (e.g., alternative job opportunities and market conditions); and job-related variables (e.g., role conflict, work conditions, job tasks) as important antecedents of turnover and turnover intentions (Arnold & Feldman; Steel & Ovalle; Shore, Thornton & Newton; Ghiselli et al., as cited in Guchait & Cho, 2010). Because of the negative implications of turnover on organisations and employees alike, numerous scholars have attempted to identify the most effective predictors of turnover intentions. This consideration has therefore informed the identification of the following constructs in the present study: psychological contract violation; transformational leadership; organisational justice; psychological empowerment; perceived organisational support; and organisational trust as important immediate predictors of employee intention to quit, as demonstrated in the present study. The major strength and perhaps the salient contribution of this study to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology is the development and validation of a structural model depicting existing relationships between the selected antecedents of intention to quit and the actual construct – intention to quit. This study will therefore significantly advance the frontier of knowledge, both theoretically and practically in the general field of management.

One of the major motivations for this study was to make theoretical and practical contributions to the general body of knowledge. From a theoretical perspective, it is hoped that this study will contribute knowledge to the field of Industrial and Organisational Psychology by helping our understanding of the interplay between variables that predict employees’ intention to leave their present organisations. From a practical perspective, this research is anticipated to provide practical guidelines for organisational managers in predicting and managing behaviour that precedes an employee’s intention to quit the organisation. This will assist managers in the formulation and implementation of an effective retention strategy that will retain the organisation’s human talent and generally reduce the incidence of turnover in the organisation. Similarly, the outcome of this research will provide managers with a better understanding of the way each of the constructs either directly influence, or mediate through other constructs, the individual employee’s intention to quit. This understanding will assist organisational managers, as well as provide Human Resource Practitioners with informed human resource intervention strategies in retaining employees, especially those whose skills are critical to attaining organisational goals.
1.7 Outline of the study

- Chapter 1 has presented the introduction, the research problem, the research questions, and the research objectives to give the study the required focus. In addition, the chapter discussed the motivation and significance of the study. Previous dominant models of turnover intentions were reviewed and the key predictors of intention to quit selected for the present study, were justified.

- In Chapter 2 each latent variable selected for the study is conceptualised. Chapter 2 also reviews related literature in order to establish the significant relationships that exist between the selected constructs. Empirical and theoretical justification for the research propositions is provided. The conceptualised structural model of intention to quit is presented at the end of this chapter.

- Chapter 3 concentrates on the methodology employed in carrying out the empirical research. This includes the research population, research design, sampling strategy, procedure for data collection, description of the measuring instruments and the methods used in analysing collected data.

- Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analyses. Statistical data analyses are reported and interpreted in a meaningful manner. The research propositions are also tested statistically in this chapter.

- Chapter 5 revisits the research question and stated objectives of the research. The research results are also discussed in this chapter and the theoretical and practical managerial implications of the research findings are addressed. In addition, the limitations of the empirical study are identified while recommendations based on the research findings are presented, and suggestions are made for possible future research around employee intention to quit. The chapter concludes by providing the unique theoretical and practical contributions of the study.

1.8 SUMMARY OF CHAPTER

This chapter has provided a general overview of employee intention to quit in order to
prepare a foundation for our understanding of the research topic. Previous dominant models of turnover intentions were reviewed in order to provide a historical context to the present study. The importance of studying intention to quit and an overview of dominant models of turnover intentions were presented. The major antecedents of intention to quit reported in the literature were identified and the key predictors of intention to quit selected for the present study were motivated and justified. The chapter also provided a discussion of the research problem, set out the research question and stated the research objectives in order to give the study the required focus and guide. The motivation and significance of the study were explained and the layout of the study was presented to conclude the chapter.

The next chapter will focus on the literature review and the theoretical framework of the selected antecedents of intention to quit, as well as evaluate the degree of relationships between each of these antecedents. Based on the articulation of relationships between the constructs under investigation, the study propositions are formulated and the conceptualised model of the study presented.
CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE CONCEPTUALISATION AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ANTECEDENTS OF INTENTION TO QUIT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the theoretical conceptualisation that provided the background for the construction of causal relationships between selected constructs in the present study. These constructs are: 1) transformational leadership; 2) psychological empowerment; 3) perceived organisational support; 4) organisational justice; 5) organisational trust; 6) psychological contract violation; 7) affective organisational commitment, and 8) intention to quit.

In this chapter, each of the eight selected constructs is discussed within the context of their definition and conceptual development. This is followed by a discussion of the relationships between the various constructs, which results in the formulation of a research proposition for each relationship. The conceptualised theoretical model of the study will be presented and explained, thus setting the stage for its empirical testing.

2.2 CONCEPTUALISING AND SHOWING EXISTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE CONSTRUCTS UNDER STUDY

‘Intention to quit’, which is an important variable for estimating an ‘actual quit’, represents the probability that an employee will leave his/her present job in the near future (Cho, Johnson & Guchait, 2009; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). Predictive factors or behaviours that underline such intentions and the relationships between these factors are regarded as antecedents of intention to quit, and have become subjects of prolific scientific investigation by organisational and academic researchers (e.g., Abubakar, Chauhan & Kura, 2014; DeConinck, 2010; DeConinck & Johnson, 2009). In the following section, the conceptual framework of the dependent variable (intention to quit) and each of the seven selected constructs (transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, organisational justice, perceived organisational support, organisational trust, affective commitment, and psychological contract violation) are considered in terms of their definitions and theoretical understandings. This is followed by an exploration of the relevant existing literature, in order to evaluate the relationships that exist between the constructs. An understanding of such relationships will provide a platform for developing a conceptual model upon which a
retention strategy can be established. This approach is predicated on the psychological perception that employees who viewed these variables negatively would be rated low on organisational commitment and trust, thus culminating in a high propensity to leave the organisation.

2.2.1 Conceptualising Intention to Quit
Globalisation has accelerated the persistent problem of employee turnover in organisations, regardless of type, size, and organisational level (Butali, Wesang’ula & Mamuli, 2013; Joo & Park, 2010; Yin- Fah, Foon, Chee-Leong & Osman, 2010). Employee turnover has remained a constant problem for consideration by organisational practitioners, thus attracting active research by academics on how turnover can be curbed (Kang, Huh, Cho & Auh, 2015). A determination to proffer a solution to the persistent problem of the high turnover rate in organisations has prompted many organisational researchers to attempt to understand the major determinants of turnover intention, in order to develop managerial strategies that will effectively deal with the causative motives of the phenomenon (Adebayo & Ogunsina, 2011; Firth et al., 2004; Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty & Keiser, 2012; Tuzun, 2007). What, then, determines employee turnover? The answer to this question is of immense importance to an individual employee who may be considering quitting his or her present job, and for organisations facing a high rate of voluntary turnover, given the direct and indirect costs associated with employee turnover (Firth et al., 2004). Contemporary studies (e.g., Basar & Sigri, 2015) have attempted to answer the question by investigating various determinants of intention to quit; to date, however, there has been little convergence in research findings. Firth et al. (2004) suggest that the reason for this lack of convergence may be due to the diversity of constructs investigated, and the consistency (or lack thereof) of the measurements. Added to this, and perhaps more importantly, is the cultural diversity of the research settings.

Over time, researchers and employers have concentrated their attention on actual turnover and its destructive tendencies. It has been argued that intention to quit should attract primary research focus since it constitutes an antecedent behaviour to turnover. As defined in Chapter 1 of this study, intention to quit simply refers to an individual employee’s thinking of a possible and voluntary exit from a present organisation, in a foreseeable period of time (Cho et al., 2009; Hsu, Chiang, Chang, Huang, & Chen, 2013). In research conducted by Carmeli et al. (2006), Tett and Meyer (1993), and Griffeth et al. (2000), intention to quit was found to be the strongest determinant of actual turnover. Findings from these studies echoed an earlier
A seminal meta-analysis study by Steel and Ovalle (1984), which showed a strong positive relationship between intention to quit and actual turnover, and further confirmed turnover intention to be a better predictor of actual turnover than affective variables, such as job satisfaction and work characteristics.

The theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) postulates that intentions most accurately predetermine a future action or behaviour (Cho et al., 2009; McCarthy, Tyrrell & Lehane, 2007; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). The reasons for these intentions mostly remains unclear (Firth et al., 2004), due largely to the nature of psychological processes that are involved when individuals decide to leave an organisation (Van Dick, Christ, Stellmacher, Wagner, Ahlswede & Grubba, 2004). The present study therefore presents an extended effort in the search for an answer to what determines an employee’s intention to quit an organisation.

For the purposes of this study, intention to quit is defined as a “conscious and deliberate desire to leave the organisation within the near future, and is regarded as the last part of a sequence in the withdrawal cognition process” (Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, as cited in Cho et al., 2009, p. 375).

2.2.2 Conceptualising Perceived Organisational Support (POS)
Perceived organisational support (POS) represents employees' perception of the amount of value the organisation attaches to their contributions and the extent to which the organisation cares for their wellbeing throughout the course of employment (Rigglea, Edmondson & Hansen, 2009). This perception among employees concerns the existence of a state created through beneficial actions of the supervisor and management, which employees feel compelled to reciprocate through a higher level of commitment to the organisation (Cho et al., 2009). The concept of POS is postulated within the context of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and reciprocal behaviour (Gouldner, 1960), in order to explain the psychological processes that define the attitudes and behaviours of employees (Setton, Bennett & Liden, 1996). Gouldner (1960) explains the underlying obligations involved in the exchange of favourable treatment by parties. From a social exchange perspective, this is when employees expect to receive a favourable outcome from their employers in exchange for satisfactory services. This social exchange expectation between employees and employers formed the concept of POS, which involves the commitment of the organisation to support the employee’s achievement of personal goals.
According to organisational support theory, the development of POS is conceptualised in a manner that depicts organisations as capable of exhibiting human attributes (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986). Although organisations do not have the capacity to act like human beings, its functions are exercised on its behalf by appointed managers or representatives, whose personal actions or inactions are considered to be the behaviour of the organisations that they represent (Levenson, as cited in Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organisational social responsibilities, such as legal, moral, and financial responsibilities, are manifested through an organisation’s policies, norms, and culture, and the extent to which these social responsibilities are exercised by the organisation’s agents (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Social exchange theorists (e.g., Blau, 1964; Cotterell, Eisenberger & Speicher, 1992; Gouldner, 1960) argue that voluntary actions are more valuable than actions that are more compelling and obligatory. Thus, organisational rewards and favourable job conditions, such as pay, promotions, job enrichment, and influence over organisational policies, enriches the concept of POS if these conditions are based on voluntary action, rather than enforcement resulting from pressure by labour unions or legislative and regulatory constraints by the government (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Since supervisors represent the face of the organisation, their treatment of employees, either favourable or otherwise, is accounted for through POS.

The psychological processes that define the consequences arising from POS are explained through the postulation of organisational support theory. Based on the consequences associated with POS, it is imperative that supervisors allocate the organisation’s resources to the welfare and wellbeing of employees, in order to achieve the organisation’s objectives and goals (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) further reiterate that demonstration of concern for employees’ socio-economic needs, and acknowledgement of their contributions to the organisation, fosters employees’ willingness to accept membership and identification with the organisation. The process of POS reinforces employees’ belief and expectations that their increased performance will be equally rewarded by the organisation. The outcome of this performance-reward POS process is a potential increase in employee job satisfaction and the experience of improved performance, affective commitment, and reduced voluntary turnover.
For the purposes of this study, POS is defined as an employee’s perception about the extent to which the organisation cares about their well-being and the values attached to their contribution (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

2.2.3 Conceptualising Organisational Commitment
Organisational commitment is widely regarded in management and behavioural science literature as a key factor in the relationship between individuals and organisations. For example, Raju and Srivastara (1994) and Gilbert and Ivancevich (1999) have described organisational commitment as the factor that enhances the attachment of an individual to the organisation. Employees are regarded as committed to an organisation if they voluntarily maintain their membership of the organisation and exert a considerable amount of effort to assist in achieving organisational goals. Empirical studies, such as those by Raju and Srivastara (1994) and Mowday (1998), have suggested that employees who demonstrate strong commitment to their organisation are considered to be more valuable to the organisation than those with weak commitment because a higher level of commitment translates to increased performance at both individual and organisational levels. Organisational behaviour researchers have studied organisational commitment from two perspectives: attitudinal and behavioural (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler & Sincich, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Meyer and Allen (1991) describe attitudinal commitment as the way that people feel and think about their organisations, including the nature and quality of their relationship. Behavioural commitment, however, reflects the way individuals have become embedded in the organisation.

Organisational psychology researchers (e.g., Mowday, 1998; Suliman & Isles, 2000; Zangaro, 2001) agree that consensus has not yet been reached regarding the definition of organisational commitment. As a result, Scholl (2000) opines that the way organisational commitment is defined depends on the approach to commitment that is adhered to. Meyer and Allen’s (1997) definition of organisational commitment as a multidimensional construct that reflects an employee’s loyalty and affective attachment to the organisation has become more widely accepted and applied by organisational researchers (Bagraim, 2004). This definition expresses ‘commitment’ as a psychological state that defines the employee’s relationship with the organisation, and the employee’s willingness to continue or terminate membership of the organisation (Tigere, 2008). The psychological nature of commitment thus emphasises the intention of an employee to voluntarily continue membership of an organisation into the future, and exert efforts on its behalf (Allen & Meyer, 1990).
2.2.3.1 Dimensions of organisational commitment
Past scholars of organisational commitment have conceptualised and approached the study of
the construct from different perspectives. Initially, Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualised
organisational commitment using two approaches: attitudinal and behavioural. Jaros et al.
(1993) and Suliman and Isles (2000) have extended these two approaches for conceptualising
and articulating organisational commitment, to four main approaches: attitudinal,
behavioural, normative, and multi-dimensional.

The attitudinal approach generally views commitment as a set of behavioural intentions that
include belief in and identification with the organisation’s goals and values, willingness to
put in maximum effort to achieve the goals, and willingness to demonstrate a strong intention
to continue membership of the organisation (Porter et al., as cited in Mowday, Steers &
Porter, 1979). In the context of the attitudinal approach, factors that are associated with
commitment include positive work characteristics, personal characteristics, and job
characteristics, with outcomes such as increased performance and reduced absenteeism and
turnover (Laka-Mathabula, 2004).

The behavioural approach for conceptualising organisational commitment amplifies the
necessity to continue membership of the organisation because of accrued social and financial
bonds, such as tenure, friendships, pension, and loyalty benefits (Suliman & Isles, 2000;
Zangaro, 2001). These social and financial bonds make leaving the organisation too costly
and unattractive to the employee. According to Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory, which draws
on the behavioural approach, an employee’s commitment to continue an employment
relationship with an organisation is informed by cost consideration; if the cost is high, there is
the possibility that the employee will decide to continue membership of the organisation
rather than discontinue at a loss. Becker’s (1960) position is supported by Kanter (as cited in
Laka-Mathabula, 2004), who described organisational commitment as having a ‘profit’
associated with continued membership and a ‘cost’ associated with leaving. That is, an
employee stands to either profit or lose depending on whether he/she chooses to remain or
leave the organisation. Whereas the attitudinal approach employs the concept of commitment
to explain performance and membership, the behavioural school uses the concept of
‘investments’ as a compelling force that binds an employee to a particular organisation
(Scholl, as cited in Laka-Mathabula, 2004).
The normative approach to studying organisational commitment argues that convergence between employee goals and values and those of the organisation make the employee feel a sense of obligation to the organisation (Becker, Randall & Regeil, 1995). This school of thought views organisational commitment as an internal pressure that compels an employee to achieve organisational goals (Weiner, as cited in Laka-Mathabula, 2004).

Finally, there is the multi-dimensional approach to conceptualising organisational commitment; although it is a relatively new concept, it is widely studied by organisational researchers. This approach highlights the complexity of organisational behaviour beyond the realms of affective, continuance, or normative attachments. This approach argues that organisational commitment evolves as a result of the interaction between all three components (Suliman & Isles, 2000). Earlier scholars of the multi-dimensional approach include Kelman (1958) and Etzioni (1961). Etzioni (1961) identified three dimensions of organisational commitment: moral, calculative, and alienation investments. Employees are considered to be morally invested in an organisation if they demonstrate positive behaviours, which are derived from their identification with and acceptance of the organisational goals (Zangaro, 2001). This positive behaviour reinforces employees’ loyalty and commitment to the organisation. Similarly, employees develop some kind of attachment to an organisation when they perceive a positive link between their investments/inputs (e.g., tenure, emotion, loyalty) and what they receive in return from the organisation (e.g., bonuses, pensions, awards). The third dimension described by Etzioni (1961) is alienation involvement; this considers an individual’s social cost or fear of the negative thoughts that others might have if an individual withdraws their membership from the organisation. As a result, individuals are no longer in control of their freedom of association and left with no option but to remain in the organisation (Zangaro, 2001). Building on Kelman’s (1958) work, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) developed a multi-dimensional approach to organisational behaviour based on the assumption that commitment represents an attitude toward the organisation, and that a number of processes can lead to attitudinal development. These authors distinguished between three dimensions of organisational behaviour: compliance, identification, and internalisation. Compliance occurs when rewards are harmonised with expected attitudes and behaviours. In order words, employees are rewarded based on their compliance with the rules and obligations stipulated by the organisation. Identification involves an individual’s willingness to accept and continue membership with the organisation, while internalisation is
manifested when prevailing organisational attitudes and behaviours are consistent with the individuals’ internal values (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

The most widely studied multi-dimensional approach in organisational psychology research literature is the one developed by Meyer and Allen (1990). Based on Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory, Meyer and Allen (1990) introduced the dimension of ‘continuance commitment’ to the existing dimension of ‘affective commitment’, which they developed in 1984. The framework described organisational commitment as a bi-dimensional concept comprising both attitudinal and behavioural components. In 1990, Allen and Meyer added a third component to the earlier two dimensions: the ‘normative commitment’. These three dimensions, the affective, continuance, and normative commitments, which are explained by different scholars but based on Meyer and Allen’s (1990) propositions, are discussed in detail below.

- **Affective commitment**

Affective commitment represents the degree of emotional attachment that an employee displays towards an organisation, together with the willingness to identify with, continue membership of, and align with the value propositions of the organisation (Ugboro, 2006). This would mean that continued membership of the organisation is emotionally induced rather than compulsion, thus making commitment to the organisation more natural. Steers and Mottaz (as cited in Ugboro, 2006) identified job characteristics that induce intrinsic satisfaction to an individual as the inherent values of a task, freedom to perform a task, identity, possession of the necessary skills to accomplish a task, and feedback regarding job performance. Other factors that promote affective commitment include the degree of involvement in setting performance goals, and POS. POS here refers to the extent to which employees feel that the organisation cares about their well-being and involves them in decision-making processes that affect their conditions of employment and work environment.

- **Continuance commitment**

Continuance commitment is concerned with an employee evaluating the personal costs associated with leaving an organisation. There are many benefits for employees who continue their membership with an organisation, which include friendship and harmonious working relationships, organisational brand and culture, pension and loyalty funds, acquired skills that are unique to the particular organisation, and tenure of employment. If an employee leaves an
organisation, however, these benefits would be lost. There are also environmental factors that make leaving an organisation too costly and unprofitable for an employee, which include social networks and climatic factors. These factors are compelling considerations that endear certain individuals to a particular organisation and discourage their decision to seek alternative employment (Ugboro, 2006).

- **Normative commitment**

Normative commitment occurs when an individual feels a sense of obligation to retain membership with an organisation, as a demonstration of loyalty and commitment to the values that the organisation represents (Wiener, as cited in Ugboro, 2006). It is considered an aberration, for example, to renounce membership of some cultural or religious institutions, such as family, marriage, country, religion, and military or political organisations, due to formalised socialisation orientation like discipline, loyalty, devotion, and cultural ideology (Ugboro, 2006). This dimension of organisational commitment is driven essentially by moral persuasion that leads individuals to believe that membership with the organisation is the appropriate thing to do, and doing otherwise amounts to a breach of traditional or cultural values. Normative commitment is mostly prevalent among religious organisations where absolute loyalty, personal sacrifice, and commitment is required from members, and criticism and renunciation of membership is viewed as a rebellion. Although such perceived disloyal behaviour and rebellion may not be sanctionable, especially in a democratic society, culprits are treated as outcasts.

A common attribute of the three dimensions of commitment is the psychological embodiment that defines the extent of an employee’s relationship with the organisation, and determines whether an employee decides to continue or discontinue their membership (Ugboro, 2006). It can therefore be concluded that individuals who develop strong affective commitment retain membership of an organisation because they are willing to. Those with a strong continuance commitment remain because of the prohibitive costs of leaving, while those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel morally obliged to do so (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993).

Affective commitment has received the most attention among organisational psychology researchers because it has been found to be the strongest and most consistent predictor of organisation outcomes such as turnover (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003; Meyer & Smith,
2000; Rhoades et al. 2001). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) provided a comparison of the different dimensions of organisational commitment in a tabular form (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Dimensions of organisational commitment with multi-dimensional models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angle &amp; Perry (1981)</td>
<td>Value commitment, Commitment to stay</td>
<td>“Commitment to support the goals of the organisation.” “Commitment to retain their organisational membership.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Reilly &amp; Chatman (1986)</td>
<td>Compliance, Identification, Internalisation</td>
<td>“Instrumental involvement for specific extrinsic reward.” “Attachment based on a desire for affiliation with the organisation.” “Involvement predicated on congruence between the individual and the organisation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penley &amp; Gould (1988)</td>
<td>Moral, Calculative</td>
<td>“Acceptance of and identification with organisational goals.” “A commitment to an organisation, which is based on the employee receiving an inducement to match contributions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer &amp; Schoorman (1992)</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>“A belief in and acceptance of organisational goals and values, and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organisation.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the purposes of this study, affective commitment is described as an employee’s loyalty, emotional bond to, involvement with, and identification with the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

### 2.2.4 Conceptualising Organisational Justice

A notable variable that has long been established in explaining organisational outcomes in organisational research is the perception of justice (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). Fairness constitutes an important consideration in all social undertakings by human beings, and this extends to relationships between employees and managers in various organisations. Attainment of social justice is a crucial requirement that precedes the fulfilment of organisational justice, which has been described in terms of all the activities and behaviours that represent organisational values and principles (Chegini, 2009). In other words, the concept of organisational justice is the perception of fairness by individuals in an organisation regarding the processes and procedures through which decisions are made concerning the distribution of organisational outcomes, including the perception of fairness of those particular outcomes (Greenberg & Baron, 2003). The very goal of an organisation and all related activities are severely threatened when organisational members perceive a sense of injustice in the way that they are treated and the manner in which the organisation reacts to such perceptions (James, 1993). The literature on organisational justice is firmly rooted in the context of organisational justice theory, which provides a useful framework for understanding individuals’ reactions to the distribution of organisational outcomes rewards and the

---

**Jaros et al. (1993)**

- Affective
- Continuance
- Moral

---

“The degree to which an individual is psychologically attached to an employing organisation through feelings such as loyalty, affection, warmth, belongingness, fondness, pleasure, etc.”

“The degree to which an individual experiences a sense of being locked in place because of the high costs of leaving.”

“The degree to which an individual is psychologically attached to an employing organisation through internalisation of its goals, values and missions.”

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001, p. 302)
procedure adopted in the distribution of such outcomes (Thornhill, Lewis, Millmore & Saunders, 2000).

Adams’ (1965) equity theory posits that individual employees assess their inputs (e.g., time, efforts, experience, qualification) into the job against those of their colleagues, and then make a comparative analysis of the input/output (e.g., pay, promotion, bonuses) ratios with those of other employees (Schultz, Bagaim, Potgieter, Viedge & Werner, 2003). The results of this comparative analysis determine the reaction (positive or negative) or course of action to be taken by the employee. Stated differently, an employee measures the effort he/she contributes to a job against the output or the rewards he/she gets for the contributed effort, and then compares it with similar effort that another employee expends and what he/she gets as a reward. The implication of this theory can be located within the procedure used by organisations for distributing outcomes such as rewards, punishment, promotions, and layoffs. In the context of organisational downsizing, Schultz et al. (2003) contend that survivors of organisational downsizing will always consider the procedure used in retrenching their fellow colleagues. Survivors will then react negatively if they regard the procedure as unfair or perceive a state of inequity. According to Steiner and Bertolino (as cited in Omoruyi, Chipunza & Samuel, 2011), perception of inequity by individuals creates a state of tension, and this tension motivates the individual to decrease input proportionately to the perceived inequity.

Employees put in a lot of effort and time into their jobs in anticipation of a commensurate reward from the organisation. Human resource activities, such as performance appraisal, pay reviews, and promotion decisions, are of critical interest to employees because such activities ultimately determine how individuals are rewarded by the organisation (Chang & Dubinsky, 2005). As a result, employees express concerns about the fairness and degree of equity that is demonstrated in the distribution and allocation of organisational rewards and resources. Employees react to the perception of inequity through emotional stress or physical withdrawal of their membership from the organisation, thus increasing the rate of turnover (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). These perceptions also influence an employee’s attitudes, performance, and behaviour (Chang & Dubinsky, 2005; Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summer, 1998; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). It is therefore appropriate to suggest that employees’ perception of justice regarding the way they are treated by their supervisors determines employees’ attitudes to work, work outcomes, and the organisation as a whole (Wat & Shaffer, 2005).
2.2.4.1 Types of organisational justice
Organisational psychology researchers have identified three types of organisational justice: distributive, procedural, and interactional (Kickul, Neuman, Parker, Finki, 2002; Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003). These three types of organisational justice will be discussed in detail below.

- **Distributive justice**
Distributive justice is essentially concerned with the fairness involved in the distribution and allocation of organisational rewards and resources among individuals in the organisation (Ismail, 2007); that is, the amount of fairness that is associated with the rewards that individuals or groups of employees received out of the entire resources available to the organisation. The study of organisational justice before 1975 was centred predominantly on the concept of distributive justice (Bakhshi, Kumar & Rani, 2009), and derived from the seminal study by Adams (1965), who used a social exchange theory framework to evaluate organisational fairness. Adams (1965) argued that employees were not particularly concerned about the organisational outcomes themselves, but the fairness with which these outcomes were arrived at. Whereas Adam's (1965) theory advocated the use of the equity rule to determine fairness, several other allocation rules have also been identified, such as equality and need (Leventhal, as cited in Bakhshi et al., 2009).

The essence of distributive justice is the fairness involved in the distribution of rewards in relation to an individual employee’s contribution to the organisation. Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland (2007) identify three principles that could be applied in order to achieve distributive justice: equality (i.e., uniformity in reward to everyone), equity (i.e., reward individuals according to their contributions), and need (i.e., consideration of the urgency of need).

- **Procedural justice**
Procedural justice emphasises the fairness involved in the process of reward allocation (Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2003). The process of reward allocation is important to individuals because this shapes their perception of fairness in the rewards that they receive. This fairness is demonstrated when employees are given the opportunity to participate in the discussions that culminate in the decisions affecting their employment (Steiner & Bertolino, as cited in Omoruyi et al., 2011). This participatory approach enhances mutual trust between
employees and management, which translates to organisational commitment because of employees’ belief that they are being treated with dignity and respect.

Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) research on the reactions of individuals to dispute resolution procedures led to the development of procedural justice theory, which is concerned with judgements about the process or means by which allocation decisions are made (Bakhshi et al., 2009). Although Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice, their work focused primarily on the reaction of employees in relation to legally binding dispute resolution proceedings. The dispute resolution procedure that is devoid of legal context was later introduced to the organisational setting, in order to apply fair procedure in the settlement of labour disputes (Bakhshi et al., 2009). Leventhal’s theory of procedural justice prescribed six criteria that are essential for a procedure to be perceived as fair. Accordingly, a procedure should be applied consistently across the board and at all times; that is, all categories of employees must undergo the same procedure over time without any element of discrimination or favouritism. The procedure employed in dispute resolution should be free from any form of bias. This can be achieved by ensuring that dispute arbitrators do not have a vested interest in the dispute under settlement. It is also important that decisions are based on accurate information and that dispute resolution procedures should have an appeal process mechanism that enables correction or reversal of inaccurate decisions or decisions that are perceived to be unfair. Furthermore, procedures should conform to an acceptable standard of moral and ethical practices. The last criterion prescribed by Leventhal’s (1980) theory of procedural justice requires that the opinions of various groups affected by a decision should be taken into consideration before a final decision is made (Bakhshi et al., 2009).

Research emphasis on organisational fairness shifted to procedural justice in the 1980s (Schminke, Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2000). As a social exchange phenomenon, procedural justice was considered to have a more predictive power among a variety of work attitudes, including organisational commitment (Warner, Hegvedt & Roman, 2005). Literature suggests that the fairness of the decision-making process is assumed to be more important than the actual amount of reward that individuals receive (Terpstra & Honoree, 2003). This assumption is predicated on the evidence that the fairness process leads to intellectual and emotional recognition, which in turn creates the platform upon which trust and commitment is built (Cropanzano et al., 2007). The elements of trust and commitment are considered important for eliciting voluntary behaviour in the execution of organisational strategy.
Performance evaluation is an essential process towards reward allocation; employees should therefore have the opportunity to express their feelings and provide inputs in the process, in order for them to perceive the system as not only fair, but as one that represents an accurate account of their performance (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Employees demonstrate greater loyalty and act in the best interest of the organisation when they perceive the performance evaluation process to be fair and just. The perception of fairness in performance evaluation procedures thus reinforces the employees’ trust that they will be fairly compensated by the organisation should they perform well in the future (Loi et al., 2006). In effect, the trust that is developed in procedural fairness tends to instil a sense of obligation in employees, which also invokes a need for reciprocity (Meyer et al., 2002).

- **Interactional justice**

Interactional justice is another component of organisational justice literature that is distinct from distributive and procedural justice. The concept of interactional justice entails employees’ experience and reaction to the quality of interpersonal relationship and communication in the course of exercising organisational procedures (Steiner & Bertolino, as cited in Omoruyi et al., 2011). Interactional justice in the context of organisational downsizing is important because communication assists in explaining why people feel unfairly treated even though they think the procedures and outcome of a decision are fair. For example, survivors will judge an organisation’s future interaction with them based on how fairly it has treated its laid-off employees.

Advancement in the organisational justice literature was made by Bies and Moag (1986), who emphasised focusing attention on the importance of the quality of the interpersonal treatment that people receive when procedures are implemented; Bies and Moag (1986) referred to this aspect of justice as ‘interactional justice’. Previous research (e.g., Greenberg, 1990, 1993) highlighted two specific types of interpersonal treatment that is embedded in interactional justice. The first, referred to as ‘interpersonal justice’, reflects the level of politeness, dignity, and respect with which management or its representatives treat employees in the course of implementing organisational procedures or determining outcomes; people want to be treated with dignity and respect by others who exercise some form of authority over them. The second type of interactional justice, labelled ‘informational justice’, refers to the explanations provided by the organisation about why certain procedures were used in a particular way, or why rewards were distributed in a certain manner (Greenberg, 1990b, 1993b). A supervisor would be considered to be interactionally just if he or she disseminates appropriate
information with individual subordinates in a polite and respectful manner (Cropanzano et al., 2007; Othman, 2008). Supervisors who show support and respect for individual employees’ dignity in the course of their interaction are perceived to have a positive influence on subordinates’ trust (Wat & Shaffer, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, organisational justice is defined as the perception of overall fairness of the organisation’s reward system, decision-making processes, and the quality of interpersonal treatment when organisational procedures are implemented.

2.2.5 Conceptualising Psychological Empowerment

Academic literature approaches empowerment from two distinct dimensions: a) structural; and b) psychological (Gkorezis & Petridou, 2008). The structural approach emphasises management practices that aim to grant power and decision-making authority to employees, so as to facilitate the latter’s participation in the organisation's processes and outcomes. The psychological approach, which was initiated by Conger and Kanungo (1988), describes empowerment both as a psychological state and psychologically enabling. The authors refer to psychological empowerment as a process that enhances feelings among employees of their ability to produce a designated level of performance if all formal barriers to organisational hierarchy are consciously removed (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), empowered employees are known to embrace task initiation behaviour and persistence to achieve task objectives. The development of literature on psychological empowerment is rooted in the management theory of power and delegation of authority, which seeks to give an employee the right to control and use organisational resources to achieve desired organisational goals (Ugboro, 2006). Psychological empowerment differs from the structural concept of empowerment in that it focuses on intrinsic motivation rather than on the managerial practices used to increase individuals’ levels of power (Spreitzer, 1995).

Bowen and Lawler (1995) define empowerment using four distinct dimensions: a) granting information about organisational performance; b) granting rewards based on organisational performance; c) granting knowledge that enables employees to understand and contribute to organisational performance; and d) granting power to make decisions that influence work procedures and organisational direction. According to Kanter (1979), empowerment results from decentralisation, from reduced levels of authority, and from employees' participation in decision-making processes. These ideologies identify a dual benefit that arises from granting
employees more power and authority. First, the complexity of an organisation's procedures is better encountered; second, employees will be more committed and effective when they are able to make decisions to accomplish tasks without necessarily going through complex bureaucratic processes. Although this approach established the notion of empowerment, it presents one disadvantage; i.e., it does not reflect the psychological state of the person that is empowered (Gkorezis & Petridou, 2008). In other words, it considers that these management practices will result, ipso facto, in empowering employees and, in consequence, ignores the subjective perception of employees.

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) argued that the concept of empowerment is much more complex and cannot be fully explained in a one-dimensional construct like self-efficacy, which was suggested by Conger and Kanungo (1988). On the strength of this argument, Thomas and Velthouse (1990) define empowerment in terms of intrinsic task motivation that consists of four cognitive dimensions that reflect an employee’s orientation towards work responsibility; these dimensions are meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) define intrinsic task motivation as the “positively valued experience that an individual derives directly from a task that produces motivation and satisfaction” (as cited in Ugboro, 2006, p. 237). Based on Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) cognitive meaning of empowerment, Spreitzer (1995) developed a four-component model of empowerment that specified the stages individuals must experience for managerial empowerment interventions to be effective (Kraimer et al., 1999).

The quest for an answer to the nature of empowerment has led to various explanations by different authors of the four cognitions of empowerment identified in Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and in Spreitzer’s (1995) model. These four dimensions are discussed in the following section.

- **Meaningfulness**

When applied to the work context, meaningfulness is defined as “the value of a work goal or purpose, judged in relation to an individual's own goals and ideals” (May et al., 2004, p. 14). Brief and Nord (1990) define meaning as a congruence between the requirements of the job tasks and an individual’s own values, beliefs, and behaviours. Meaningfulness is derived from one’s feeling that job tasks are valuable and fulfilling. Because of the self-expression and creative instinct that are inherent in people, it is natural that employees will seek out
work roles that allow them to express their creativity. It is therefore important that work roles and activities that are associated with the self-concepts of individuals should be aligned with more meaningful work experiences, as empowered employees derive a greater sense of meaning from their work (Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004). The restoration of meaning in work is thus seen as a strategy employed to enhance an employee's motivation and work embeddedness, which ultimately results in the individual’s work engagement (May et al., 2004; Nelson & Simmons, 2003; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Schlechter & Engelbrecht, 2006).

### Competence

Empirical research has shown that individuals experience enhanced intrinsic motivation and improved wellbeing when they feel competent and confident about valued work goals (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Competence is an expression of the extent to which a person is able to successfully accomplish tasks with the necessary skills. Employees who are fully engaged with their work thus see themselves as possessing the ability to take control and meet the demands of their jobs (self-efficacy) (Llorens, Salanova, Bakker & Schaufeli, 2007). Deriving from earlier literature on competence, Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) reported a strong correlation between self-efficacy and employee engagement.

### Self-determination

Self-determined employees experience feelings of having control over their work performance (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Work engagement by employees is enhanced when individuals personally endorse their goals, which differs to goals that are externally imposed, even when introduced with efficiency (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The explanation to this assertion is based on the tendency for individuals to take responsibility for goals that they personally determined and for which they are given the autonomy to accomplish (Ryan, Huta & Deci, 2008). Goal achievement under the concept of self-determination is therefore a reflection of freedom in the initiation and accomplishment of work behaviour and processes (Ryan et al., 2008).
• **Impact**

Impact reflects a feeling by engaged employees of the extent to which their work performance is making the required contribution to organisational goals (Spreitzer et al., 1999). Impact therefore enhances employee engagement, since individuals consider that their behaviour is seen as having a significant influence in achieving the organisation’s task processes and outcomes (Ashforth, 1989).

Previous studies on employee empowerment provide contextual factors and strategies that promote and support empowerment. Burke (1986), for example, suggests that individuals feel empowered when the organisation establishes high but achievable work goals, and expresses confidence in the employees’ ability to successfully accomplish tasks. In establishing high performing tasks, it is also important to give individuals the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process, and provide them with the autonomy to execute the task, by removing bureaucratic impediments that could interfere with work performance (Block, 1987). While it is motivating to set challenging and inspiring performance objectives that recognise autonomy (Bennis & Nanus, 1985), such activity should be supported by a performance-based reward system that promotes career advancement and meaningful work engagement (Oldham, Kanter & Strauss, Hackman & Oldham, as cited in Ugboro, 2006).

Organisations can achieve employee empowerment through human resource practices, such as designing selection and training programmes that are targeted towards the acquisition of specific skills, and the development of an organisational culture that encourages self-determination and collaboration rather than competition (McClelland, 1975; House, 1988).

Bowen and Lawler (1995) offer a more practical and process-orientated definition of employee empowerment. They define the concept as a process that involves making information about an organisation’s performance and performance-based reward system available (Bowen and Lawler, 1995). Employee empowerment also involves sharing knowledge that enables employees to understand and contribute to organisational performance with management employees, and giving employees the power to make decisions that influence organisational direction and performance. This empowering strategy is capable of removing rigid control at management level, and encourages initiative and reward innovation (Zemke & Schaaf, 1989). Overall, empowerment promotes a strong control of competence and internalisation of organisational goals by employees. An
empowered employee is thus expected to demonstrate high job involvement and an affective commitment to the organisation (Menon, 2001).

For the purposes of this study, psychological empowerment is described as a high intrinsic task motivation that is conceptualised on a cognitive model of empowerment, which includes four dimensions: meaningfulness, competence, choice/self-determination, and impact (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

2.2.6 Conceptualising Organisational Trust
Organisational behaviour literature identifies ‘trust’ as central to interpersonal relationships, especially between management and employees. Many employees have expressed increasingly negative perceptions of their organisations (Perry & Mankin, 2007), with four in five employees found to be suspicious of management actions (Lazarus & Salem, 2005). Studies in the South African context indicate a significant gap in trust between employees and employers (Engelbrecht, Heine & Mahembe, 2014; Martins, 2000; Esterhuizen & Martins, 2008). Due to its centrality within the context of organisational functioning, trust has received a great deal of attention from organisational researchers, who have also defined the construct from different perspectives. There is consensus among scholars that the concept of ‘trust’ is multidimensional and does not lend itself to a simple and straight-forward definition (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000) because each definition depends on the context of the trust relationship (Büssing, 2002). This multifaceted nature of trust has led to a plethora of definitions, some of which are summarised in Table 2.2.

### Table 2.2: A summary of some of the definitions of trust in the organisational context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotter (1967)</td>
<td>“An expectancy held by an individual or group that the word, promise, verbal, or written statement of another individual or group could be relied upon.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zand (1972)</td>
<td>“The willingness of one person to increase his/her vulnerability to the actions of another person.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook &amp; Wall (1980)</td>
<td>“The extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to, and have confidence in, the words and the actions of other people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt &amp; Morgan (1994)</td>
<td>“Trust exists when one party has confidence in an exchange partner’s reliability and integrity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr &amp; Spekman (1994)</td>
<td>“The belief that a party’s word is reliable and that a party will fulfil its obligations in an exchange.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayer et al. (1995)</td>
<td>“Trust is the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousseau et al. (1998)</td>
<td>“Trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert &amp; Tang (1998)</td>
<td>“Organisational trust is a feeling of confidence and support in an employer...... organisational trust refers to employee faith in corporate goal attachment and organisational leaders and to the belief that ultimately, organisational action will prove beneficial to employees.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tschannen-Moran &amp; Hoy (1998)</td>
<td>“It is an individual’s or a group’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Laka-Mathebula, 2004, p. 23)

Trust as a multidimensional construct is regarded as consisting of a cognitive base (belief about the worth of someone’s trust), affective base (role of emotions in the trust process), and behavioural base (relying on another and disclosing sensitive information) (Büssing, 2002; Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998; Schoorman et al., 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000, p. 556) proposed a multidimensional definition of trust: “one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open”. Sitkin and Roth (1993) similarly suggest four platforms on which trust can be defined: trust as an individual attribute, trust as behaviour, trust as a situational feature, and trust as an institutional arrangement. Other authors (e.g., Bews & Martins, 2002; Hay, 2002; Lämsä & Pučėtaitė, 2006; Martins, 2000; Nooteboom, 2002; Rossouw & Van Vuuren, 2004; Schoorman et al., 2007) have conceptualised the common characteristics of trust as follows:

1. Trust in another party with the belief that that party will act to the benefit of the other.
2. Trust is also a willingness to put oneself in a weak position and take the risk of the possibility that the party who is being trusted may not act to the benefit of the other party.

3. Trust therefore involves dependence between two or more parties.

Hosmer (1995) provides a significant contribution to the trust literature, as well as to the conceptualisation of trust in the organisational literature, by categorising the different definitions of trust into five contexts: individual expectations, interpersonal relationships, economic exchanges, social structures, and ethical principles. Based on these contexts, Hosmer (1995, p. 399) defined trust as “the expectation by one person, group or firm of ethically justifiable behaviour – that is, morally correct decisions and actions based on ethical principles of analysis – on the part of the other person, group or firm in a joint endeavour or economic exchange”.

Following the context provided by Hosmer (1995), Rousseau et al. (1998, p. 395) define trust as a “psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another”. Although the concept of trust has attracted diverse definitions from different authors, there seems to be an agreement that trust is “the willingness to be vulnerable based on the positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of others” (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995, p. 712). Other elements that are necessary for the development of trust between parties are dependence on one another and condition of uncertainty. McEvily, Weber, Bicchieri and Ho (2006, p. 54) conceptualise trust as a “choice to make oneself vulnerable under the conditions of interdependence and uncertainty”. In their study, Van der Berg and Martins (2013, p. 3) defined organisational trust as “the choice to make oneself vulnerable with the express belief in the positive intent and commitment to the mutual gain of all parties involved in the relationship”. Mayer et al. (1995, p. 712) seem to provide a more explicit definition of trust as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party”. Central to Mayer et al.’s (1995) definition is the expectation that an exchange partner will behave benevolently in a situation of risk and uncertainty. This definition firmly positions trust as a critical element in a social exchange-based relationship. Trust therefore remains the central tenet of the social exchange relationship, since there is no
guarantee that parties will reciprocate the same measure of favour or good deed extended to one another (Blau, 1964).

McAllister (1995) identifies and distinguishes between two psychological states of trust: cognitive and affect-based trust. Cognition-based trust describes an individual’s ability to fulfil an obligation based on reasonable assessment rather than emotion. A cognitive evaluation is therefore a judgment regarding an individual’s reliability, dependability, and competency. In contrast, affect-based trust is a reflection of an emotional attachment that develops from a common relationship between individuals who care and have concerns for each other (McAllister, 1995). Although a social exchange-based relationship is characterised by affect-based trust (Chen, Chen & Meindl, 1998), other dimensions of trust (e.g., concerns for others’ interests, reliability, openness, and competence) also influence an individual’s degree of trustworthiness (Aryee et al., 2002).

An exchange relationship is premised on investment by one party and constitutes commitment to another party, since social exchange is built on the principle of reciprocity (Blau, 1964) in order to attain an equilibrium or a balance in their exchange relationship. It is however required that the trusting parties prove their trustworthiness before an exchange relationship can be firmly established. Based on this requirement, Blau (1964) contended that the quality of fair treatment between an organisation and its employees provides the platform upon which a social exchange relationship can be initiated. As a consequence of this platform, employees will feel obligated to reciprocate the fair treatment and other good gestures received from the organisation. The principle of reciprocity thus provides the catalyst that reinforces and stabilises trust, and the platform upon which social exchange is anchored (Aryee et al., 2002). Deriving from the theoretical conceptualisation of trust in the literature, there exists a number of empirical evidence that links trust in organisations to some behavioural outcomes, such as organisational commitment, intention to remain or quit, and civic virtue dimensions of OCB (Liou, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Further empirical research has also established a relationship between the supervisor-focused citizenship behaviour dimensions of altruism, courtesy, and conscientiousness (Podsakoff et al., 1990), and a general measure of citizenship behaviour (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

The general problem that defined an exchange relationship is that it is not static in nature. This dynamic nature of the exchange relation has informed Rousseau et al.’s (1998, p.400) argument that “a dynamic of relational trust is its potential for expansion or contraction,
where experiences over time can escalate positive beliefs regarding the intentions of the other or, conversely, exacerbate negative beliefs”. A psychological contract violation represents one such experience that will cause a contraction of relational trust leading to the employee’s negative feelings. When relational trust diminishes as a result of a psychological contract breach, employees do not feel motivated to engage in actions that promote mutual loyalty and support. This position is supported by Robinson’s (1996) research finding, where he established that trust in the employer fully mediated the relationship between a psychological contract breach and the employee behaviours of civic virtue and task performance, but partially mediated the relationship with turnover intentions.

In order to arrive at a definition of trust, Robinson (1996) integrates various definitions of trust found in the literature. Robinson (1996) defines trust as an individual’s expectations, assumptions, or beliefs that the future actions by another individual or party will likely be of benefit, in favour, or at least not be of detriment to, the individual’s interests. As a social construct, Robinson (1996) explains that trust provides the basis upon which relationships and contracts are formed. Trust therefore influences the level of relationship between each party, and acts as an index evaluation of social behaviours and influence within a relationship.

As shown in this section, there are many inconsistent and often confusing definitions of trust by different authors, which could be the result of the flurry of definitions and dimensions of trust over the years. For the purposes of this study, organisational trust is defined as the employees’ feeling of confidence and belief in the corporate goal and organisational leaders, and the belief and confidence that organisational actions will ultimately be of benefit of employees (Gilbert & Tang, 1998).

2.2.7 Conceptualising Psychological Contract Violation
A crucial element in the concept of psychological contract is the employee's belief that the organisation will fulfil its promises and commitments. Psychological contract violation therefore occurs when an employee perceives that the organisation has failed to fulfil its important promises or obligations (Rousseau, 1995; Tomprou, Rousseau & Hansen, 2015). Thus, a psychological contract violation is defined as an employee's perception that he/she has received less than was promised by the employer. This perception results in a negative emotional response that is typically expressed in the form of distress and anger (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). This violation could be activated by an event
or series of events that an employee considers to be a significant loss (i.e., a violation); such event could be a failure to promote an employee as promised, or the inability of management to honour long-established benefits (Tomprou, Rousseau & Hansen, 2015).

One important construct that has significantly shaped the literature on intention to quit is the concept of psychological contract; the importance of studying the concept has gained currency in the contemporary field of organisational psychology. In the seminal works by Argyris (1964) and Levinson et al. (1962), the psychological contract was developed mainly as a framework, rather than a social construct that depicts the unclear nature of the exchange relationship between employee and employer (Millward & Brewerton, 2000). Argyris (1964), who first used the term ‘psychological contract’ in 1964, considers it an implicit, unwritten agreement between two or more parties to respect each other’s norms. It is mainly this implicit nature that differentiates psychological contracts from formal contracts. Levinson et al. (1962, p. 22) define the psychological contract as “an unwritten contract, a product of mutual expectations which are largely implicit and unspoken”. This mutual expectation thus provides the basis for personal beliefs and behaviours regarding the obligations that exist between an employee and his or her organisation (Knights & Kennedy, 2005). This exchange agreement between the employer and employee provides a basis upon which psychological contract perception is established (Fantinato & Casado, 2011). Since the 1990s, the psychological contract has acquired the status of a scientific construct that warrants both conceptual and empirical attention by researchers following the initial seminal works by Rousseau (1989, 1990, 1995).

Psychological contract theory essentially posits that employees seem to constantly evaluate the extent to which their contributions are recognised and reciprocated by their organisation (Antonaki & Trivellas, 2014). Psychological contracts assist in defining the relationship between employees and their organisations, and provide a basis for mutual understanding between the parties as to their respective roles within the organisational context. Psychological contracts, in particular, involve what employees believe they owe their organisations and what they believe they are owed in return (Rousseau, 1995). Most prior research has conceptualised the psychological contract as an aspect of the social exchange relationship that exists between individuals and their organisations (e.g., Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Social exchange relationships comprise the voluntary actions that each party engages in with the expectation that the other party will return those actions in one way
or another (Blau, 1964). Although the exact nature of the exchange relationship is not implicitly stated in advance, its establishment is generally guided by the principle of reciprocity.

Rousseau (1989, p. 123) introduces a narrower definition of the psychological contract construct:

“an individual’s belief in the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between the focal person and another party. A psychological contract emerges when one party believes that a promise of future returns has been made, a contribution has been given, and thus, an obligation has been created to provide future benefits.”

This definition has generally provided a framework within which scholars and researchers built and advanced the theory and articulation of the concept of psychological contract. Notable researchers (e.g., Coye-Shapiro & Kessler, 1998; Millward & Hopkins, 1998; McLean Parks et al., 1998; Turnley & Feldman, 1999) have variously defined the psychological contract within the context of an existing reciprocal exchange between one individual and another party, with the belief that each party will honour the terms and conditions of the exchange relationship. In other words, the psychological contract is made up of the individual’s perceptions regarding what he/she has been promised by the organisation (e.g., competitive wages, advancement opportunities, job security) and what he/she is expected to give the organisation in return (e.g., a fair day’s work, loyalty). A careful analysis of the various definitions of the psychological contract provided by different authors leads to the following two points of convergence: psychological contracts are subjective and reciprocal in nature. Psychological contracts are subjective in the sense that it refers to an individual’s beliefs in the existence of an exchange agreement that is neither expressly written nor stated. Psychological contracts are also subjective because it relates to the way the employment contract is interpreted, understood, and established on a daily basis within the work context (Millward & Brewerton, 2000). The psychological contract is reciprocal, in the sense that it contains an individual’s belief regarding the mutual obligations of both parties in the exchange relationship (McLean Parks et al., 1998; Rousseau, 1990).

2.2.7.1 Dimensions of the psychological contract
Because of its subjective and inexplicit nature, the psychological contract is characterised by confusion, especially on the part of employees who, most of the time, estimate that the employer is not doing enough to fulfil their psychological contract obligations. This has prompted much of the later research on the content of psychological contracts to be focused
on developing dimensions of the content. Authors have broadly identified two dimensions of the psychological contract as transactional versus relational psychological contracts (Behery, Paton & Hussain, 2012; Conway & Briner, 2005; Lövblad, Hyder & Lönstedt, 2009; Sels, Janssens & Brande, 2004), which Lee (2001) referred to as the ‘new’ and ‘old’ psychological contracts. The first, which is also the most commonly used dimension, is the transactional orientation of the contract. A transactional psychological contract is explicitly defined and stipulates the time-frame, scope of performance, and financial rewards (O’Donohue, Sheehan, Hecker & Holland, 2007). Transactional contracts are commonly structured to place emphasis on economic benefits that are short-term and relatively narrow in scope. Transactional contracts in contemporary employment relationships are often defined in terms of monetary value, are specific, and exist for a short duration of time (Shen, 2010). The essence of the transactional component of the psychological contract can be expressed as fair compensation for a fair day’s work (Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1994), or as the return process of exchanging effort for reward (Lee, 2001). The transactional contract, which is characterised by maximum productivity, commitment, and efficiency from a minimised workforce (Burack, Burack, Miller & Morgan, 1994; Hiltrop, 1996), is mostly practiced in private sector work settings. This dimension of psychological contract emphasises task accomplishment within a specified time-frame in exchange for financial compensation. Transactional contracts are free from personal or emotional considerations, with both parties minimising future risks by limiting the contract relationship to a short time.

A relational orientation, on the other hand, is often more complex, long-term, and interdependent (O’Donohue et al., 2007). It involves a system in which employers generally offer employees job security, consistent rewards, career management through steady training and advancement, and long-term company-defined benefit plans (retirement) in exchange for the expectation that employees would give all their loyalty and effort to the company for the very long term (Erlich, 1994). Relational contracts are defined within an on-going employment relationship, and with the perceptions that long-term, less specified, socio-emotional obligations exist, which may be characterised by attributes such as trust and commitment (Shore & Tetrick, 1994). This characterisation has therefore provided a link between psychological contracts and commitment (Millward & Hopkins, 1998), and betrayal of trust (Robinson, 1996). Thus, psychological contracts, commitment, and trust have been empirically associated with both turnover and other job outcomes (Lee, 2001). In essence, relational contracts are structured around less tangible rewards with a significant duration of
time, and are subject to the individual party's beliefs. Monetary rewards in relational contracts are often incremental and expressed into the future between the individual employee and the organisation (Guzzo, Noonan & Elron, 1994). The open-ended nature of the relational contract involves considerable investment by employees (e.g., life-long commitment) and employers (e.g., training and development).

The relational contract is seen as more valuable for the organisation in terms of its reliance on the expertise, commitment, and loyalty of the employees for future sustainability while the organisation commits resources for the professional development of its employees (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993; Flood et al., 2001). Because of the importance of both transactional and relational dimensions of psychological contracts, Sarantinos (2007) suggests the need for organisations to strengthen the transactional component of its contracts before attempting to establish a sustainable relational deal, which requires a considerable amount of investments in trust and loyalty. Guzzo et al. (1994) therefore suggest a combination of psychological contracts that comprise both transactional and relational elements, in order to accommodate employees’ needs, which are dynamic and fluctuate with the changing organisational climate.

As explained above, psychological contracts do not constitute any behavioural threat until they are either breached or violated by either of the parties, which in most cases, is by the employer. When activated, the construct becomes an important variable in the withdrawal cognition process of an individual employee, thus making it a subject of evaluation in the present study.

2.2.7.2 Psychological contract breach/violation
A psychological contract breach arises when one party in an exchange relationship perceives the other party to have failed to fulfil the promised obligations (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 2011). Most experiences of psychological contract breaches are premised on human resource management (HRM) practices such as pay, training and development, promotions, and job security. Employees tend to reduce the level of their commitment and loyalty when they perceive that the organisation is in breach of the existing psychological contract (Chen, Tsut & Zhong, 2008). According to Chen et al. (2008), psychological contract breaches also impair the willingness of employees to engage in OCB, and impact negatively on an employee’s job satisfaction, thus increasing their intent to leave the organisation and actual turnover.
Previous research suggests that perceived breaches of the psychological contract between employer and employee can result in negative attitudinal and behavioural responses, such as anger or distress (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 2011; Turnley & Feldman, 2000). This is more so when the perceived breach involves a significant amount of loss to the employee. Rousseau (1989) has argued that psychological contracts are important to an individual’s commitment to an organisation. Rousseau (1989) hypothesised that psychological violation of a significant magnitude results in a more intense response than violations that are more transactional in nature, as these are more defined and could be immediately redressed in terms of the contractual agreement. Given the more explicit terms of the transactional psychological contract, perceived breaches are most strongly associated with dissatisfaction, thoughts of quitting, and labour turnover, while perceived breaches of professional role obligations are more often associated with lower levels of organisational commitment, job performance, productivity, and client satisfaction (Bunderson, 2001). Psychological contract breaches and violations have dysfunctional, negative implications on the work processes which, in turn, can result in an increase in turnover rate, withdrawal activities, and reduced loyalty to the organisation (Turnley & Feldman 2000). Grimmer and Oddy (2007) reported that 53.3 per cent of the participants in a survey in Australia experienced violation of their psychological contract. Such a perception of breach in an employee's psychological contract has negative implications for the employee's commitment and a great implication for personal and organisational variables, mostly in negative ways (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; DelCampo, 2007; Nadin & Cassell, 2007).

2.2.7.3 Distinguishing between a psychological contract breach and violation
The terms psychological contract ‘breach’ and ‘violation’ have been consistently used interchangeably in psychological contract literature (Rigotti, 2009). Many scholars have not made a distinction between these two terms until Morrison and Robinson (1997) proposed a useful conceptual differentiation. These authors defined breach as a “rational, mental calculation of what individuals have or have not received, and violation as an emotional and affective state that may follow from the belief that one’s organisation has failed to adequately maintain the psychological contract” (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, p. 230). Consistent with Morrison and Robinson (1997), Suazo, Turnley, and Mai-Dalton (2005) argue that although a psychological contract violation is related, it is conceptually distinct from a psychological contract breach. Suazo et al. (2005) further argued that a psychological contract violation does not always result from the perception of a psychological contract breach. The definition
of a psychological breach could be further explained in terms of the emphasis it places on an employee’s emotional suffering and feelings of anger, resentment, bitterness, disappointment, frustration, betrayal, injustice, mistrust, indignation, and wrongful harm, which develop from the realisation that one’s organisation has failed to fulfil its obligations (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Raja, Johns & Ntaliansis, 2004). A plethora of studies have reported on the substantial relationship between perceived breaches of psychological contracts and different organisational outcomes, such as organisational commitment and trust (Conway & Briner, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 1998; Raja et al., 2004).

The study by Suazo et al. (2005) extended the research on psychological contracts by examining the extent to which the negative emotional feelings associated with a psychological contract violation explain the relationship between a psychological contract breach and important work outcomes. Specifically, the study examined whether a psychological contract violation acts as a critical intervening (or mediating) variable in the relationship between a psychological contract breach and work outcomes, such as intention to quit, commitment, in-role job performance, and helping behaviour (a dimension of OCB) (Suazo et al., 2005). Suazo et al. (2005) concluded that an employee’s cognitive perception of unfulfilled promises by the organisation (perceived contract breach) may in turn develop into a sense of anger and betrayal (perceived contract violation). A psychological contract breach therefore has been found to represent a mechanism by which a psychological contract breach may be translated into negative workplace attitudes and behaviours (Suazo et al., 2005).

For the purposes of this study, a psychological contract violation is defined as an emotional and affective state that may result from the belief that the organisation has failed to fulfil its obligations towards an employee, within the context of a psychological contract (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

**2.2.8 Conceptualising Transformational Leadership**

Research on leadership in the past decade has focused on the transformational theory of leadership, which House and Shamir (1993) describe as the dominant model of effective leadership. The expectation by researchers and management practitioners has been that this type of leadership would provide the much needed catalyst for competitive advantage in today’s complex organisational environment (Ngodo, 2008). Transformational leadership operates on the premise of motivating followers to perform beyond expectations. This is achieved by emphasising the importance and values of goals, and communicating the
collective vision that inspires followers to look beyond their self-interests for the good of the organisation (Bass, 1985). The strategy employed by this leadership genre is to create emotional attachment between the leader and his/her followers, in order to shape the followers’ values, aspirations, and priorities (Antonakis & House, 2002). The resultant effect of this strategy is that followers develop feelings of identity with both the leader and the associated team (Kark, Shamir & Chen, 2003). Based on the Burns model, Bass (1985) asserts that transformational leaders are generally able to influence their followers to achieve higher levels of performance and other positive work-related outcomes.

Avolio and Yammarino (2002, p. 123) posit that transformational leadership represents a “leadership genre that is individually considerate, intellectually stimulating, inspirationally motivational, visionary, and of high moral and ethical standard”. These attributes entail a type of bonding among leaders and followers that is predicated on emotional attachment, respect, and trust. Establishment of such a unique bonding enhances attachment of the followers to the leader and consequently the organisation; thus negatively influencing their intention to quit (Avolio & Yammarino, 2002). The level of conduct and interaction between a leader and followers is elevated because of the ability of the transformational leader to influence his/her followers positively (Krishman, 2009). A further description of the transformational leadership genre by Bass (1985) involves the ability to motivate followers to transcend beyond work behaviour that the organisation originally expects of them. Many other authors (e.g., House & Baetz, 1990; House & Podsakoff, 1996) have emphasised the unique attributes of transformational leadership, such as communicating a great vision and the importance of a task. This leadership behaviour is aimed at producing an affective and emotional attachment to and trust in the leader, activate intense motivation, and enhance self-efficacy in the followers (Ngodo, 2008). The theory of transformational leadership is therefore concerned with values, ethics, standards, opinions, and long-term goals of people or groups (Bass, 1985, 1997). In both theoretical and empirical literature, there has been evidence that these activities make organisations more effective (Bass, 1997; Dvir et al., 2002; Pillai et al., 1999; Zhu et al., 2005).

Bass (1985, 1995) and Bass and Avolio (1991, 1997) conceptualised the transformational leadership model as having four components: idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualised consideration. These components are discussed in more detail below.
• Idealised influence

Idealised influence is a personality or behaviour characteristic and attribute that confers pride and respect in a leader, such as to make him or her become a trustworthy and an energetic role model for the followers (Rowold & Heinitz, 2007). Thus, the essence of an idealised influence is for the leader to transform followers by creating changes in their goals, values, needs, beliefs, and aspirations (Rowold & Heinitz, 2007; Yukl, 2013). According to Ngodo (2008), this transformation objective is achieved through a conscious appeal to the followers’ self-concepts, namely their values and personal identity. Ngodo (2008) notes that the purpose is to create commitment, energise workers, create meaning in employees’ lives, establish a standard of excellence, and promote high ideals. The end result of the idealised effort of the leader is that the existing gap between the organisation’s problems and its future goals and aspirations is closed (Huang, Cheng & Chou, 2005).

Ngodo (2008) therefore submits that idealised influence from a leader would involve setting a standard for challenging but attainable goals with high performance expectations, as this work attribute and behaviour will ultimately lead to high productivity. This is essential because employees are more likely to be motivated to pursue difficult tasks when they believe that they can accomplish what is being asked of them from their leader, whom they see as a role model (Huang et al., 2005; Kreitner & Kinicki, 2006). Through their actions, leaders with idealised influence demonstrate the necessary values, traits, beliefs, and behaviours that are required to realise the visions. Transformational leaders are therefore able to build trust in the leader-subordinate relationship by using the attribute of idealised influence, which can then be developed to full emotional identification by both the leader and his/her followers (Ngodo, 2008). The gradual nurturing of emotional identification could evolve into a socialised charismatic appeal to the followers, since the ethical foundation of the leader’s visions and methods are fundamental in the theory of transformational leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1993).

• Inspirational motivation

Inspirational motivation is another component of transformational leadership as conceptualised by Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1991, 1997). Inspirational motivation is a process through which the transformational leader motivates his or her followers to embrace and become committed to the organisation’s shared vision. By means of inspirational motivation, transformational leadership communicates high expectations to followers, which inspires them and creates in them the desire to become committed to and
involved in efforts to realise the shared vision in the organisation. In practice, transformational leaders mostly use emotional appeals together with inspirational strategies that direct the efforts of group members performing beyond the prescribed level, in the interest of the organisation (Ngodo, 2008). Also, it has been shown that this type of leadership behaviour energises team spirit and consequently leads to greater motivation, improved behaviour, and increased productivity (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2006; Yukl, 2010).

- **Intellectual stimulation**
Transformational leaders adopt the process of intellectual stimulation by engaging in activities that stimulate followers to be creative and innovative and challenge their own beliefs and values, including those of the leader and the organisation (Ngodo, 2008). This type of leadership behaviour is essential, as it encourages followers to adopt new methods and be proactive in dealing with organisational problems. Through intellectual stimulation, followers engage in independent thinking and take self-initiative in solving problems (Bass, 1985; Kreitner & Kinicki, 2006).

Through intellectual stimulation, followers become creative and innovative, using new methods to deal with organisational problems, rather than employing old methods for resolving new problems. Intellectual stimulation thus provides followers with the intellectual capacity to challenge prevailing organisational methods and assumptions (Bass & Avolio, as cited in Schlechter, 2005). Transformational leaders equip and involve followers in the application of rationality and intuition in appraising problems, so that these followers may resolve problems in an intelligent manner. The main objective of the leader for stimulating followers intellectually is not only to motivate followers to solve problems on their own, but to solve problems using new and creative methods (Bass & Avolio, as cited in Schlechter, 2005).

- **Individualised consideration**
Individualised consideration, which is the final component of transformational leadership as described by Bass (1985) and Bass and Avolio (1991, 1997), involves the leader listening and giving personalised attention to individual members of the group, and creating a supportive environment for them. Through this process, the leader is able to pay particular attention to the individual member’s particular needs, rather than assuming a general need for all members. The process of individualised consideration also entrusts coaching responsibility to the leader, who advises members and assists them to become self-actualised. The use of
mentoring programmes and delegation of authority in real-life organisational settings helps followers overcome their personal challenges (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2006; Yukl, 2013). The transformational leader makes concerted effort to provide followers with direction, attention, structure, advice, and feedback in accordance to their individual needs and level of self-development. In doing this, transformational leaders raise the levels of expectations and increase the degree of confidence that enables followers to assume greater levels of responsibility (Bass & Avolio, as cited in Schlechter, 2005).

Given the attributes of transformational leadership as discussed in the above literature, it is evident that this leadership genre fundamentally represents a change agent. The new vision that is developed and communicated by the leader would inspire subordinates to expend greater efforts that are directed towards bringing about a change in their attitudes, self-concept, and motives (House & Shamir, 1993). The overall effects of communicating a new vision by means of inspiration and emotional appeals at varying degrees, including the establishment of emotional ties between the leader and the followers and demonstrating the ideal behaviour and values by the leader, could lead to performance beyond expectations (Ngodo, 2008, p.84). Therefore, development of the theory of transformational leadership upon inception articulates a vision by the leader an essential component of this leadership paradigm (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

For the purposes of this study, transformational leadership is defined as a leadership genre that is individually considerate, intellectually stimulating, inspirationally motivational, visionary, and of high moral and ethical standards (Avolio & Yammarino, 2002).

2.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CONSTRUCTS AND PROPOSITIONS

The following section presents the relationship between the constructs under investigation and the related propositions that were formulated for this study.

2.3.1 Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Intention to Quit

According to Hughes, Avey, and Nixon (2010), intention to quit is expected to have a negative relationship with followers’ perceptions of a leader’s transformational style. Effective transformational leadership behaviour potentially decreases a follower’s intention to leave, as this portrays a fundamental agreement between “the goals and values of the group, follower, leader, and organisation” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 36). Hughes et al. (2010) argue that followers are less likely to quit when the leader is seen as a champion of goal
accomplishment, particularly goals that are consistent with that of the organisation. Furthermore, it is less likely that followers will leave a leader who they believe is meeting their personal needs by means of individualised attention and consideration. This relationship could therefore motivate such employees to continue their membership of the organisation.

A study conducted by Krishnan (2005) found a significant negative relationship between transformational leadership and the intention of subordinates to quit. In addition, Shamir et al. (as cited in Hughes et al., 2010) argue that idealised influence (i.e., charisma) enables followers to identify with and emulate their leaders; thus, remaining with the leader allows followers to maintain this part of their identities. In their own submission, Bass and Riggio (2006, p. 36) posit that transformational leaders “use inspirational motivation to build emotional commitment to a mission or goals; thus, emotional commitment may create the desire to remain in the organisation”. Preliminary research by Avey et al. (2008) suggests that transformational leadership is negatively related to followers’ intention to quit.

Russell (1996) found a significant negative relationship between transformational leadership and an employee’s intention to quit. Oluokun (2003) also indicates that higher transformational leadership lowers the employee turnover intent. In a study conducted in the hospitality industry in India, Gill, Mathur, Sharma, and Bhutani (2011) observed that hospitality industry workers, like in other sectors, are subjected to rapidly changing working environments that increase their levels of work-related frustration, which in turn, leads to employees’ intention to quit. Transformational leadership clarifies mission, goals, and objectives to followers; to a great extent, this reduces the tension of employees regarding the requirements of their daily tasks, and thus reduces employees’ intention to quit. Consistent with the body of literature cited above, this study proposes that:

**Proposition 1:**

Transformational leadership has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.

**2.3.2 Relationship between Perceived Organisational Support (POS) and Intention to Quit**

POS as a key predictor of turnover intention has attracted significant attention among researchers (Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell & Allen, 2007). In their extensive review of literature, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) report a negative association between POS and intention to leave an organisation. Accordingly, employees who feel supported by their employer are less likely to search for an alternative job. It is appropriate to assume that
organisations consciously show concern for all aspects of their employees’ wellbeing, in order to create a positive social environment and encourage them to remain in their employ for a longer period of time. Further studies revealed that since employees often respond positively to the support that they receive from their organisations (Sherony & Green, 2002), it is expected that a POS will encourage a strong longing to stay with the organisation. Eisenberger et al. (1990) perceive that individuals with a high POS would be less likely to search for alternative employment in other organisations.

Hui, Teo, and Lee (2007) examined both turnover intention and POS, and concluded that POS was negatively related to employees’ intention to leave the organisation. This finding is consistent with that of Kinnunen, Feldt, and Makikangas (2008) and Allen et al. (2003), who found that POS was negatively related to the likelihood of leaving an organisation and the frequency of thinking about leaving the organisation. In a similar study by Van Schalkwyk, Els, and Rothmann (2011), the researchers established a significant negative association between POS and turnover intention. The implication of this finding is that in the presence of the sub-components of POS (e.g., role clarity, job information, participation in decision-making, colleague support, and supervisory relationships), the turnover intention in the organisation will decrease, leading to a corresponding decrease in employees’ turnover intention. The finding by Van Schalkwyk et al. (2011) further confirms similar findings by previous studies, which suggest that turnover intention is influenced by the extent of support that employees receive from their colleagues (Brough & Frame, 2004; Kim & Stoner, 2008) and supervisors alike (Lambert, 2006; Maertz et al., 2007).

Similar studies within the context of organisational psychology suggest that employees with a high level of POS tend to express stronger feelings of affiliation and loyalty to their organisation (Loi, Hang-Yue & Foley, 2006). This expression thus has a diminishing effect on employees’ intention to leave the services of their current organisation (Wayne et al., 1997). Further research (e.g., Wickramasinghe, 2008) also provides evidence of a significant negative relationship between POS and turnover intention. In line with the evidence provided in the foregoing literature, the present study argues that:

**Proposition 2:**

POS has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.
2.3.3 Relationship between Affective Organisational Commitment and Intention to Quit

Organisational commitment is recognised as a key factor in the employment relationship, and it has also been widely accepted that one way to reduce voluntary turnover is by strengthening employee commitment to the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday, 1998; Suliman & Isles, 2000; Zangaro, 2001). An avalanche of existing literature suggests that employees who are committed to their organisation are also more willing to demonstrate a deliberate act of dependence on their organisation (Johnson & Yang, 2010; Robinson, 1996; Tirelli & Goh, 2015). Cooper-Hamik and Viswesvaran (2005) posit a relationship between the commitment level of employees and a number of work outcomes, such as task performance, job satisfaction, withdrawal activities, and turnover. Further literature indicates that it is less likely that employees who showed strong commitment will leave the organisation, in contrast to those with less commitment (Tett & Meyer, as cited in Cho et al., 2009). Various studies, such as those by Griffeth, Hom & Gaerner (2000), Meyer & Allen (1997), Stallworth (2003), Wasti (2003), and Winterton (2004), have confirmed the importance of organisational commitment as a major antecedent of intention to quit. Other studies (e.g., Meyer et al., 1993; Griffeth et al., 2000; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998) have accordingly established a significant negative relationship between organisational commitment and intention to quit. When employees are emotionally attached to the organisation, they are less likely to leave the organisation.

Some studies conducted amongst correctional services’ employees in Florida (USA) have found that organisational commitment has a negative association with intention to quit (Jaramillo, Nixon & Sams, 2005). Further empirical studies (e.g., Camp, Lambert, Robinson, Porporino & Simourd; Stohr et al., as cited in Lambert & Hogan, 2009) have also established an inverse relationship between organisational commitment and both turnover intention and actual turnover amongst correctional services’ employees. The consistency in the various research outcomes could be linked to the definition of turnover intention as “a conscious and deliberate wilfulness to leave the organisation” (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 262). Employees who are strongly committed will therefore not nurture a conscious willingness to leave the organisation. Intention to quit is often measured with reference to a specific interval (e.g., within the following six months), and has been regarded as the last in a sequence of withdrawal tendencies that consist of a set of thoughts regarding quitting and an intent to search for alternative employment (Tett & Meyer, 1993). The literature on turnover suggests that organisational commitment mediates the relationship between perceived job security and
turnover intention. Mowday (1998), for instance, proposed that work-related expectations (particularly job security) directly affect psychological responses (e.g., organisational commitment), and reductions in organisational commitment can be considered to be psychological attempts to withdraw from the organisation (Davy et al., 1991).

Findings from past research show that affective commitment is negatively, significantly, and consistently related to turnover intention (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). Den Hartog and Den Hoogh (2009) observed that organisational commitment strongly predicted voluntary turnover. Den Hartog and Den Hoogh (2009) contended that an increase in organisational commitment and trust results in a higher level of stability for the organisation and eliminates the disruptive and costly effects of voluntary turnover. Apart from establishing a negative relationship between organisational commitment and intention to quit, Baakile (2011) revealed that turnover intentions were antecedents to actual turnover. There is therefore a convergence in literature establishing negative correlations between organisational commitment and intention to quit or actual turnover (Jepsen & Rodwell, 2012; Joo & Park, 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Having considered the relationship between organisational commitment and intention to quit in the above literature review, together with the empirical evidence presented therein, the following is hereby proposed for the present study:

**Proposition: 3**

Affective organisational commitment has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.

### 2.3.4 Relationship between Organisational Justice and Intention to Quit

Fairness has been identified as a key predictor of extra-role behaviour (Malatasta & Byrne, 1997; Masterson et al., 2000), organisational commitment (Hendrix et al., 1998), and intention to leave the organisation (Hendrix et al., 1998; Masterson et al., 2000; Robbins, Summersm Miller & Hendrix, 2000). Cropanzano et al. (2007) identify the ability of organisational justice to create substantial benefits for both the organisation and its employees; these benefits include employees’ increased trust in and commitment to the organisation. Previous studies (e.g., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Brockner, 1990) have found that procedural and distributive justice have an equally strong negative relationship with turnover intentions. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) explain that employees who feel
that future decisions by management could impact on them unfairly have an increased tendency to look for alternative employment.

Employees’ desire to quit an organisation may be heightened by evidence illustrating the degree of unfairness in the distribution of rewards (Dailey & Kirk, 1992). Distributive justice therefore plays a crucial and deciding role in employees’ evaluation of an organisation (Loi et al., 2006). It is on the strength of this literature that this study proposes that:

**Proposition: 4**

Organisational justice has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.

2.3.5 Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Intention to Quit
The results of a meta-analysis by Spector (as cited in Dhladhla, 2011) show the existence of a negative relationship between psychological empowerment and turnover intentions. Furthermore, Wilkinson (also cited in Dhladhla, 2011) reports that psychological empowerment increases job satisfaction and reduces turnover intention. Supporting Wilkinson (as cited in Dhladhla, 2011), Koberg et al. (1999) emphasise the beneficial effects of employee empowerment to both the organisation and the individual employee. This argument provides evidence to support the suggestion that feelings of empowerment are associated with increased job satisfaction and decreased intentions to quit the organisation. However, contrary to findings by Wilkinson (as cited in Dhladhla, 2011) and Koberg et al. (1999), Hayes (as cited in Dhladhla, 2011) failed to find any relationship between empowerment and intention to quit.

Empowerment is known to offer substantial prospects for improving employee self-esteem and decreasing the degree of power relationship, which in turn lowers employees’ intention to quit. Conger and Kanungo (1988) indicate that empowerment enhances feelings of self-efficacy among employees when the level of authority is devolved to the level of individual employees. An empowered employee’s feeling of being able to accomplish tasks has the potential to reduce their intention to quit. Further studies that found negative relationships between empowerment and employee intention to quit include Avey et al. (2008) and Moynihan and Landuyt (2008). An empirical study of employees in the hospitality industry revealed that employees experienced different organisational and personal factors, such as locus of control, self-esteem, perceptions of supervisor support, and other variables (Firth et al., 2004). These factors are known to cause frustration among service employees and thus
increase their intention to quit. Empowerment thus minimises external locus of control and other minor work-related problems by increasing employee discretion and flexibility in executing tasks (Wynne, 1993). The increased discretion and flexibility experienced by empowered employees is likely to make them feel satisfied with their jobs, thus reducing their intention to quit. Consistent with the above literature, this study postulates that:

**Proposition: 5**

Psychological empowerment has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.

**2.3.6 Relationship between Organisational Trust and Intention to Quit**

The willingness for engaging in positive employee behaviours is informed by the assumption that the organisation is just and has intentions to act to the benefit of employees (Restubog *et al.*, 2008). Only when this trust exists can employees confidently expect that their extra-role behaviours will be reciprocated. Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) argue that the non-fulfilment of perceived obligations reduces trust by lowering the values of integrity and disposition to do well, which are important elements in the establishment of trust. Indeed, previous research (e.g., Robinson, 1996) has found that trust in the organisation is lost when employees experience contract breach, and this erosion of trust results in the reduction in employees’ contributions to the organisation. Along similar findings, there is evidence to suggest that trust mediates the relationship between breaches and employee attitudes (e.g., turnover intentions), and behaviours (e.g., OCBs, performance) (Lo & Aryee, 2003; Robinson, 1996). The link between trust and intention to quit is also supported by Konovsky and Cropanzano, and Mishra and Morrissey (as cited in Ferres, Connell & Travaglione, 2004).

In line with the evidence provided by Schoorman *et al.* (2007, p. 346), the thrust of this study is to argue that “the level of trust is an indication of the amount of risk that one is willing to take”. Since employees take a risk when they trust their employers, it is important that those acting on behalf of the organisation make concerted efforts to maintain this trust. Indeed, the perception of a breach (real or imaginary) of trust may immediately generate mistrust, which would further result in negative attitudes and behaviour (Zhao, Wayne, Glibkowski & Bravo, 2007). In order to avoid perceptions of mistrust and sustain trust in the organisation, managers must consider the promotion of all forms of action and practices that enhance the development of employee trust in an organisation. Earlier research has shown that the establishment of trust in an organisation may be sustained by the organisation’s ability and disposition towards benevolent actions and integrity (Davis, Schoorman, Mayer & Tan,
Where trust was dominant in organisational culture, a strong and negative relationship exists between organisational trust and employees’ intention to leave (Ooi, Safa & Aumugam, 2006). Based on this finding, Ooi et al. (2006) concluded that organisational trust represented the decisive factor for decreasing intention to leave. When employees believed that the organisation was concerned about their wellbeing (a dimension of organisational trust), they were more likely to remain in the organisation because of the perception that their services were being valued (Ng & Feldman, 2012; Tekleab & Chiaburu, 2010). Thus, it can be postulated that:

**Proposition 6:**

Organisational trust has a significantly negative effect on intention to quit.

**2.3.7 Relationship between Psychological Contract Breach/Violation and Intention to Quit**

There is much literature on employees’ responses to a psychological contract breach and violation in relation to their decision to leave the organisation (e.g., Dulac, Coyle-Shapiro, Henderson & Wayne, 2008; Fu, 2007; Orvis, Dudley & Cortina, 2008; Parzefall & Hakanen, 2010; Robinson & Morrison, 2000; Suazo, 2009). This body of literature confirms that perceived violations of the psychological contract increase intended or actual turnover, which negatively affects work attitudes and behaviour. This is more so since the perception of a psychological contract breach is an indication of the level to which the employer is committed and values the employee’s contribution and intention to continue the employment relationship (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005). Intention to quit represents a common response to negative practices in the organisation (Lum et al., 1998); thus, a psychological contract breach, as a negative event for employees, can increase their propensity to leave. Empirical evidence indicates that violations, rather than breaches, are a better predictor for most turnover thoughts (Fu, 2007; Paillé & Dufour, 2013; Suazo, 2009). Prior research has thus far demonstrated that psychological contract breaches and violations are relatively common (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994), and that they are associated with various negative outcomes, such as a reduction in perceived obligation to the employer, decreased out-role behaviour, and reduced commitment and satisfaction (Robinson, Kraatz & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Some authors (Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia & Griffeth, 1992; Tett & Meyer, 1993) have similarly suggested that the breach of psychological contracts by the employer will result in employees’ dissatisfaction, which will motivate negative behaviours, such as increased withdrawal, absenteeism,
tardiness, intention to quit, and actual turnover. Other research has indicated that a psychological contract breach is positively related to employees' intention to quit (Bunderson, 2001; Raja et al., 2004; Suazo, Turnley & Mai-Dalton, 2005).

In particular, instances of psychological contract breaches are likely to lead employees to evaluate whether their continued employment relationship with the organisation is still mutually beneficial (Turnley & Feldman, 1999). When the perception of imbalance is considered to be substantial, or the possibility of future mistreatment high enough, employees activate the process of seeking alternative employment. A psychological contract breach is likely to be positively related to employees' intention to quit. Furthermore, psychological contract breaches are likely to result in perceptions of inequity (Morrison & Robinson, 1997), which may reduce employees’ beliefs that continued membership of the organisation will be mutually beneficial. As such, experience of a psychological contract breach is likely to cause employees to re-evaluate their continued employment relationships (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). When the evaluation shows that the perceived inequity is of a great proportion and without any commitment by the organisation to redress this, employees may respond by voluntarily terminating the employment relationship.

Based on the above theoretical convictions and empirical evidence, this study proposes the following:

**Proposition: 7**

Psychological contract violation has a significantly positive effect on intention to quit.

### 2.3.8 The relationship between Transformational Leadership and POS

The relationship between transformational leadership and POS appears not to have been adequately evaluated in past studies. This has therefore resulted in a paucity of research in this direction. However, a handful of studies have shown that employees who have been well supported by the organisation over a period of time, as assessed by POS, are likely to ask for and accept a high-quality exchange relationship with their supervisor (Asgari et al., 2008). Furthermore, a supervisor is more likely to engage in behaviours that promote a high-quality exchange relationship with employees who demonstrate increased ability, as a result of support received from the organisation over a period of time. It is therefore expected that managers tend to allocate more resources and rewards to employees with whom they maintain high-quality exchanges, which may, over time, influence employees’ perceptions of organisational support. Because the supervisor acts on behalf of the organisation when
evaluating an employee’s performance and allocating rewards, employees consider the discretion they received from the supervisor as a signal of organisational support (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Wayne et al., 1997). The implication of this perception is the belief that the level of supervisory support has a positive relationship with POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001; Wayne et al., 1997).

The present study hereby proposes that:

**Proposition: 8**

Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on POS.

**2.3.9 Relationship between Organisational Justice and Perceived Organisational Support (POS)**

A small but consistent body of research has established varying relationships between specific types of organisational justice and POS (Tekleab, Takeuchi & Taylor, 2005). It is important to understand how the decision-making procedures in the organisation tend to predict POS. There is existing literature on the existence of a chain of relationships between organisational justice, social exchange relationships, and employee attitudinal and behavioural reactions (including intention to quit) (Tekleab et al., 2005).

One dimension of organisational justice is procedural justice. Procedural justice is the fairness with which organisational procedures are applied in decisions that affect employees (Thibaut & Walker, as cited in Tekleab et al., 2005). Fair procedures are an indication of the organisation's respect of employees' rights to participate in the procedures that lead to decisions that affect their employment relationships, which in turn contributes positively to POS (Moideenkutty, Blau, Kumar & Nalakath, 2001). Under the norm of reciprocity, employees who experience high POS would most likely develop a feeling of obligation to repay the organisation in terms of their organisational commitment. However, only a few studies have examined how distributive justice affects organisational commitment through POS (e.g., Moideenkutty et al., 2001). In terms of distributive justice, Shore and Shore (1995) argue that the allocation of reward outcomes (e.g., pay) are infrequent, whereas development of POS is based on daily interactions. In this regard, procedural justice seems to be more relevant than distributive justice when analysing the relationship between organisational justice and POS. Furthermore, the extent to which organisations can control these outcomes (procedural and distributive) are equally important. However, the discretion of organisations over employee outcomes (e.g., pay) is very much constrained in labour.
markets where unionism is strong, with many legal regulations on labour affairs (e.g., in South Africa). As pointed out by Moorman et al. (1998), employees are likely to believe that the organisation has discretion over procedures even when the organisation lacks discretion over outcomes. Whether distributive justice could be considered by the organisation as discretionary treatment, like procedural justice, remains a debatable assumption.

Stinglhamber et al. (2006) posit that favourable treatment would affect perceived support to the extent that it indicates the organisation’s positive evaluations of the employees. The underlying principle upon which the above assumption is predicated is that organisational actions are interpreted by the employee as representing the degree of care and commitment. This assumption within the realm of POS and its antecedent variables is supported by empirical evidence (e.g., Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), which indicate a positive and significant relationship between procedural justice and POS. In their meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) and Stinglhamber et al. (2006) reported a weighted correlation of .59 (p < .001) between procedural justice and POS, suggesting that procedural justice, as a positive job condition provided by the organisation, promotes employees’ perception of organisational support.

Drawing on the relationships between organisational justice and POS that were revealed above, the present study argues that:

**Proposition 9:**

Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on POS.

**2.3.10 Relationship between Perceived Organisation Support (POS) and Affective Commitment**

The literature emphasises the need for an organisation to show its concern for their employees’ wellbeing, in order to increase their employees’ commitment (Cho et al., 2009). POS has been found to indicate the strongest link to increasing organisational commitment (Cho et al., 2009). Cho et al. (2009) found that POS had twice as strong an impact on intention to stay as it did on intention to leave the organisation. According to the findings by Cho et al. (2009), POS was the only variable that significantly increases intent to stay and decreases intention to leave the organisation.

The association between POS and affective commitment can be explained within the context of reciprocity and social exchange (Lee & Peccei, 2007). In terms of reciprocity, employees
who believe that their organisation values them and cares for their wellbeing are more likely to feel a sense of obligation toward the organisation and, therefore, to reciprocate the favourable treatment with increased loyalty and commitment. Similarly, within the context of social exchange theory, it is believed that POS can assist in fulfilling important socio-emotional needs of individuals, such as the need for approval, esteem, and association. The fulfilment of such needs enhances employees’ affective attachment to and identification with the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Lee and Peccei (2007) note that the social exchange approach has been the dominant framework underpinning much of the research relating to POS. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) and Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) link POS and affective commitment more generally with the antecedents of organisational commitment.

Social exchange theory indicates that employees’ perception of psychological contracts is likely to affect the level of their organisational commitment and, consequently, impact on the overall performance of the organisation (Behery et al., 2012). The theoretical conceptualisation is that when organisations show care and support for employees by providing favourable contracts and working conditions, employees normally respond with increased organisational commitment (Passarelli, 2011). On the contrary, when employees do not perceive such care and support, the result is reduced levels of trust, loyalty, and commitment (Passarelli, 2011).

The generally accepted explanation for the relationship between POS and affective commitment is consistent with the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). This explanation refers to how favourable treatment results in creating a sense of indebtedness to the organisation among employees (Eisenberger et al., 1986). This sense of indebtedness that employees have to the organisation provides a basis for a stronger affective association with the organisation. The various articulations of organisational support theory suggest that POS increases affective commitment by creating a felt obligation to care about the organisation and assist it to meet its objectives (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli & Lynch, 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995). It is further argued that employees who perceive the organisation as caring for their wellbeing are assumed to be more likely to reciprocate, not only by engaging in various forms of pro-social behaviour directed toward the organisation, but also by developing a stronger affective commitment to the organisation (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch & Rhoades, 2001). Eisenberger et al. (2001)
contend that the feeling of obligation to reciprocate care for care, both in behavioural and attitudinal terms, are expected to be more pronounced among employees who have a stronger social exchange ideology. This reciprocal behaviour is also expected to be more marked where the organisation is believed to provide valued support on a voluntary basis, rather than out of necessity or compulsion by legislation or labour unions (Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1997). In the former situation, POS can be expected to have a stronger influence on affective commitment because its impact on felt obligation is likely to be correspondingly more pronounced. Felt obligation, however, remains the core factor through which POS is assumed to influence affective commitment (Lee & Peccei, 2007).

Eisenberger et al. (2001) provide an empirical argument to establish that although POS and affective commitment were distinctive, there is a direct and positive relationship between POS and affective commitment. Other studies (e.g., Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002) also found direct and positive relationships between POS and affective commitment, including among Korean employees (Lee & Peccei, 2006) and expatriates in Mainland, China (Liu, 2009). All of these researchers concluded that employees translate the support received from the organisation into their emotional attachment to the organisation.

Further literature has established a relationship between POS and affective commitment (O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999; Aube, Rousseau & Morin, 2007; LaMastro, as cited in Colakoglu, Culha & Atay, 2010). Research outcomes from these studies suggest that employees who feel supported by their organisation and feel valued as employees in their organisation are much more attached to the organisation. The relationship between POS and affective commitment can be explained within the context of social identity theory, which postulates that employees remain loyal when they feel that their organisation values and appreciates their contributions (Tyler, 1999). If the organisational support is directed at meeting employees’ needs for recognition and approval, it is likely that employees will respond by incorporating their organisational membership into self-identity, thereby developing a positive emotional bond (affective commitment) with the organisation. Similarly, Kim et al. (2005) argue that when employees view their organisation as supportive, they are likely to feel a strong desire to maintain continued membership with the organisation. A study by Colakoglu, Culha, and Atay (2010) provide further support to the findings of previous studies, by confirming a significantly positive association between POS.
and affective commitment. Colakoglu et al. (2010) concluded that employees who have POS would demonstrate more attachment to the organisation. In light of the empirical studies and social identity theory, this study proposes that:

**Proposition: 10**

POS has a significantly positive effect on affective organisational commitment.

### 2.3.11 Relationship between Organisational Justice and Affective Organisational Commitment

In the recent past, the link between organisational justice and organisational commitment has become the subject of renewed interest due to studies examining the justice climate (Li & Cropanzano, 2009; Liao & Rupp, 2005). In particular, the concept of justice climate has attracted a number of studies in the areas of justice and commitment. Within this context, employees who experience distributive justice are more likely to show increased commitment to their organisation, since they perceive that they are receiving sufficient return on their invested resources (Mattila & Patterson, 2004). Employees furthermore increase their affective commitment when they perceive that their efforts at work are fairly reciprocated by the organisation (He & Brown, 2013). Perceptions that their efforts are fairly compensated by the organisation with due process encourage employees to consistently invest more affective commitment by demonstrating exceptional work behaviours that may even transcend the prescribed standards (Janssen, Müller & Greifeneder, 2011). Perceptions of high interactional justice are known to develop positive emotions and affections that, in turn, activate a high level of job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2001; Fredrickson, 2001). According to this literature (i.e., Colquitt et al., 2001; Fredrickson, 2001), this outcome is accentuated because interactional justice builds emotional bonds between employees through the manager’s show of dignity and respect to an employee, as well as the manager’s adequate explanation and rationale for a decision taken by management.

It can be argued that perception of fairness among employees provides a platform upon which employee attitudes and behaviours are formed. Studies have shown that individuals with a weak perception of justice tend to have a high level of negative affection for the organisation (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Wanberg, Gavin & Bunce, 1999); that is, they more easily feel negative emotions (Watson & Clark, 1984) and are more responsive to negative elements (Judge, 1993). Meyer and Allen (as cited in Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001) note that
work experiences, such as organisational rewards, procedural justice, and supervisor support, have stronger associations with affective commitment than the structural composition of organisational or personal characteristics. Hence, this study focuses on the affective commitment, as it is most strongly related to the work experiences of employees.

Literature has argued that the ability of employees to express their concerns regarding the fairness of organisational processes may contribute to increased organisational commitment and lower levels of quit intention (Wells & Peachey, 2011). Procedural fairness, as an important characteristic of organisational trust, could potentially translate into affective commitment. In their study, Sulu, Ceylan, and Kaynak (2010) observed the effect of fairness on employee attitudes and behaviours, such as intent to leave and organisational commitment. The same authors established a relationship between distributive justice and the concept of fairness and social exchange within the organisation in relation to outcomes such as rewards in exchange for employee inputs. Empirical studies by Jepson and Rodwell (2012) found a direct relationship between distributive justice and organisational commitment, while positive correlations were also found between the perceptions of fairness of human resource practices and affective organisational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to Love and Forret (2008), distributive, procedural, and interactional justice perceptions are related to supervisor and collegial trust and morale. Other research findings stressed the need for organisations to enhance perceptions of fairness in the distribution of rewards, procedures, and treatment of employees (Farndale, Hope-Hailey & Kelliher, 2011; Love & Forret, 2008). Farndale et al. (2011) and Love and Forret (2008) established further relationships between distributive justice and the fairness of outcomes received by employees, while procedural justice was related to the human resource policies and procedures used in determining such outcomes. Similarly, other authors identified a positive relationship between interactional justice and the quality of the interpersonal process of explaining the outcome through treating employees with respect, honesty, and sincerity (Farmer & Meisel, 2010; Forret & Love, 2008; Salamon & Robinson, 2008). Further research findings also indicate that distributive justice predicts organisational commitment and trust in both the supervisor and the organisation (Love & Forret, 2008; Jepsen & Rodwell, 2010). These studies identified fairness as the fundamental basis upon which organisational justice is built (DeConinck & Johnson, 2009; Farndale, Hope-Hailey & Kelliher, 2011; Forret & Love, 2008). Finally, Shapira-Lishchinsky and Evan-Zohar (2011) have also established a positive and significant relationship between distributive justice and affective organisational commitment.
The following proposition is based on the strength of the literature examined above:

**Proposition: 11**

Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on affective organisational commitment.

2.3.12 Relationship between Organisational Trust and Affective Organisational Commitment

Once the employees are willing to be vulnerable to the organisation, they are more likely to engage in behavioural manifestations of trust, such as risk-taking relationships with the organisation. Employees must believe that practices or risks, such as experimentation, expressing new ideas, making mistakes, and challenging the status quo, are encouraged by management (Tirelli & Goh, 2015). In other words, employees should be free to experiment with innovative ideas without any fear of punishment should they fail, and they should also be encouraged to develop new ways of doing things, rather than the current methods. Other research has shown that organisational trust increases affective organisational commitment, decreases employee turnover intentions (Tan & Tan, 2000), and enhances employees’ ability to focus attention on activities that add value to the organisation (Mayer & Gavin, 2005). As predicted, organisational trust correlates positively with affective organisational commitment and negatively with turnover intentions (Tirelli & Goh, 2015). Thus, employees who trust their organisation are more likely to be emotionally bonded to their organisation and less likely to quit for another organisation.

Drawing on previous research, Mohamed, Kader, and Anisa (2012) reported that relationships through the range of organisational commitment may be more predictive of an employee’s attachment to the organisation. These authors further noted that an employee’s emotional attachment to an organisation may reinforce stronger personal commitment and enhance the employee’s intention to stay in the organisation. It is against the background of this explanation that the authors found a statistically significant and strong positive correlation between organisational trust and affective commitment (Mohamed et al. (2012). In essence, and as concluded more recently by Tirelli and Goh (2015), committed employees are more willing to be vulnerable to the organisation and to trust organisational strategies and practices. Tirelli and Goh (2015) suggest that building a trusting image provides the organisation with a platform to positively influence employee commitment, and that this strategy may assist the organisation in effectively reducing turnover intentions.
Organisational commitment is commonly defined in terms of both human action (the ‘act of committing’) and subjectivity (the ‘state of being committed’), with trust being a central component of such definitions (to give and trust) (Tan & Tan, 2000). Trust has been identified as partially mediating the relationship between POS, affective commitment, and intention to quit (Guerrero & Herrbach, 2009). It has also been established that human resource management (HRM) practices, such as skills development and communication, forms potential antecedents of organisational trust and POS (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003). According to Allen et al. (2003), HRM practices provide a perception of organisational support that is favourable to trust because those practices are an indication of the attention that the organisation gives to its employees.

Mathai (1989) specifically evaluated the relationship between trust and affective commitment and found a strong, positive relationship, thus concluding that trust may be a predictor of organisational commitment. Moreover, Nyhan (as cited in Tigere, 2008) notes that Blake and Mouton's (1984) view of trust is synonymous with mutual respect, and a key to developing affective commitment. Empirical research by Yilmaz (2008) found that one of the most important variables affecting organisational commitment is trust. This position is also supported by Podsakof et al. (1996) and Ugboro (2003). Yilmaz’s study (2008) found that teachers with high organisational trust show more commitment to their organisation. Laschinger et al. (2000) and Tan and Tan (2000) provide further insight on the relationship between organisational trust and commitment; they found that trust influences affective and continuance commitment. Others such as Fiorito et al. (2007) and Joo and Park (2010) reported a convergence of literature establishing the predictive power of organisational commitment in relation to turnover. Finally, Cosner (2009) provides a link between organisational trust, organisational commitment, and other variables.

Consistent with the literature reviewed above, the present study argues that:

**Proposition: 12**
Organisational trust has a significantly positive effect on affective organisational commitment.
2.3.13 Relationship between Perceived Organisational Support (POS) and Organisational Trust

When employees have trust in their organisations, their perception of the quality of an exchange relationship is enhanced. In accordance with this expression, Khazanchi (2005) found that trust is significantly and positively related to POS. The explanation is that when trust is built, leadership efforts at enforcing rules and workplace regulations are reduced; hence, control decreases when trust increases (West-Burnham & O’Sullivan, 1998). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) further indicate that high levels of POS are believed to trigger thoughts of trust and strong feelings of attachment to the organisation. In their own contribution, Hochwarter, Kacmar, Perrew, and Perrew (2003) regard trust as an essential element of the exchange relationship that is associated with POS. Hochwarter et al. (2003) further submit that when POS is prevalent, the employee believes that positive action will be compensated, while the organisation believes that providing an adequate level of reward will sustain positive behaviours.

Consistent with the literature cited above, this study proposes that:

**Proposition: 13**

POS has a significantly positive effect on organisational trust.

2.3.14 Relationship between Organisational Justice and Organisational Trust

An avalanche of research provides evidence to support a positive relationship between organisational justice and trust in the supervisor (Cameran et al., 2007; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Stinglhamber et al., 2006), as well as trust in the organisation (Aryee et al., 2002; Stinglhamber et al., 2006). In addition, the results from meta-analyses indicate a significant relationship between each dimension of organisational justice and trust (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). The results from these studies illustrate the importance of examining how both dimensions of trust (i.e., organisation and supervisor) influence various outcomes.

As identified by Konovsky and Pugh (1994), one important source of trust is procedural fairness. Procedural fairness, or procedural justice as it is sometimes referred to, is concerned with perceptions of fairness with regards to procedures and processes. Organisational agents have considerable impact on building trust, because as Konovsky (2000) argues, management’s fair treatment of employees can create feelings of trust by removing fears of argument and discrimination. This also extends to the perception that management has
respect for the rights and dignity of employees, thus leading to the development of trust (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Procedural justice is concerned with perceptions of fairness regarding procedures and processes. Folger and Konovsky (1989), for example, found that employees who perceived that their supervisors had conducted a performance evaluation in a fair manner tended to rate trust more positively. Similarly, Brockner and Siegel (1996) suggest that an individual’s positive views of processes and procedural justice were likely to be linked to higher levels of trust in the organisation and in supervisors. A study by Engelbrecht and Chamberlain (2005) concluded that trust in the supervisor is enhanced when leaders place emphasis on procedural fairness within the organisation because then leaders are seen to demonstrate that they follow principles of fairness. As human resource practices, distributive and procedural justice have been empirically shown to be related to trust in organisations (Pearce, Branyiczki & Bakacsi, 1994), while interactional justice has been found to be related to trust in the supervisor (Whitener, 1997). Whitener (1997) argued that employees’ trust in the organisation increases when supervisors build positive relations and fulfil employees’ perceptions of the organisation’s obligations.

Trust implies that perceptions of fairness (justice) will lead to increased trust in management (Brockner & Siegel, 1996). In addition, both Mayer et al. (1995) and Leventhal et al. (1980) emphasised the importance of consistency in their discussions of trust and procedural justice. Mayer et al. (1995, p. 719) stated that

“such issues as the consistency of the party's past actions…, belief that the trustee has a strong sense of justice, and the extent to which the party's actions are congruent with his or her words, all affect the degree to which the party is judged to have integrity.”

Thus, justice is implied to be an integral part of trust.

Only one study could be found that includes all three components of organisational justice and/or both measures of trust (Aryee et al., 2002). However, research indicates that all three forms of justice are distinct constructs (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001), and correlated highly with either organisational trust or supervisory trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

From a reasonable review of literature (e.g., Cropanzano & Folger, 1991; Sweeney & McFarlin, 1993), it was found that procedural justice affects the evaluation of the organisation and its authority by employees, and thus it would have a strong impact on trust in the organisation. This suggests that employees will have a high level of trust in an
organisation when they are assured of fair procedural treatment. Interactional justice, which refers to the quality of the interpersonal interaction between individuals, has been found to be a significant predictor of reactions to supervisors (Malatasta & Byrne, 1997; Masterson et al., 2000). An empirical study by Konovsky and Pugh (1994) also found a very high correlation between subordinates’ judgment of their supervisor’s interactional justice and their trust in the organisation. Further research has indicated that perceptions of distributive and procedural justice are related to trust in the organisation (Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). To the extent that the organisation is seen as responsible for the distribution of outcomes, it is logical to expect that distributive justice perceptions are related to organisational trust.

Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) contend that perceptions of procedural justice are linked to trust in the organisation because procedural fairness is an indication that the organisation acts with fairness in its dealings with employees, and therefore can be trusted. In the ‘group value model’ and in ‘self-interest theory’, Brockner and Siegel (1996) view procedures as organisational ‘traits’ that give information about how the organisation is likely to behave over time. Furthermore, Brockner and Siegel (1996) claim that although the structural aspects of procedural justice are dynamic and subject to change, the nature of institutional forces suggests that they are static and more likely to be stable over time for an organisation. Thus, if an organisation uses fair procedures once, they are believed to use fair procedures always; leading people to believe that the organisation can be trusted to act consistently in this manner in its future operations (Brockner & Siegel, 1996; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994).

Although much less research has been focused on examining the relationship between perceptions of interactional justice and organisational trust (Hubbell et al., 2005), a number of research has indicated that perceptions of interactional justice and organisational trust are positively related (Aryee et al., 2002; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Hubbell et al. (2005) explain that the paucity of research may be due to interactional justice being so directly associated with a specific individual communicating decisions or implementing procedures. Since supervisors are regarded as representatives of the organisation, management tend to pay attention to the supervisor's interpersonal communication style. Failure on the part of management to pay attention to supervisors’ interpersonal communication will leave employees to perceive that both the supervisor and the organisation are unjust and not to be trusted.
Although all three types of organisational justice have been found to predict organisational trust, Hubbell et al. (2005) suggest that the predictive strength of a given justice perception varies depending on the type of trust it is predicting. For example, many scholars suggest that perceptions of procedural justice affect reactions such as trust in the organisation, while perceptions of interactional justice affect reactions such as trust in supervisors (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Bies & Moag, 1986; Brockner & Siegel, 1996; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Masterson et al., 2000). As managerial trust involves a specific person, it is likely to be most strongly predicted by the type of justice that is most directly under the control of the individual (Flaherty & Pappas, 2000). This type is likely to be interactional justice, as it involves perceptions related to the communication of the individual manager, which is likely to originate from the person (i.e., the organisation cannot reasonably control how sensitive or respectful the manager is). In contrast, procedures, and thus, procedural justice, are more likely to be controlled by, or at least constrained by, the larger organisational system (i.e., managers may not be able to deviate from an organisation's evaluation criteria, even if they want to) (Hubbell et al., 2005).

Drawing from the variety of evidence provided by existing literature, this study proposes that:

**Proposition: 14**

Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on organisational trust.

**2.3.15 Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Organisational Trust**

Empirical research on the topic of leadership has witnessed an impressive increase, which has resulted in the development of diverse leadership theories (Dinh et al., 2014). Despite this, it is only in recent years that research has focused on the variables that mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and work outcomes, such as followers’ development of trust in the leader (Zhu et al., 2013). Earlier literature on transformational leadership (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985) argues that effective transformational leaders earn the trust of their followers; on this basis, the literature suggests a direct relationship between transformational leadership and trust. Bass (1985) similarly posits that trust may also be important to transformational leaders because of the need to mobilise follower commitment to the leader’s vision. It will therefore be logical to suggest that a leader who is not trusted by his or her followers may not successfully achieve commitment to a vision because lack of confidence in
the leader reduces the attraction of the vision. It is against this background that Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) argue that trust is an important antecedent to risk-taking behaviour. Transformational leaders stimulate their followers intellectually to be creative in problem-solving and experiments; therefore, if transformational leaders wish to motivate their followers to experiment and be innovative, they may have to set a personal example in order to win the trust of their followers. Podsakoff et al. (1990) showed that trust, conceptualised as faith in and loyalty to the leader, was directly related to transformational leadership. Transformational leaders formulate and communicate visions that are beyond the usual; thus, for them to get people to become committed to their visions, they have to develop trust from their subordinates (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

A recent study by Marques de Lima Rua and Araújo (2013) found a directly positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational trust, with transformational leadership enhancing organisational trust. In a previous research finding, Ngodo (2008) similarly established a significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational trust. Ngodo (2008) explained that the strongest implication that can be drawn from this research finding is that trust plays a central role in the transformational leader’s work. This would imply that for a transformational leader to succeed in translating his or her extraordinary vision into a visible reality, the leader needs to build and sustain an attitude of trust among members of the organisation or group. In practical terms, this means that as long as the individual member of the organisation can sustain an attitude of trust in the long-term fairness of his or her ties with the organisation and its leadership, he or she would be willing to perform beyond expectations to achieve the organisation’s goals.

Notwithstanding the various research findings that indicate positive relationships between transformational leadership and organisational trust, Krafft, Engelbrecht, and Theron (2004) failed to establish support for a significant direct relationship between transformational leadership and trust. They, however, provided a new insight into the extent that interactional justice probably plays a mediating role in the relationship between transformational leadership and trust. Krafft et al. (2004) explained that for transformational leaders to instil trust, they have to treat employees in a sensitive and considerate manner. The emphasis in the achievement of trust is on the quality of interaction and not necessarily the procedure itself.
In a similar research finding, Engelbrecht and Chamberlain (2005) reported an indirect relationship between transformational leadership and trust through procedural justice.

The present study, consistent with major research findings, proposes that:

**Proposition: 15**
Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on organisational trust.

### 2.3.16 Relationship between Psychological Empowerment and Organisational Trust

In order to create organisational trust, it is important that organisations make employees feel supported, by providing them with material rewards, such as increasing their income and autonomy at work (Tan & Tan, 2000; Kim et al., 2005). A study by Chen et al. (2008) found a significant positive relationship between subordinates’ trust and perceived empowerment by their employers. Furthermore, Ergeneli, Ari, and Metin (2007) revealed a significant relationship between cognition-based trust in immediate managers and overall psychological empowerment. Ergeneli et al. (2007) found that cognition-based trust related to meaning and competence aspects, whereas affect-based trust related to impact only. The study did not, however, establish any relationship between types of trust in the immediate manager and self-determination. In a related study by Findikli, Gulden, and Semercioz (2010), it was established that trust in a supervisor positively affects employees’ psychological empowerment in terms of meaning and competence. This finding is consistent with that of Gomez and Rosen (2001), who investigated the relationship between managerial trust and employee empowerment, revealing that managerial trust affected perceived empowerment through manager-employee relationships. Gomez and Rosen (2001) provided evidence that management highlights employees’ awareness of the importance of their work and contributions to the achievement of organisational goals, thus giving importance and meaning to the role of employees in the organisation. Findikli et al. (2010) further found that trust in a supervisor affects psychological empowerment in terms of competence, when the period of job experience is taken into consideration. This research finding is supported by a plethora of similar studies (e.g., Tan & Tan, 2000; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Colquitt, Scott & LePine, 2007; Brower et al., 2009), which explain that employees who believe that their supervisors trust their competence on the job become more responsible towards their supervisors, thus using their skills more effectively with less supervision.

Consistent with the findings of the above studies, this research proposes that:
Proposition: 16
Psychological empowerment has a significantly positive effect on organisational trust.

2.3.17 Relationship between Organisational Trust and Psychological Contract Breach/Violation

The pool of arguments derived from literature suggests that employees perceive breaches through the existing levels of trust that they have in their organisation. Indeed, Robinson (1996) found that trust moderates the relation between contract breaches and future trust. In their consideration of how much effort they want to expend on behalf of the organisation, there is the tendency that employees who perceive betrayal of trust will be more inclined to reduce their contribution to the organisation. Mayer et al. (1995) contend that employees who experienced a psychological breach and violation display higher risks in trusting their employer. Therefore, a contract breach or violation would amount to a substantial damage of the trust-based relationship between the organisation and its employees (Matthijs, Bal Dan, Chiaburu & Jansen, 2010). Researchers have revealed that the breach of a psychological contract significantly influences organisational commitment (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006; Grimmer & Oddy, 2007; Lemire & Rouillard, 2005). Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2000) suggest that when faced with a contract violation, employees seek to redress the imbalance in their relationship with their employers by deliberately reducing their commitment. Tekleab, Takeuchi, and Taylor (2005) found that perception of a breach results in decreased motivation and commitment to the organisation, with the possible outcome being the intention to quit.

A considerable number of studies have also reported on the negative relationship between psychological contract breaches and work attitudes (i.e., an employees’ evaluation of their organisation and job), such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment (e.g., Cassar & Briner, 2011; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Eisenberger et al., 1997; Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood & Bolino, 2002; Schalk & Roe, 2007; Zhao et al., 2007).

An early seminal study by Davis and Todd (1985) postulated a decrease in the level of trust and respect when an employer breaks a basic rule in work relationships, such as good faith and fair treatment. Gabarro and Athos (1976) identified a number of bases of trust within business relationships, which include beliefs regarding the other’s integrity, motives, and intentions. Other bases identified by Gabarro and Athos (1976) are behavioural consistency,
openness, and discreteness. Each of these bases can be undermined through psychological contract violations. The authors further contended that an employer’s integrity becomes doubtful if the employer fails to deliver on a promise, and such violation could lead an employee to also lose trust in the employer’s initial motives in building and maintaining a symbiotic relationship (Gabarro & Athos, 1976). Such loss of trust in the employer as a result of violations may also impair the confidence of an employee in the employer’s ability to honour the terms of future contractual obligations (Gabarro & Athos, 1976).

A psychological contract breach/violation is known to diminish the level of trust in an employment relationship because it undermines the relational bond between the parties (Lo & Aryee, 2003). Apart from relational bonds, Robinson (1996) contended that when an employee perceives a contract breach/violation by the employer, he or she perceives an inconsistency between the employer's words and actions. As a result, the employee loses confidence that present contributions to the organisation will be reciprocated as promised by the employer, in the future. The lack of trust in the employer to reciprocate good deeds in the future undermines the link between performance and outcomes, which results in a decline in the quality of the employee’s contribution to the organisation (Katz, Porter & Lawler, as cited in Robinson, 1996). Trust develops from the relational bonds between parties and is manifested in the express assumptions that all parties in a social relationship will treat each other with respect and show concern for their respective well-being (Robinson, 1996). Following this assertion, Robinson (1996) observed that a psychological contract breach leads employees to believe that the organisation does not care about their well-being and that the organisation cannot be trusted to honour its obligations. As a consequence, a psychological contract breach has been found to negatively influence employees' attitudes toward their organisations and jobs (e.g., Lester et al., 2002; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994).

Rousseau (1989) has argued that failure to meet employees’ expectations and a loss of trust, both mediate the relationships between a psychological contract breach/violation and employees' behavioural reactions. According to Rousseau (1989), research has repeatedly shown that when unmet expectations occur, employees experience 'reality shock', which results in dissatisfaction with the status quo, decreased performance, and heightened turnover. Psychological contract theorists, however, contend that the effect of a psychological contract violation extends beyond unmet expectations because apart from a loss of something
expected, it also involves an erosion of trust and weakens the foundation of the relationship between the two parties (Rousseau 1989). Rousseau (1989, p. 129) stated further that

“the intensity of the reaction (to violation) is directly attributable not only to unmet expectations of specific rewards or benefits, but also to more general beliefs about respect of persons, codes of conduct and other patterns of behaviour associated with relationships involving trust”.

Montes and Irving (2008) explain that trust was a central element to relational, but not transactional breach effects. This is because the terms and conditions of transactional contracts are explicitly stated, while remedies are stipulated for breaches. The relational nature of trust comprises both cognitive and emotional elements. Cognitive elements of trust are thought to include the evaluation of costs, benefits, and risks associated with a particular breach, whereas the emotional component is believed to incorporate emotions that construct trust (e.g., interest, admiration), sustain trust (e.g., affection, gratitude), and facilitate enjoyment of the relationship (e.g., contentment, satisfaction) (Young & Daniel, 2003). When management fails to keep its promises, an employee’s trust is weakened and sometimes completely lost, thus culminating in the employee feeling a sense of betrayal and anger (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). As a consequence, the social exchange between employer and employee is no longer based on a strong foundation of trust, which has been shown to have a number of benefits for organisations, such as positive effects on attitudes, perceptions, behaviours, and performance outcomes (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002).

Based on the foregoing literature and empirical evidence presented, this study proposes that:

**Proposition: 17**

Organisational trust has a significantly negative effect on psychological contract violation.

**2.3.18 Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Organisational Justice**

Transformational leaders are recognised as facilitating and encouraging employees to express their concerns (Wells & Peachey, 2011); a role that is linked to the justice theory. It has been suggested that organisations may experience lower levels of intention to quit when employees are able to express their concerns regarding the fairness of organisational processes (Wells & Peachey, 2011). The concepts of transformational leadership and organisational justice have been discussed in various sections above. Cropanzano (1993) observed an intimate
relationship between organisational justice and both leadership and decision-making processes. It is a well-established expression in the literature of organisational justice that employees’ perception of procedural justice is reinforced when they are involved in decision-making processes (Bass, as cited in Engelbrecht & Chamberlain, 2005). Transformational leaders are expected to create enabling organisational systems that members perceive as fair, transparent, and caring. It then follows that in a just and ethical organisation, the decisions that leaders make should reflect fair treatment of individuals and concern for their welfare (Tatum et al., 2003). Procedural justice therefore constitutes a central element in the definition and functioning of transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 2004; Pillai et al., 1999). Further to the element of justice in the functioning of transformational leadership, is the empowerment role. Empowerment implies allowing members of the organisation a voice in decision-making processes. It also entails ensuring that each employee receives equitable treatment, as well as support and encouragement to take initiative in solving work problems (Bhatnagar, 2005). It is in consideration of the above literature that Ngodo (2008) empirically established a positive relationship between transformational leadership and procedural justice.

Both theoretically and empirically, evidence has been advanced to support the crucial roles that procedural justice plays in subordinates’ perception of leadership (Engelbrecht & Chamberlain, 2005; Pillai et al., 1999; Yusof & Shamsuri, 2006). Subordinates’ perception of procedural justice, for example, is enhanced by leadership behaviours, which include the ability of subordinates to influence outcomes of decisions that affect them, and also ensuring that the leader-follower relationship is based on equity. Many studies (e.g., Pillai et al., 1999; Yusof & Shamsuri, 2006) have provided evidence to show that organisational commitment and trust in the leader are positively affected when people perceive that fair procedures have been used to determine the outcomes they receive. Furthermore, Pillai et al. (1999) and Yusof and Shamsuri (2006) have shown that procedural justice strengthens the individual employee’s attachment to the leader and has a strong relationship with transformational leadership. Other authors (e.g., Moorman, 1991) also assert that in addition to affecting subordinates’ positive attitudes toward the decisions that leaders make, procedural justice has a unique function of helping to strengthen the individual’s relationship with the leader.

The procedural justice and equity functions of transformational leadership are defined within the contexts of idealised influence and inspirational motivation (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999). These linkages have been empirically supported by authors (e.g., Walumbwa & Lawler,
2003; Zhu et al., 2005), who indicate the crucial roles that procedural justice plays in the functions of transformational leaders. A South African study conducted by Engelbrecht and Chamberlain (2005, p. 9) provides “credibility to the theory that suggests transformational leaders foster perceptions of fairness (procedural justice) by, for instance, treating subordinates equitably, supporting employees, and allowing them to participate in decision-making processes”. Engelbrecht and Chamberlain’s (2005) finding of a positive relationship supports the view that transformational leaders influence employees’ perceptions of justice based on social exchange relationships. The research finding is consistent with those of Pillai et al. (1999) and Krafft, Engelbrecht, and Theron (2004).

Consistent with the various research outcomes discussed above, this study argues that:

**Proposition: 18**

Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on organisational justice.

**2.3.19 Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Psychological Empowerment**

Previous theory and research provide support regarding the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment (Allameh et al., 2012; Dinh et al., 2014). For example, Bono and Judge (2003) found that followers of transformational leaders viewed their work as more important and consistent with their own values. This supports the notion that followers of transformational leaders would believe that they are more empowered, perhaps through greater autonomy, meaning, and ownership of their work. Transformational leaders have been documented to motivate their followers through the following mechanisms: by increasing followers’ self-efficacy, by facilitating followers’ social identification with their group or organisation, and by linking the organisation’s work values to those of their follower’s (Shamir et al., 1993). These linkages allow followers to feel greater levels of self-determination in their work and to increase their level of perceived empowerment. In a more direct test of the relationship between transformational leadership and employee empowerment, Dvir et al. (2002) conducted an intervention study and found evidence that followers’ perceptions of transformational leadership in their supervisor led to a greater sense of follower empowerment.

A research finding by Schlechter and Engelbrecht (2006) provides evidence of a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and meaning (a major component of empowerment). The finding supports the notion that transformational leaders can exert an
influence on the extent to which followers find meaning, by affecting what people do and how they value what they do and achieve. According to Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000), leadership empowerment behaviour includes six dimensions: delegation of authority, accountability for outcomes, self-directed decision-making, information-sharing, skills development, and coaching for innovative performance.

Delegation of authority entails the leader granting power to his/her subordinates. The essence of delegation of authority is to increase intrinsic task motivation by influencing task assessments in relation to psychological empowerment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Accountability for outcomes concerns the leader’s emphasis on subordinates taking responsibility for consequences. Empowerment devolves power and provides a means through which individuals assume responsibility for their own performance. Self-directed decision-making entails that the leader encourages independent decision-making. Information-sharing entails that leaders share information and knowledge that enables employees to contribute optimally to organisational performance. Skills development concerns the leader facilitating (rather than directing and/or controlling) skills development and securing the appropriate training of employees (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991). Lastly, coaching for performance is related to behaviour that encourages considered and careful risk-taking and new ideas, and that provides performance feedback to employees, treating their mistakes and setbacks as opportunities to learn (Konczak et al., 2000).

The relationship with one’s leader can have an effect on employees’ perceptions of the safety of the work environment. A supportive leader who displays concerns for employees’ needs and feelings, such as providing positive feedback, encouraging employees to voice their concerns, developing employees’ skills, and solving employees’ work-related problems, will enhance the self-efficacy of employees and their interest in their work (May et al., 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2001). Employees under this type of supportive leader will feel a sense of safety, rather than intimidation in the work environment.

Given the dimensions of empowerment as articulated above, research such as that undertaken by Spreitzer, De Janaz, and Quinn (1999) found a positive relationship between empowerment and transformational leadership. These researchers posited that empowered individuals do not wait passively for the work environment to provide direction; instead, they take a proactive approach toward shaping and influencing their work environment. Further research (e.g., by Dvir et al., 2002) also found evidence that transformational leadership led
to empowerment and to subsequent engagement in the task, self-efficacy, and an independent thinking approach. Avolio et al. (2004) similarly found that transformational leadership led to empowerment and commitment. Kark et al. (2003) also suggested that transformational leadership is related to employee empowerment and transforms followers into leaders, thus making meaning out of work and providing autonomy. Bono and Judge (2003) reported that followers of transformational leaders viewed their work as more important and consistent with their personal values. This supports the belief that followers of transformational leaders are more empowered, perhaps through greater autonomy, meaning, and assuming ownership of their work (Avey et al., 2008). In the light of above findings, this study argues that:

Proposition: 19

Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on psychological empowerment.

2.3.20 The conceptual model informing this study

The model in Figure 2.1 presents both the direct and the mediating relationships between various latent variables and intention to quit as a dependent variable. While some of the independent variables impact directly on intention to quit, others mediate through other variables. For example, the model demonstrates a direct relationship between the following variables and intention to quit: transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, organisational justice, POS, affective organisational commitment, organisational trust, and psychological contract violation. Furthermore, the relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit may be mediated by various variables, such as organisational justice and affective organisational commitment, or by psychological empowerment, organisational trust, and psychological contract violation, or by POS and affective organisational commitment.

Various postulations have been formulated to depict the direction and strength of these relationships. These postulations are tested in a subsequent chapter of this study, in order to confirm or reject the validity of the relationships shown in the model.

As shown in different sections of this chapter, all these relationships have been well established through the theoretical and empirical literature reviews. The structural testing and validation of the proposed model is reported in the empirical part of this study.
2.4 Summary of this chapter

This chapter has presented an overview of previous models of intention to quit. This was done in order to demonstrate the existence of different perspectives on the study of intention to quit. This chapter has also provided a conceptualisation and theoretical composition of each of the selected constructs. This was followed by an evaluation of the relationships that exist between the selected constructs and intention to quit, on the one hand, and the mediating influences of other constructs, on the other hand. Based on the theoretical and empirical
evaluation of the constructs documented in the literature, propositions have been formulated and proposed to give this study a solid direction. Finally, this chapter presented the conceptual structural model of antecedents of intention to quit, and provided an explanation of the conceptual model.

The next chapter presents and discusses the methodology that was used to conduct the empirical component of this study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION
The primary objective of this study was to develop and validate a conceptual structural model that demonstrated a mediating relationship between selected psychological constructs and an employee’s intention to quit an organisation, as a dependent variable. This primary objective necessitated the development of a fundamental research question as stated in Chapter one of this dissertation. The theoretical argument presented in the literature study (Chapter 2) provided the basis for the development of a conceptual model of the antecedents of intention to quit (depicted in Figure 2.1), which hypothesised specific structural relationships between the latent variables. Therefore, it has become necessary to test the conceptual structural model. However, to reach a meaningful conclusion regarding the validity of the structural model, depends to a large extent on the appropriateness of the research methodology that was employed to arrive at such a conclusion.

3.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
Research methodology is a collective term for the structured process of conducting research. According to Babbie and Mouton (2006) research methodology serves the epistemic ideal of science. Science is committed to an “epistemic imperative” to search for valid explanations. Such explanations can only be regarded as permissible to the extent to which the explanation closely fits the available data. If the methodology that is used is only explained partially, it would not be possible to evaluate the merits of the resulting conclusions. Such descriptions and the motivation for the choices that were made, would make it possible for other researchers to identify possible methodological flaws and to determine to what extent a given flaw will influence the validity of these conclusions (Babbie & Mouton, 2006). To establish the reader’s confidence in the scope and quality of the procedures that were used in this study, the research process and the choice of the methodology that were used in this study are discussed in the following sections. This chapter also discusses the following: the research design, sampling strategy, data collection procedure, the measuring instruments, and a description of the statistical analysis procedures that were used to analyse collected data.
3.2.1 The research design and justification
The need to empirically test the merit of the structural relations, as hypothesised by the conceptual structural model (Figure 2.1) requires an appropriate research design. A strategic framework or plan that guides research activity to ensure that sound conclusions are reached, is known as research design (Terre-Blanche, Durrheim & Painter, 2006). Similarly, Babbie and Mouton (2006) define the research design as a plan or a blue print of how a researcher intends to conduct a study. The research design aims to provide answers to the research question, and it also endeavours to control variance (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Variance, according to Theron (2007), represents the extent to which the value of a variable differs/varies across units of analysis. The unambiguosness with which the empirical evidence can be interpreted for or against the operational hypotheses, is largely determined by the degree to which the research design is able to minimise error variance, maximise systematic variance and control extraneous variance (Kerlinger, 1973).

Developing and validating the conceptual model (Figure 2.1) involves the facilitation of a research process, necessitating a particular research design which will set up a framework that is required to regulate the manner in which the validity of the hypothesised relations among the variables will be examined. The plan and structure of the present research is best achieved within the realms of the quantitative research design paradigm. Cooper and Schindler (2003, p.563) describe a quantitative research design as a “systematic scientific investigation of quantitative properties and phenomena and their relationship”. The objective of a quantitative approach is to develop and employ mathematical models, theories and/or hypotheses pertaining to a phenomenon. The provision of measurement is central to quantitative research, because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. Leedy and Ormrod (2001) further contend that quantitative research allows for data to be rigorously tested by using statistical means that enhance reliability.

The research question, and relevant evidence that is required to address this question, would best be achieved by making use of an ex post facto research design. Ex post facto research is a systematic empirical enquiry whereby the independent variables cannot be manipulated and their manifestations have already occurred. The researcher uses neither random assignment nor experimental manipulation of the independent variables, primarily because the researcher lacks direct control over the independent variables, either because their manifestations have already occurred, or because they are not inherently manipulable. This allows the researcher
to investigate variables that would be impossible or unethical to study through manipulation (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Although ex post facto research designs are widely used in studies, they do however have three limitations (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000):

1) the inability to manipulate the independent variables;
2) the lack of power to randomise; and
3) the risk of improper interpretations.

Regardless of these limitations, Kerlinger and Lee further contended that this particular research design is ideally suited to social sciences research, as the inability to manipulate variables implies that the variables are measured as they exist normally. Consequently, researchers are able to investigate variables that would be impossible or unethical to study through manipulation.

The current study employed correlational research, which is a type of relational research. The purpose of a correlational research strategy is to examine and describe the associations and indirect relationships in data, and it permits the researcher to objectively establish which variables are closely associated with, and/or influence one another. More specifically, both the independent and dependent variable(s) are observed across individuals in an attempt to identify any patterns of relationship that exist between the two variables, as well as to measure the strength of the particular relationship (Gravetter & Forzano, 2006). The main drawback of correlational designs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) is that it cannot be used to demonstrate cause-and-effect relationships between variables. However, this approach offers strong support to the structural equations model theory that is used to (a) test the validity of theories about sequential relationships between two or more variables that have been studied in a correlational research design and (b) determine the combination of variables that predict a particular variable (Kerlinger, 1992).

3.2.1.1 Survey research

In order to provide an answer to the research questions and the resultant propositions, a survey methodology that used standardised measuring instruments, was followed. Primary data was collected through standardised questionnaires that allows for numerical manipulation. Survey research entails the administration of questionnaires to a sample of respondents that forms part of a larger population, in order to discover the relative incidence, distribution, and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Surveys take various forms including mail, self-administered, face-to-face and
telephone surveys and they can be utilised for descriptive, exploratory and explanatory research.

The self-administered survey (in which respondents independently complete questionnaires) and online survey methods were employed in this study. These methods are only appropriate when the population that is being studied is adequately literate—a requirement that was set to all respondents. These data collection methods hold certain advantages: (a) they make the analysis of large datasets possible through the use of computer technology, (b) they are relatively inexpensive and concise, enabling quick completion, (c) they minimise interviewer bias and is largely accurate, (d) they allow for anonymous and honest responses from respondents, and (e) they minimise or even eliminate the problem of missing values in a data set. Some disadvantages of survey research include: (a) the possible low response rate to the survey and a chance for significant response bias, (b) the researcher's lack of control over the conditions accompanying questionnaire completion, (c) receiving incomplete questionnaires, and (d) the researcher's lack of observation with regard to how respondents react towards questions and the research setting (Babbie & Mouton, 2006; Newman, 1997; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Due to the assumption that survey studies employ statistical techniques, it is appropriate to elaborate on statistical modelling studies in the following section.

3.2.1.2 Statistical modelling studies

Although survey studies provide a broad overview of the phenomenon being studied, they lack the ability to evaluate the theoretical models developed through a literature review. To overcome this limitation, statistical modelling studies must also be combined with survey studies. The theoretical model is developed through a process of theorising about the process as observed in previous research studies. Data collected through the use of survey studies is used to quantitatively validate the theoretical model. Most often multivariate statistical analyses are used to evaluate and validate theoretical models. These analyses include multiple regression analysis and structural equation modelling (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Babbie & Mouton, 2006). Multiple regression and structural equation modelling are discussed later in this section.

Both survey as well as statistical modelling studies have the use of survey data based on a sample, in common. This highlights the importance of choosing a sample that is appropriate for the study regarding sample size, level of education and other prerequisites of the specific
study. The importance of sampling and the sampling design that are used for this study are elaborated on in the next section.

3.3 THE SAMPLE

3.3.1 The Sampling Strategy
A distinction is made between probability sampling (i.e., random samples, stratified samples, systematic samples and cluster samples) and non-probability sampling (accidental samples, quota samples, snowball samples, purposive samples and convenience samples). Probability sampling remains the optimal method of sampling as it aims to “select a set of elements from a population in such a way that descriptions of those elements (statistics) accurately portray the parameters of the total population from which the elements are selected” (Babbie & Mouton, 2006, p. 175). Although this method of sampling is the ultimate, this type of sampling method is not always practical or even attainable in social research. Thus, non-probability sampling techniques are often the most practical alternative. For the reasons stated above, the present study made use of non-probability sampling as a means of generating an appropriate sample. Although this method of sampling was the most viable option, the study cannot claim to have sampled a representative subset of people working in South African organisations. This particularly, is due to the use of a convenient sample.

3.3.2 The Data Collection Procedure
The sample consisted of 232 employees that are operating within various organisations in South Africa. A questionnaire, measuring organisational trust, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support, organisational justice, turnover intention, affective organisational commitment, psychological contract violation and transformational leadership, was either physically handed to the respondent in the form of a pencil and paper format, or it was made available as an online composite questionnaire, depending on the respondent’s preference. The online survey was completed by 40 respondents, while the remaining 192 respondents chose to complete the questionnaire in pencil and paper format. The cover letter which was included in both the online survey and the hard copy, explicating the reasons for the research, as well as for the aim of the study with emphasis on the confidentiality of responses, and the constructive nature in which the results of the study were to be utilised. Due to the sensitive nature of this study, consent to participate in this study did not require any participant to reveal his/her identity. Items were however included in the demographic questionnaire that pertained to the industry in which the respondent’s organisation represented the South African economy, as well as the age, race and gender of the
respondent. Information regarding the respondent’s level of professional qualification was also obtained.

The electronic questionnaire was designed in such a way that respondents could provide only one answer per item and that all items had to be answered in order to proceed to the subsequent section. Thus, the only responses that were used, were those from respondents who had completed all the sections correctly. Prior to the respondent completing the electronic questionnaire, an email request was sent to the individuals to request their participation in the study, as well as a link to the online questionnaire (as described above) that was developed and kept on the web server of the University of Stellenbosch. To view the questionnaire, participants were instructed to click on the link, which then opened the web form of the questionnaire. In order to complete the required fields, participants were requested to tick an electronic box at the end of the cover letter, confirming that they accept the conditions and agree to participate voluntarily in the study. The raw data was then collected from the web questionnaire into a Microsoft Excel database, which was then used as input for the two statistical programmes that were utilised in conducting the statistical analyses. These programmes include SPSS (version 17) and partial least squares modelling (PLS) and they are discussed in detail in section 3.8.

3.3.3 The Demographic Profile of the Sample

The overall sample consisted of 101 males (49.8%) and 102 females (50.2%). The sample presented an average age of 37.53 years, which indicates that the majority of the respondents were aged between 21 - 30 years (30.90%). The race distribution of the sample was as follows: African (67.2%), Coloured (10.8%), Asian (1.5%), White (18.1%) and other (2.5%). The sample was also compiled from respondents in different companies and organisations from three economic sectors, namely public sector (46.8%), private sector (46.3%) and parastatal (6.9%), with the majority of them working in the Eastern Cape Province (67.5%). The majority of the respondents came from middle level management (40.8%), with the highest educational level as above matriculation (83.3%). The majority of the respondents also have less than 5 years of total work experience (28.57%) and they have served for a period of less than 5 years under their current supervisors (50.69%). These descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-managerial</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level management</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level management</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper level management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than matric.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-matric.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parastatal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period under current supervisor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total work experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 MISSING VALUES

Multivariate data sets more often than not contain missing values, which in this case, was a result of the unwillingness of the respondent to answer a particular item on the survey questionnaire. Subsequently, missing values presented a problem that had to be addressed before the analysis could proceed. According to Pigott (2001), selecting the most suitable method of managing missing values was not an easy task, as different methods require certain assumptions about the nature of the data, and the reasons for the missing values are not openly acknowledged or observable during the data gathering phase. Spangenberg and Theron (2004) believe that the traditional way in which missing values are dealt with, is the use of list-wise deletion to generate a data set that would only contain the complete data cases. However, the problem with this approach is that due to the extent of the problem and the length of the questionnaire, the sample size would be dramatically reduced, making any meaningful statistical analysis impossible.

In order to avoid the problem of a diminished data set, the possibility of using imputation as a method to solve the missing value problem was explored. Lohr (1999) contends that imputation is commonly used to assign values to the missing items. The substitute values replaced for a case are derived from one or more other cases that have a similar response pattern over a set of matching variables (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). The main advantage of multiple imputations is that they reflect the uncertainty of estimates whilst delivering plausible values, in other words, they correct for bias by conducting several imputations for each missing value (Raghunathan, 2004). However, one should take note that although this method is considered relatively robust, the model that was used to generate the imputations will only be approximately true (Schafer, 1999). Although ideally one would want to use matching variables that will not be utilised in the confirmatory factor analysis, this will not be possible in this case. Thus, the items least plagued by missing values were identified first to serve as matching variables. The PRELIS programme (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996) was used to impute missing values, which proved to be an effective response to the missing value problem. By default, cases that contained missing values after imputation, were eliminated. After imputation, 207 of the original 232 cases, with observations on all the items included in the questionnaire, remained in the validation sample.
3.5 MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Both the self-administered and the online questionnaires contained measures of organisational trust, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support, organisational justice, turnover intention, affective organisational commitment, psychological contract violation and transformational leadership. The questionnaire items were compiled by using existing credible measuring instruments that were developed and used in previous studies, and whose validity and reliability have been tested. The following measuring instruments were therefore chosen from these established measuring instruments to measure the constructs under investigation.

3.5.1 Intention to quit

Intention to quit was measured using the six-item scale adapted from Cohen (1993) (2 items), De Coninck and Johnson (2009) (1 item), and Becker (1992) (3 items). The items were measured on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly) was used. The respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with items such as “I think a lot about leaving the organisation”, “Within the next six months, I would rate the likelihood of leaving my present job as high”, “It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in the next year”.

3.5.2 Perceived organisational support

The current study adapted 12 items from the original version of the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) (Eisenberger et al., 1986) as modified and used by Cho et al. (2009) to measure perceived organisational support. A 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly) was used. Two sample items are: “The organisation values my contribution to its well-being”; “The organisation cares about my opinions”.

In addition to the original 36-item instrument, a 17-item version of the POS survey was introduced by Eisenberger et al. (1986) by selecting high-loading items from the 36-item set. The 36-item SPOS demonstrated high reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of .97 and item-total correlations ranging from .42 to .83 (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The mean and median item-total correlations were .67 and .66, respectively. Several studies (Eisenberger et al., 1986; 1997; Settoon et al., 1996) have provided evidence of the unidimensional nature, the high internal reliability, and construct validity (Shore and Tetrick, 1991) of the instrument’s items. SPOS has also proved to be distinguishable from commitment (affective, continuance) (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), and it was reported to be positively related to work performance.
(Hekman *et al.*, 2009; Liao *et al.*, 2009), leader-member exchange, affective commitment, and trust (Dulac *et al.*, 2008).

### 3.5.3 Affective organisational commitment
Affective organizational commitment was measured through an 8-item scale adapted from Allen and Meyer’s (1996) Organizational Commitment Scale, which measures the three dimensionality of organisational commitment (affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment). All the items were measured using a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly).

The reliability of the affective commitment scale was above .60 (Allen & Meyer, 1996). The scale was also used in previous studies by Karim and Noor (2006), which found a Cronbach alpha of .81, as well as Yilmaz (2008), which reported a reliability coefficient of .66. A sample item is, “I do feel emotionally attached to this organisation”.

The Affective Organisational Commitment Scale was the only subscale of the three subscales of the Allen and Meyer’s Commitment Scale that was used.

### 3.5.4 Organisational trust
Organisational trust was measured by using an adapted 24-item Workplace Trust Survey (WTS) developed by Ferres and Travaglione (2004). For the purpose of this study only two of the three subscales of the WTS were used, namely Trust in the supervisor/leader (10 items) and Trust in the Organisation (14 items). A 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly) was used.

The reliability for the subscales is .96 for trust in the supervisor, and .95 for trust in the organization (Ferres & Travaglione, 2004). Concurrent validity was established by correlating the subscale of trust in the organization with the subscale of Cook and Wall (1980) regarding trust in management (r = .91). The scale was previously used in South African studies (Schlechter, 2006; Van Staden, 2007). Schlechter (2006) found a reliability coefficient of .96 for the total scale, and a .95 for the Trust in the organisation and a .92 for the Trust in the leader sub-scales. Van Staden (2007) found a reliability coefficient of .94 for Trust in the supervisor sub-scale.

### 3.5.5 Psychological contract violation
Psychological contract violation was measured using the 4-item Psychological Contract Violation Scale. The Psychological Contract Violation Scale was adapted from the
Psychological Contract Breach and Violation Scale developed by Robinson and Morrison (2000). The scale was adapted and used in a study by Knights and Kennedy (2005), which found a Cronbach alpha of .84. A 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly) was used to measure the items.

The psychological contract violation scale used in this study assessed respondents’ perceptions regarding the extent to which their organisations have failed to fulfil their obligations and promises in a number of areas. Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agree with statements such as:

“I feel betrayed by my organisation.”

“I feel extremely frustrated by how I have been treated by my organisation.”

“I feel that my organisation has violated the contract between us.”

3.5.6 Organisational justice
An adapted 21-item Organisational Justice Scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was used to measure distributive justice (5 items), procedural justice (6 items) and interactional justice (9 items). One additional item was adapted from the Interactional Justice Scale developed by Colquitt (2001).

The measure was assessed on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 6 (agree strongly). Niehoff and Moorman (1993) found a Cronbach alpha of .918 for the 20-item scale, an alpha value of .786 for distributive justice, an alpha of .826 for procedural justice, and an alpha of .894 for the interactional justice subscale. A sample item for distributive justice is, “My work schedule is fair”. A sample item for procedural justice is, “Job decisions are made by my supervisor/manager in an unbiased manner”. A sample item for the interactional justice subscale is, “My supervisor/manager offers adequate justification for decisions made about my job”. The scale was previously used by Najafi et al. (2011) who found a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .83 for the combined scales. Leouw and Khong (2009) also found a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .94 for interactional justice .91 for distributive justice and .89 for procedural justice.

3.5.7 Psychological empowerment
Psychological empowerment was assessed with the 15-item Menon Empowerment Scale (Kotze, Menon & Vos, 2007), comprising three five-item subscales, which reflect perceived control (e.g. “I can influence the way work is done in my department”), perceived
competence (e.g. “I have the skills and abilities to do my job well”) and goal internalisation (e.g. “I am inspired by the goals of the organisation”). Respondents had to indicate their degree of agreement on a six-point Likert scale (1 = disagree strongly; 6 = agree strongly). Menon (2001) reported alpha reliability coefficients of .83, .80 and .88 for the three scales respectively. Menon (2001) also provided strong evidence of construct validity of the scale. Kotze et al. (2007) found a reliability coefficient of .90 for the total Menon Empowerment Scale in the South African context.

3.5.8 Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was measured by the 20-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) and adapted by Engelbrecht, Van Aswegen and Theron (2005). Transformational leadership was assessed through four subscales: 1) idealised influence (8 items), 2) inspirational motivation (4 items), 3) intellectual stimulation (4 items), and 4) individualised consideration (4 items).

Pillai et al. (1999) identified the MLQ as the most widely used measurement of transformational leadership and Bass (1997) also cited an extensive range of studies from almost all sectors across all continents, to support the reliability and validity of the original questionnaire.

In earlier studies, Cronbach alpha coefficients of 0.93 for idealised influence, .72 for inspirational motivation, .81 for intellectual stimulation, and .75 for individualised consideration have been found for the transformational leadership subscales (Den Hartog et al., 1997). Lowe et al. (1996) reported similar Cronbach alpha coefficients for these dimensions. In the South African context, two studies have used the MLQ as a measure of transformational leadership. Engelbrecht et al. (2005) reported high Cronbach alpha values for the transformational leadership subscales (.75 < α < .87). Engelbrecht and Chamberlin (2005) reported the following Cronbach alpha coefficients: 0.94 for idealised influence, .92 for inspirational motivation, .92 for intellectual stimulation, and .92 for individualised consideration.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

The choice of data analysis technique is dependent on the type of research questions the study is aiming to answer. As previously stated, this study’s research questions are guided by several propositions, each focusing on a specific purpose associated with scientific research.
In general, data analysis techniques focus on relationships, significance of group membership, and structure (Field, 2005; Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2010). The data in this study was analysed by quantitative techniques. The following sections elaborate on the various data analysis techniques that were employed to test the various propositions. These include item analysis, exploratory factor analysis, Pearson product-moment correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis, and structural equation modelling (e.g. partial least squares path modelling).

3.6.1 Item analysis
The structural model comprises latent variables and various scales that were used to measure specific dimensions in the model. The purpose of item analysis is to determine whether a measurement is reliable and to identify items in these scales that do not represent the specific latent variable. Such items are referred to as poor items, because of their inability to differentiate between various states of the latent variable they are meant to reflect. Elimination of these items is then considered (Theron, Spangenberg & Henning, 2004). Nunnally (1978) stated that a measurement is reliable to the extent that it provides the same result, regardless of any opportunities for variation that might occur.

Coefficient alphas were calculated to determine the reliability of these scales, based on internally consistency. The size of the reliability coefficient is based on both the average correlation among items (internal consistency) and the number of items (Nunnally, 1978). Cronbach’s alphas range from 0 – 1 and the closer the values are to 1, the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale. According to Kline (as cited in Field, 2009) items with a Cronbach alpha of .7 are satisfactory. Every scale underwent item analysis through the SPSS Reliability Procedure (version 20) to identify and possibly eliminate the poor items.

Item-total correlations for specific items can be determined to further ensure that the measuring instruments are internally consistent. Item-total correlations were calculated for all the scales. Those correlations above .20 were seen as satisfactory and those below .20 qualified for elimination (Nunnally, 1978).

Nunnally’s (1967) guidelines were used to determine the critical levels of reliability for the scales and sub-scales and are indicated in Table 3.2.
### Table 3.2

**General guidelines for interpreting reliability coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability coefficient value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90 and above</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80 - .89</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 - .79</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below .70</td>
<td>May have limited applicability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.6.2 Exploratory factor analysis

The typical goal of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is to let the data determine the interrelationships among a set of variables. Although a researcher using EFA may have a theory to relate the variables to one another, there are relatively few restrictions on the basic factor model in an EFA. Firstly, the EFA is useful in data reduction when interrelationships among variables are not specified beforehand. A second benefit of EFA is the ability to detect a general factor. Thirdly, EFA is particularly useful in scale or test development, because it allows the researcher to determine the dimensionality of the test and detect cross-loadings (correlations of variables with more than one factor) (Fletcher, 2007).

In determining acceptable factor loadings, the general rule is that factors have to have a loading of $> .30$ to be accepted (Hair *et al*., 2010). In the event of a two-factor (or more) structure, items are also analysed for possible cross-loadings. In the case of the latter, items may be removed to provide a simple structure.

In order to conduct exploratory factor analysis on the identified variables in question, the following steps are proposed (Field, 2005; Grimm & Yarnold, 1995; Hair *et al*., 2010; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000): (a) deciding which method of extraction should be used to extract the factors, (b) identifying the most appropriate method of rotating the factors, (c) determining how many factors can be extracted, and (d) determining how factor scores must be computed if they are of interest.
3.6.2.1 Determining the number of factors to be extracted

Before determining how many factors could be extracted, it is important to first determine if the identified construct can be factor analysed. This was done by calculating both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity. The KMO can be calculated for individual and multiple variables and represents the ratio of the squared correlation between variables to the squared partial correlation between variables. The KMO statistic varies between 0 and 1. A value of 0 indicates that the sum of partial correlations is large relative to the sum of correlations, indicating diffusion in the pattern of correlations, thereby deeming factor analysis inappropriate. A value close to 1 indicates that patterns of correlations are relatively compact and therefore factor analysis should present distinct and reliable factors. The cut-off value that will be utilised in this study is .60 (Hair et al., 2010).

Another method of determining the appropriateness of factor analysis examines the entire correlation matrix. The Bartlett test of sphericity is one such measure as it is a test for the presence of correlations among the variables. It examines the correlations among all variables and it assesses whether significant intercorrelations exists collectively (Hair et al., 2010). Significance is measured at the level of .05.

The factor analysis method employed to extract factors in the present research study was principal axis factoring (PAF). This method is a statistical technique that was used among a large number of variables to analyze their interrelationships, in order to identify which variables if any, correlate within a set (Hair et al., 2010). This method enables information from the original variables to be condensed into smaller factors with minimal loss of information. Lawrence and Hancock (cited in DeWinter & Dodou, 2012) found PAF to be more robust than principal component analysis. Similarly, DeWinter and Dodou (2012) state that PAF is better able to recover weak factors and that the maximum likelihood estimator is asymptotically efficient when compared to other factor analysis techniques, such as the maximum likelihood factor analysis (MLFA).

Rather than arbitrarily constraining the factor rotation to an orthogonal solution, the oblique rotation identifies the extent to which the factors are correlated. The oblique rotation assumes that the extracted factors are correlated (Hair et al., 2010). This method is deemed suitable “if the ultimate goal of the factor analysis is to obtain several theoretically meaningful factors or constructs” (Hair et al., 2010, p.110). Conclusions drawn from this method are restricted to
the sample collected, and generalisation of the results can be achieved only if the analysis of using different samples reveals the same factor structure (Field, 2005).

In deciding whether a factor in the factor analysis is statistically important enough to extract from the data for interpretation purposes, the decision is made on the eigenvalue associated with the factor. The eigenvalue (or Kaiser’s criterion) is based on the principle of retaining factors with associated eigenvalues greater than 1 (Fletcher, 2007).

The scree plot can be used to assist in the decision concerning the number of factors to be retained. The use of the scree plot entails inspecting the point at which the shape of the curve changes direction and becomes horizontal (Pallant, 2010). According to Cattell (1966), all factors above the elbow, or break in the plot should be retained, as these factors contribute most to the explanation of the variance in the data set.

### 3.6.3 Determining the degree of relationship between variables

In Chapter 2, research propositions were identified suggesting statistical analysis techniques that can determine the relationships among the measured constructs. These propositions focus on both the descriptive and predictive purpose of research, as well as on the question of relationships between variables.

Two of the most appropriate data analysis techniques that can be employed in evaluating these propositions are bivariate correlation ($r$) and multiple regression ($R$) (Bless & Higson-Smith, 2000; Field, 2005; Hair et al., 2010; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Both of these techniques are discussed below.

#### 3.6.3.1 Bivariate Correlation

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to measure the extent of the direct (i.e., bivariate) relationships between the various constructs. The Coefficients of Determination ($100 \times r^2$) derived from the correlation coefficients were also calculated when the correlation coefficient was significant. The Coefficients of Determination indicate the percentage common variance between the different variables that correlates with one another (Tabachnic & Fidell, 2001).

The relationships were interpreted in terms of the actual size of Pearson’s $r$ and the amount of shared variance between variables. The correlation coefficients were further evaluated in terms of their effect size or practical significance, rather than their statistical significance (Cohen, 1988). Effect sizes were used for several reasons. Firstly, inferential statistics cannot
be used, because the study population could not be regarded as a probability sample (Steyn, 1999). Correlations of .20 and below may further be statistically significant, but they would be very limited in terms of practical significance or relevance, according to Guilford (cited in Tredoux & Durrheim, 2002). Furthermore, these small significant correlations are often due to large sample size (i.e., 100+) or the presence of mono-method bias and they are most probably not true reflections of the relationships in the data (Tabachnic & Fidell, 2001). For this reason, a cut-off point of .30, which is described as a medium effect by Cohen (1988), was set for the practical significance of correlations coefficients (Steyn, 1999). This is slightly higher than the .20 proposed by Guilford (cited in Tredoux & Durrheim, 2002).

To evaluate the strength of a statistically significant relationship, it is useful to have a guide to interpret the strength of the identified correlation. Guilford (cited in Tredoux & Durrheim, 2002) provides a useful reference to interpret statistical significant relationships among variables. Thus, although a correlation may be statistically significant, it must still be evaluated in the context of its associated strength and value to the research. Guilford’s informal interpretations of the magnitude of correlations \( r \) are presented in Table 3.3.

**Table 3.3**

**Guilford’s informal interpretations of the magnitude of correlations \( r \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of ( r ) (+ or -)</th>
<th>Informal interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; .2</td>
<td>Slight; almost no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 – .4</td>
<td>Low correlation; definite but small relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 – .7</td>
<td>Moderate correlation; substantial relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7 – .9</td>
<td>High correlation; strong relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9 – 1.0</td>
<td>Very high correlation; very dependable relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of the present study, the 0.30 cut-off point and the value interpretation in Table 3.3 were used to evaluate the obtained correlation coefficients.
The following section elaborates on multiple regression analysis (i.e. multiple $R$) to evaluate which of the independent variables contribute significantly to the variance in the dependent variable.

**3.6.3.2. STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS**

Standard Multiple Regression performs standard regression analysis for the continuous dependent variable on the continuous independent variables. Standard Multiple Regression analyses were conducted in order to predict the levels of the identified dependent variable (i.e., Intention to Quit) by means of different independent variables (i.e., transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, organisational justice, psychological contract violation, affective organisational commitment, organisational trust and perceived organisational support). The unique contribution of each independent variable to the prediction of the dependent variable can be determined by using this method. The use of Standard Multiple Regression for this study was decided because predictions were simultaneously put into the equation. In Standard Multiple Regression, all independent variables are entered into the regression equation at once and each variable is assessed as if it had entered the regression after all the independent variables had entered (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

The effect size (which indicates practical significance) was again used for the same reasons as were provided above. In the case of Multiple Regression effect size is assessed by the following formula proposed by Steyn (1999):

$$f^2 = \frac{R^2}{(1 - R^2)}$$

A cut-off point of 0.35 is regarded as a large effect and was set for the practical significance of $f^2$ (Steyn, 1999).

The results of the Standard Multiple Regression analysis for this study will be discussed in Chapter 4. The results of the standard multiple regression will assist in predicting the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

The following sections elaborate on structural equation modelling (SEM) and in particular the partial least squares path modelling approach that was specifically utilised in the present study.
3.7. EVALUATING THE STRUCTURAL COMPONENT OF SEM THROUGH PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES MODELLING (PLS)

Confirmatory factor analysis was utilised to evaluate the measurement component of the proposed structural model. In order to evaluate the structural model, it was decided to use the soft modelling approach to SEM. The soft modelling approach involves the use of Partial Least Squares (PLS) in contrast to the hard modelling approach to SEM, which makes use of maximum likelihood (Henseler et al., 2009). The rationale for choosing the PLS approach to SEM is highlighted below.

PLS models are formally defined by two sets of linear equations: the inner model and the outer model. The inner model specifies the relationships between unobserved or latent variables, whereas the outer model specifies the relationships between a latent variable and its observed or manifest variables (Henseler et al., 2009). The outer model in PLS is similar to the measurement model that was used in the hard-based modelling approach and the inner model is similar to the structural model that was used in the hard-based modelling approach. Partial least squares (PLS), is a family of alternating least squares algorithms, or “prescriptions” which extend principal component and canonical correlation analysis. The method was designed by Wold (1985) for the analysis of high dimensional data in a low-structure environment and has undergone various extensions and modifications. PLS, a variance-based technique has been used by a growing number of researchers from various disciplines, such as strategic management (e.g., Hulland, 1999), management information systems (e.g., Dibbern, Goles, Hircschheim, & Jayatilaka, 2004), e-business (e.g., Pavlou & Chai, 2002), organisational behaviour (e.g., Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992), marketing (e.g., Reinartz, Krafft, & Hoyer, 2004), and consumer behaviour (e.g., Fornell & Robinson, 1983).

3.7.1 Motivation for using PLS modelling

One of the major strengths of the PLS lies mainly in its robustness. That is its ability to provide a solution even to problems that could not be resolved, by using structural equation modelling (SEM) (Hair et al., 2010). Hair et al. (2010, p.777) argue that PLS “can address a wide range of problems given its ability to work efficiently with a much wider range of sample sizes and model complexity and its less strict assumptions about the underlying data.” Similarly, PLS is more amenable to the use of constructs with fewer items (e.g., one or two)
unlike SEM, and presents an attractive alternative to SEM in cases when measures are problematic and/or the emphasis is rather on exploration than on confirmation.

The most important motivations for using PLS modelling are exploration and prediction, as PLS path modelling is recommended at an early stage of theoretical development in order to test and validate exploratory models. Another powerful feature of PLS path modelling is that it is suitable for prediction-oriented research. Thereby, this methodology assists researchers who focus on the explanation of endogenous constructs (Henseler et al., 2009).

The characteristics researchers regard as relevant for the above-mentioned prediction oriented research can be summarised as follows:

- PLS delivers latent variable scores, i.e. proxies of the constructs, which are measured by one or several indicators (manifest variables).
- PLS path modelling avoids small sample size problems and it can therefore be applied in some situations where other methods cannot.
- PLS path modelling can estimate very complex models with many latent and manifest variables (i.e. saturation problem of covariance based SEM).
- PLS path modelling has less stringent assumptions about the distribution of variables and error terms.
- PLS can handle both reflective and formative models (Henseler et al., 2009).

It is noteworthy that PLS path modelling does not have less stringent assumptions about the representativeness of the sample than covariance based structural equation modelling (Henseler et al., 2009). A rule of thumb for robust PLS path modelling estimations suggests that sample size be equal to the larger of the following (Barclay, Higgins, & Thompson, 1995): (1) ten times the number of indicators, or (2) ten times the largest structural paths directed at a particular construct in the inner path model. Chin and Newsted (1999) presented a Monte Carlo simulation study on PLS with small samples. They found that the PLS path modelling approach can provide information about the appropriateness of indicators at sample size as low as 20. This study confirms the consistency at large on loading estimates with an increased number of observations and numbers of manifest variables per measurement model.
3.7.2 Methodological characteristics
PLS modelling is rooted in four major characteristics:

(1) Instead of solely drawing on the common reflective mode, the PLS path modelling algorithm allows the unrestricted computation of cause-effect relationship models that employ both reflective and formative measurement models (Diamantopoulos & Winklhofer, 2001).

(2) PLS can be used to estimate path models when sample sizes are small (Chin & Newsted, 1999).

(3) PLS path models can be very complex (i.e. consist of many latent and manifest variables) without leading to estimation problems (Wold, 1985). PLS modelling is methodologically advantageous to covariance-based structural equation modelling (CBSEM) whenever improper or non-convergent results are likely to occur (i.e. Krijnen, Dijkstra, & Gill, 1998). Furthermore, with more complex models, the number of latent and manifest variables may be high in relation to the number of observations.

(4) PLS path modelling can be used when distributions are highly skewed (Bagozzi, 1994), or the independence of observations is not assured, because, as Fornell (1982, p. 443) has argued, “there are no distributional requirements”.

3.7.3 Evaluation of PLS path model results
PLS path modelling does not provide for any global goodness-of-fit criterion. Consequently, Chin (1998) has put forward a catalogue of criteria to assess partial model structures. A systematic application of these criteria is a two-step process, encompassing the assessment of (1) the outer model and (2) the inner model. Figure 3.1 depicts the two-step process. At the beginning of the two-step process, model assessment focuses on the measurement models. A systematic evaluation of PLS estimates reveals the measurement model reliability and validity according to certain criteria that are associated with formative and reflective outer models. It only makes sense to evaluate the inner path model estimates when the calculated latent variable scores show evidence of sufficient reliability and validity.
**OUTER MODEL**

- Reliability and validity of reflective constructs
- Validity of formative constructs

**INNER MODEL**

- Variance explanation of reflective constructs
- Effect sizes
- Predictive relevance

(Henseler et al., 2009, p. 298)

**Figure 3:1**

The two-step process of evaluating the PLS path model assessment

### 3.7.4. Assessing the PLS outer (measurement) model.

In the following section, the assessment of the PLS outer (measurement) model will be discussed.

#### 3.7.4.1. Reliability

The measurement models should be assessed with regard to their reliability and validity (Henseler et al., 2009). Figure 3.1 provides an overview of the typical criteria (Henseler et al., 2009). Usually, the first criterion that is checked is internal consistency reliability. The traditional criterion for internal consistency is Cronbach’s Alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which provides an estimate of reliability based on the indicator inter-correlations. While Cronbach’s Alpha assumes that all indicators are equally reliable, PLS prioritises indicators according to their reliability, resulting in a more reliable composite. As Cronbach’s Alpha tends to provide a severe underestimation of the internal consistency reliability of latent variables in PLS path models, it is more appropriate to apply a different measure, namely composite reliability ($\rho_c$) (Werts, Linn, & Jöreskog, 1974).

The composite reliability takes into account that indicators have different loadings, and can be interpreted in the same way as Cronbach’s Alpha. No matter which particular reliability coefficient is used, an internal consistency reliability value above .70 in the early stages of research, and values above .80 or .90 in more advanced stages of research, are considered...
satisfactory (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), whereas a value below .60 indicates room for improvement.

### 3.7.4.2. Validity

Convergent validity signifies that a set of indicators represents one and the same underlying construct, which can be demonstrated through their unidimensionality. Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggest using the average variance extracted (AVE) as a criterion of convergent validity. An AVE value of at least 0.50 indicates sufficient convergent validity, meaning that the latent variable is able to explain more than half of the variance of its indicators on average (Götz, Liehr-Gobbers, & Krafft, 2009).

#### Table 3.4:

**Assessing the PLS Outer Model (Measurement Model)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>The composite reliability is a measure of internal consistency and must not be lower than .60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</td>
<td>The average variance extracted should be higher than .50.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section outlines the assessment criteria for the PLS structural (inner) model.

### 3.7.5 Assessing the PLS inner (structural) model

Unlike covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM), the PLS-SEM does not optimise a unique global scalar function. Fit statistics for CB-SEM are derived from the discrepancy between the empirical and model-implied (theoretical) covariance matrix, whereas PLS-SEM focuses on the discrepancy between the observed (in the case of manifest variables) or approximated (in the case of latent variables) values of the dependent variables, and the values predicted by the model in question. As a consequence, researchers using PLS-SEM rely on measures
indicating a model’s predictive capabilities to judge the model’s quality (Hair, Sarstedt, Pieper, & Ringle, 2012).

Reliable and valid outer model estimations permit an evaluation of the inner path model estimates. Table 3.5 provides an overview of the typical criteria. The essential criterion for this assessment is the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) of the endogenous latent variables. Chin (1998) describes $R^2$ values of .67, .33 and .19 in PLS path models as substantial, moderate and weak, respectively.

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ of endogenous latent variables</td>
<td>$R^2$ values of .67, .33, and .19 for endogenous latent variables are described as substantial, moderate, or weak by Chin (1998, p. 323).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates for path coefficients</td>
<td>The estimated values for path relationships in the structural model should be evaluated in terms of sign, magnitude, and significance (the latter via bootstrapping).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual path coefficients of the PLS structural model can be interpreted as standardised beta coefficients of ordinary least squares regressions (Henseler et al., 2009). In order to determine the confidence intervals of the path coefficients and statistical inference, resampling techniques such as bootstrapping should be used (Tenenhaus, Esposito Vinzi, Chatelin, & Lauro, 2005).

3.7.6. Bootstrapping
The nonparametric bootstrap (Davison & Hinkley, 2003; Efron & Tibshirani, 1993) procedure was used in PLS path modelling to provide confidence intervals for all parameter estimates (also indicates significance), building the basis for statistical inference. Generally, the bootstrap technique provides an estimate of the shape, spread, and bias of the sampling distribution of a specific statistic. Bootstrapping treats the observed sample as if it represents
the population. The PLS results for all bootstrap samples provide the mean value and standard error for each path model coefficient. This information permits a student’s $t$-test to be performed for the significance of the path model relationships. Chin (1998) proposes using the following test statistic for PLS:

$$t_{\text{emp}} = \frac{w}{se(w)}$$

whereby $t_{\text{emp}}$ represents the empirical $t$-value, $w$ the original PLS estimate of a certain path coefficient, and $se(w)$ its bootstrapping standard error. If a confidence interval for an estimated path coefficient $w$ does not include zero, the hypothesis that $w$ equals zero is rejected.

The following hypotheses will guide the current study in answering the two research questions. Empirical and theoretical support for these hypotheses was provided in Chapter 2.

**3.8. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

In order to answer the research questions developed for this study, 20 hypotheses were formulated that will be tested. In accordance with the aim of the study and the findings of previous research, the proposed relationships between the constructs discussed in Chapter 2, are believed to exist.

Kerlinger (1992) posits the importance of defining hypotheses as speculative statements about the relation between two or more variables, arguing that hypotheses (a) are the working instruments of theory, (b) can be tested and shown to be probably true or probably false, and (c) are powerful tools for the advancement of knowledge. Kerlinger and Lee (2000) argue that there are two primary criteria for good hypotheses: (a) proposition statements about the relationships between variables, and (b) those that carry clear implications for testing the stated relationships.

Hypothesis 1:

Transformational leadership has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.
Hypothesis 2:
Perceived organisational support has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 3:
Affective organisational commitment has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 4:
Organisational justice has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 5:
Psychological empowerment has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 6:
Organisational trust has a significantly negative effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 7:
Psychological contract violation has a significantly positive effect on Intention to quit.

Hypothesis 8:
Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on Perceived organisational support.

Hypothesis 9:
Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on Perceived organisational support.

Hypothesis 10:
Perceived organisational support has a significantly positive effect on Affective organisational commitment.

Hypothesis 11:
Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on Affective organisational commitment.
Hypothesis 12:
Organisational trust has a significantly positive effect on Affective organisational commitment.

Hypothesis 13:
Perceived organisational support has a significantly positive effect on Organisational trust.

Hypothesis 14:
Organisational justice has a significantly positive effect on Organisational trust.

Hypothesis 15:
Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on Organisational trust.

Hypothesis 16:
Psychological empowerment has a significantly positive effect on Organisational trust.

Hypothesis 17:
Organisational trust has a significantly negative effect on Psychological contract violation.

Hypothesis 18:
Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on Organisational justice.

Hypothesis 19:
Transformational leadership has a significantly positive effect on Psychological empowerment.

Hypothesis 20:
Each of the independent variables will explain a significant proportion of the variance in Intention to quit.

3.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS
Ethical issues in scientific research involves consideration of the rights of participants, integrity of the research process and accountability of the researcher to the moral conduct of
the research process (Kvale, 1996). Diener and Crandall (cited in Bryman & Bell, 2011) identified four important ethical principles in business research as harm to participants, informed consent, privacy and deception. The present study adhered strictly to the ethical considerations highlighted by Kvale, and Diener and Crandall in the conduct of the empirical study. The identity of both research participants and those of their organisations were adequately protected as participants were not required to disclose this information in completing the research questionnaire. Information provided by respondents were treated with outmost confidentiality as indicated in the questionnaire cover letter. Furthermore, research participants were informed of their rights to withdraw from participation in the survey at any time without any penalty.

Institutional approval was obtained from Stellenbosch University Ethics Committee before the commencement of data collection. This was a university requirement in order to protect research participants, the researcher and the university against unethical conduct in research and possible litigation (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

3.10. SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

In this chapter, an overview of the methodology that was used for this study was provided. The methodology included both survey and statistical modelling research. The measuring instruments and their psychometric properties were discussed. Emphasis was placed on using both item analysis and exploratory factor analysis to identify and verify interpretable and understandable factor structures that were associated with each of the measured constructs. The techniques that were used for data analysis, including bivariate correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis, were also discussed. The chapter also provided support for the use of structural equation modelling and in particular partial least squares path modelling, in evaluating the theoretical model depicting the relationships between the constructs that are investigated in this study. In Chapter 4, the results of data analyses that were conducted by using the methodology explained in this chapter, will be presented. Emphasis will be placed on determining the factor structure of each of the measured constructs, statistically describing the correlations between the measured constructs (emphasising Pearson’s r), statistically explaining the modelling of the relationship between the constructs (emphasising structural equations modelling, e.g., the partial least squares path modelling approach), as well as statistically predicting the sequential relationship between the constructs (emphasising both multiple regression analysis and PLS path modelling).
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CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The theoretical model presented in Chapter 2 is based on relationships obtained from analysing the literature. Hypotheses were subsequently formed which, together with the measurement and structural models, were subjected to the methodology explained in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 deals with a comprehensive description of the results obtained through analysing the data by means of the statistical analysis process. The measurement models of the eight underlying constructs, namely transformational leadership; psychological empowerment; perceived organisational support; organisational justice; organisational trust; psychological contract violation; affective organisational commitment; and intention to quit, were subjected to reliability analysis in order to determine the reliability of the measurement models. Hypotheses identified in Chapter 2 were also tested to determine relationships between the variables in the structural model. This chapter presents a discussion of the outcomes of the statistical analysis of all the models and the end findings thereof.

4.1 MISSING VALUES

The missing values problem is a common occurrence when self-reporting instruments are used. In the present study, this problem was addressed through multiple imputation (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2006). The advantage of the multiple imputation procedure is that estimates of missing values are derived for all cases in the initial sample (i.e., no cases with missing values are deleted) and the data set is available for subsequent item and dimensionality analyses, and the formation of item parcels (Du Toit & Du Toit, 2001; Mels, 2003).

4.2 ITEM ANALYSIS

Item analysis was performed on all the measurement scales in order to ensure internal reliability and to identify the items that did not contribute to the internal description of the
latent variables. It was important to ensure that the instruments used measured the variables they were intended to measure within the study. Item analysis was performed by means of SPSS (version 20). The reliability of each of the scales was established. Cronbach’s alpha is the indicator of the reliability of the scale. According to a number of scholars, Cronbach’s alpha should preferably exceed the value of 0.70 in order to be regarded as a reliable scale (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Nunnally & Marlowe, 1997; Pallant, 2010. In this study, a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.70 was regarded as acceptable and reliability values of below 0.70 therefore qualified for elimination.

The corrected Item-Total Correlation also needed to be determined as it is an indication of the degree to which each item correlates with the total score. Values lower than 0.20 may indicate that the item is not measuring the specific variable sufficiently (Nunnally, 1978). The removal of such items should be considered as they may lead to a higher Cronbach alpha for the entire scale.

4.2.1 Reliability results: Intention to quit
In Table 4.1, the item analysis associated with the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS) was presented. The scale consists of six items with a Cronbach alpha of 0.92. The scale therefore shows excellent reliability (see Table 3.2) (Nunnally, 1967) with none of the item-total correlations below 0.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Corrected</th>
<th>Squared</th>
<th>Cronbach's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Variance if Item Deleted</td>
<td>Item-Total Correlation</td>
<td>Multiple Correlation</td>
<td>Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int73</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>56.961</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int74</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>55.664</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int75</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>54.265</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int76</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>56.021</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int77</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>58.592</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int78</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>62.419</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Statistics for the Turnover Intention Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.918</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Reliability results: Perceived Organisational Support

Table 4.2 presents the item analysis associated with the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support (SPOS) which consists of ten items. The Cronbach alpha of this scale was found to be 0.94. The scale therefore shows excellent reliability (Nunnally, 1967), with none of the item-total correlations below 0.20.

Table 4.2

Reliability and Item Statistics of the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sup40</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>127.970</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup41</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>120.832</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup42</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>119.507</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup43</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>118.666</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup44</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>117.981</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup46</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>118.457</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup47</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>121.270</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup48</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>119.092</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup50</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>120.178</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup51</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>117.472</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Reliability results: Affective Organisational Commitment

The results associated with the item analysis for the Affective Organisational Commitment Scale are reported in Table 4.3.

The four items measuring affective organisational commitment have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.89. According to Nunnally (1967), this can be interpreted as good. It is clear from Table 4.3 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm79</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>22.298</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm80</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>20.987</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm81</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>24.403</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm85</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>21.495</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the Affective Organisational Commitment scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 Reliability results for Organisational Trust

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 represent the reliability results for the Workplace Trust Survey (WTS) which is made up of two sub-scales – i.e. Trust in the Organisation and Trust in the Leader. The sub-scales consist of 14 and 10 items respectively, with the total scale consisting of 24 items. The Cronbach alpha of the Trust in the Organisation sub-scale was found to be 0.97, while that of the Trust in the Leader sub-scale was found to be 0.96, which is considered to be excellent (Nunnally, 1967). Furthermore, the reliability analysis showed item-total correlations of above 0.20 to further confirm the high reliability of the sub-scales (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust1</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>274.388</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust2</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>263.534</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust3</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>271.342</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust4</td>
<td>49.13</td>
<td>263.687</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust5</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>266.335</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust6</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>263.064</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust7</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>266.201</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust8</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>274.122</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust9</td>
<td>49.28</td>
<td>265.870</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust10</td>
<td>49.22</td>
<td>264.705</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust11</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>265.263</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust12</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>267.005</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reliability Statistics of the Trust in Organisation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.5**

### Reliability and item statistics of the Trust in Leader sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust13</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>118.270</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust14</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>116.834</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust15</td>
<td>38.14</td>
<td>116.674</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust16</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>117.125</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust17</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>117.710</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust18</td>
<td>38.14</td>
<td>117.043</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust19</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>117.277</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust20</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>117.373</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust21</td>
<td>38.51</td>
<td>117.678</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust22</td>
<td>38.39</td>
<td>117.259</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reliability Statistics for the trust in leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.2.5 Reliability results: Psychological Contract Violation
The results associated with the item analysis for the Psychological Contract Violation Scale are reported in Table 4.6.

The four items measuring psychological contract violation have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.92. According to Nunnally (1967), the scale therefore shows excellent reliability. It is clear from Table 4.6 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4.6
Reliability and item statistics of the psychological contract violation scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contr100</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>20.934</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr101</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>19.391</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr102</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>19.251</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr103</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>19.005</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the psychological contract violation scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**4.2.6 Reliability results: Organisational Justice**

Tables 4.7 to 4.9 present the item analyses associated with the Organisational Justice Scale indicating the reliability coefficient of each of the sub-scales.

Table 4.7 presents the item analysis of the procedural justice sub-scale, which consists of six items. The Cronbach alpha of this sub-scale was found to be 0.94, thus showing that the sub-scale is exceptionally reliable (Nunnally, 1967), with none of the item-total correlations below 0.20.

**Table 4.7**

**Reliability and Item Statistics for the procedural justice sub-scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just52</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>48.153</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just53</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>42.340</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just54</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>42.626</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just55</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>43.584</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just56</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>44.255</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just57</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>44.438</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reliability Statistics for the procedural justice sub-scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 presents the item analysis of the interactional justice sub-scale, which consists of ten items. The Cronbach alpha of this sub-scale was found to be 0.99, which is considered to be exceptionally reliable (Nunnally, 1967). Furthermore, none of the item-total correlations was below 0.20.
Table 4.8

Reliability and item statistics of the interactional justice sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just58</td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td>183.931</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just59</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>184.992</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just60</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>185.049</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just61</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>185.849</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just62</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>184.329</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just63</td>
<td>31.81</td>
<td>182.856</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just64</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>184.136</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just65</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>186.187</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just66</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>184.283</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just67</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>182.762</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the interactional justice sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows the item analysis of the distributive justice sub-scale, which consists of five items. The Cronbach alpha of this sub-scale was found to be 0.93, thus showing that the sub-scale is exceptionally reliable (Nunnally, 1967), with none of the item-total correlations below 0.20.
Table 4.9

Reliability and item statistics of the distributive justice sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just68</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>30.892</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just69</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>30.723</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just70</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>29.441</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just71</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>29.649</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just72</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>29.432</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the distributive justice sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 Reliability results for psychological empowerment

Tables 4.10 to 4.12 present the item analyses associated with each of the three dimensions of the Menon Empowerment Scale (i.e. perceived competence, perceived control, and goal internalisation).

The results associated with the item analysis for Perceived Competence are reported in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10

Reliability and item statistics of the perceived competence sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp26</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>9.702</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp27</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>10.065</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp34</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>8.881</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp36</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>8.737</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for perceived competence sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five items measuring perceived competence have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.86. According to Nunnally (1967), this can be interpreted as good. It is clear from Table 4.10 that none of the items would substantially increase the overall reliability if they were deleted.

Table 4.11

Reliability and Item Statistics of the perceived control sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp30</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>22.298</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Statistics for the perceived control sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp31</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five items measuring Perceived Control have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.83. According to Nunnally (1967), this can be interpreted as good. It is clear from Table 4.11 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

The results associated with the item analysis for the Goal Internalisation sub-scale are reported in Table 4.12.

**Table 4.12**

Reliability and Item Statistics for the Goal Internalisation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp28</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>16.232</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp29</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>15.095</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp35</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>16.811</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp37</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>16.928</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp38</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>15.890</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five items measuring the Goal Internalisation sub-scale have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.87. According to Nunnally (1967), this can be interpreted as good. It is clear from Table 4.12 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

The results associated with the item analyses for all the sub-scales of Transformational Leadership are reported next.

4.2.8 Reliability results: Transformational leadership

Tables 4.13 to 4.16 report on the item analyses regarding each of the four dimensions (idealised influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualised consideration) associated with the sub-scales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ).

The results associated with the item analysis for the idealised influence dimension are reported in Table 4.13.

The eight items measuring Idealised Influence have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.95. According to Nunnally (1967), the scale therefore shows excellent reliability. It is clear from Table 4.13 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability and item statistics of the idealised influence sub-scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results associated with the item analysis for the Intellectual Stimulation dimension are reported in Table 4.14.

The four items measuring intellectual stimulation have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.91. According to Nunnally (1967), the scale therefore shows excellent reliability. It is clear from Table 4.14 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lead106</th>
<th>25.49</th>
<th>96.571</th>
<th>.672</th>
<th>.541</th>
<th>.952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead109</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>87.444</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead111</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>89.571</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead113</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>87.446</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead115</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>91.017</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead116</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>92.130</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead122</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>89.432</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14

Reliability and item statistics of the intellectual stimulation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead105</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>19.125</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead107</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>18.338</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead119</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>16.775</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead121</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>18.486</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the intellectual stimulation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results associated with the item analysis for the Inspirational Motivation dimension are reported in Table 4.15.

The four items measuring inspirational motivation have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.93. According to Nunnally (1967), the scale therefore shows excellent reliability. It is clear from Table 4.15 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).
The results associated with the item analysis for the Individualised Consideration dimension are reported in Table 4.16.

The four items measuring individualised consideration have an overall reliability coefficient of 0.91. According to Nunnally (1967), the scale therefore shows excellent reliability. It is clear from Table 4.16 that none of the items has an item-total correlation that is below 0.20 (Nunnally, 1978).
Table 4.16

Reliability and item statistics of the individualised consideration sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scale Mean if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead112</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>19.243</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead114</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>19.549</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead118</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>20.436</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead120</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>19.416</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics for the individualised consideration sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardised Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Summary of the item analysis results

The results of the item analyses performed on the various scales are summarised in Table 4.17. After examination of all the scales, it was concluded that all the Cronbach alpha values exceeded the required 0.70 cut-off criterion and all items presented high item-total correlations. Each scale was therefore considered to be internally consistent and reliable.
Table 4.17

Summary of the item analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Item-total r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.60 - .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.41 - .91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.63 - .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Organisation sub-scale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.66 - .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leader sub-scale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.75 - .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Contract Violation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.72 - .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice sub-scale</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.56 - .90?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional Justice sub-scale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.91 - .95?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice sub-scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.77 - .84?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Competence sub-scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.59 - .75?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control sub-scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.51 - .74?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Internalisation sub-scale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.60 - .76?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealised Influence sub-scale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.67 - .91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation sub-scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.79 - .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation sub-scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.80 - .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualised Consideration sub-scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.75 - .85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 DIMENSIONALITY ANALYSIS

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to confirm the uni-dimensionality of each scale and subscale. (Hair et al., 2010). Unrestricted Principal Axis Factor analyses with oblique rotation were performed on the various scales and subscales.

Prior to performing the EFA, the measures of sampling adequacy had to be evaluated to determine whether the correlation matrix for the items comprising the scale was suitable for factor analysis. In this case, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy exceeding 0.60 and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity would indicate that the data were suitable for factor analysis (Pallant, 2010).

Investigating the eigenvalues was imperative because it determined which factors remain in the analysis. Any factors with an eigenvalue of less than 1 were excluded (Kinnear & Gray, 2004). Factor loadings of items on the factor they were designated to reflect was considered satisfactory if they were greater than 0.50. The higher the value of the loading, the more the factor explains the total variance of scores on the variable concerned (Kinnear & Gray, 2004).

4.3.1 Intention to quit scale

The Intention to quit scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.878 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.18) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 68.10% of the variance.

Table 4.18

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Intention to quit scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>1097.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>int73</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int74</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int75</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int76</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int77</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int78</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.
5 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.351</td>
<td>72.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>12.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>7.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>3.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>2.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.

4.3.2 Perceived organisational support scale

The perceived organisational support scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.944 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.000) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.19) indicated that all the items, besides Item Sup42, loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor
accounted for 68.85% of the variance. However, Sup42 still loaded adequately (> 0.30) on the identified factor.

Table 4.19

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Perceived organisational support scale

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling | .944 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 2120.528 |
| | Df | 45 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup40</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup41</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup42</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup43</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup44</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup46</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup47</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup48</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup50</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sup51</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted.
4 iterations required.
4.3.3 Affective organisational commitment

The affective organisational commitment scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.815 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.20) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 68.71% of the variance.

Table 4.20

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Affective organisational commitment scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.138</td>
<td>71.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>8.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>5.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>3.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>3.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>1.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>1.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>comm79</th>
<th>comm80</th>
<th>comm81</th>
<th>comm85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted.
6 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.032</td>
<td>75.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>12.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>7.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>3.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.4.1 Uni-dimensionality of the organisational trust scale (trust in the leader sub-scale)
The trust in the leader sub-scale used for measuring the organisational trust achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.914 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.21) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 72.15% of the variance.
Table 4.21

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Trust in the leader sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square Df Sig.</td>
<td>2380.752 45 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust13</th>
<th>Trust14</th>
<th>Trust15</th>
<th>Trust16</th>
<th>Trust17</th>
<th>Trust18</th>
<th>Trust19</th>
<th>Trust20</th>
<th>Trust21</th>
<th>Trust22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.
4 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.486</td>
<td>74.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>8.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>3.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>3.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>2.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>1.915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4.2 Uni-dimensionality of the organisational trust scale (trust in the organisation sub-scale)

The trust in the organisation sub-scale used for measuring the organisational trust achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.926 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.22) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 69.05% of the variance.

Table 4.22

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Trust in the organisation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Trust1</th>
<th>Trust2</th>
<th>Trust3</th>
<th>Trust4</th>
<th>Trust5</th>
<th>Trust6</th>
<th>Trust7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>0.739</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust9</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust10</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust11</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust12</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust23</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust24</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.

4 iterations required.

### Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.947</td>
<td>71.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>6.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>4.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>3.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>2.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>2.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>1.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.5 Psychological contract violation

The psychological contract violation scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.838 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.23) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 75.43% of the variance.

Table 4.23

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Psychological contract violation scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>.838</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>674.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contr100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.6 Organisational justice scale
Organisational justice construct was measured using sub-scales as discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.3.6.1 Organisational justice (procedural justice sub-scale)
The procedural justice sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.877 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.24) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 72.83% of the variance.
Table 4.24

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Procedural justice sub-scale

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .877 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: Approx. Chi-Square | 1292.045 |
| Df | 15 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Factor Matrix\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>just52</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just53</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just54</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just55</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just56</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just57</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted. 5 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.594</td>
<td>76.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>11.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>5.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>3.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.6.2 Organisational justice (interactional justice sub-scale)

The interactional justice sub-scale achieved unidimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.947 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.25) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 89.39% of the variance.

Table 4.25

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Interactional justice sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just58</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just59</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just60</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just61</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just62</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just63</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just64</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just65</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just66</td>
<td>.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just67</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted. 3 iterations required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.044</td>
<td>90.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>2.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>1.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.6.3 Organisational justice (distributive justice sub-scale)
The distributive justice sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.829 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.26) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 71.65 % of the variance.
Table 4.26

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Distributive justice sub-scale

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .829 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 868.004 |
| Df | 10 |
| Sig. | .000 |

Factor Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>just68</th>
<th>just69</th>
<th>just70</th>
<th>just71</th>
<th>just72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
a. 1 factor extracted. 5 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>77.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>10.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>5.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>3.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
4.3.7 Psychological empowerment scale
Psychological empowerment construct was measured using the sub-scales discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.3.7.1 Uni-dimensionality of the psychological empowerment scale (perceived competence sub-scale)
The perceived competence sub-scale used for measuring psychological empowerment demonstrated uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.764 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.27) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 58.00% of the variance.

Table 4.27

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Perceived competence sub-scale

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .764 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 654.504 |
| | Df | 10 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrixa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction
Method: Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted. 7 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.299</td>
<td>65.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>19.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>6.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>4.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>3.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.7.2 Uni-dimensionality of the psychological empowerment scale (perceived control sub-scale)
The perceived control sub-scale used for measuring psychological empowerment achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.714 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.28) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 51.76% of the variance.
Table 4.28

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Perceived control sub-scale

KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</th>
<th>.714</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>496.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphericity</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Emp30</th>
<th>Emp31</th>
<th>Emp32</th>
<th>Emp33</th>
<th>Emp39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

8 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.032</td>
<td>60.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>19.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>9.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>5.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>4.090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
4.3.7.3 Uni-dimensionality of the psychological empowerment scale (goal internalisation sub-scale)
The goal internalisation sub-scale used for measuring psychological empowerment achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.810 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.29) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 58.60% of the variance.

Table 4.29

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Goal internalisation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrixa</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp28</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp29</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp35</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp37</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp38</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted.
5 iterations required.
Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>66.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>12.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>9.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>7.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>4.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.8 Transformational leadership scale
Transformational leadership construct was measured using the sub-scales discussed in the following sub-sections.

4.3.8.1 Transformational leadership (idealised influence sub-scale)
The idealised influence sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.913 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.30) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 70.77% of the variance.

Table 4.30

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Idealised influence sub-scale

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .913 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square | 1596.571 |
| Df | 28 |
| Sig. | .000 |
Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead104</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead106</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead109</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead111</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead113</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead115</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead116</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead122</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis
Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.
4 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.938</td>
<td>74.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>7.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>5.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>3.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>2.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.8.2 Transformational leadership (intellectual stimulation sub-scale)
The intellectual stimulation sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.763 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.31) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 71.73% of the variance.

Table 4.31

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Intellectual stimulation sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Adequacy</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square 626.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphericity</td>
<td>Df 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead105</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead107</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead119</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead121</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
a. 1 factor extracted.
5 iterations required.

### Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.151</td>
<td>78.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>12.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>4.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>4.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

### 4.3.8.3 Transformational leadership (inspirational motivation)

The inspirational motivation sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.849 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.32) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 76.66% of the variance.

#### Table 4.32

**Results of exploratory factor analysis: Inspirational motivation sub-scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square: 663.924 Df: 6 Sig.: .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead108</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead110</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead117</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead123</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.
6 iterations required.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.296</td>
<td>82.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>7.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>5.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>4.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring

4.3.8.4 Transformational leadership (individualised consideration)
The individualised consideration sub-scale achieved uni-dimensionality. A Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy of 0.820 (> 0.60) and a significant (p < 0.001) Bartlett’s test of sphericity were achieved, indicating sufficient evidence that the correlation matrix was factor analysable (Kaiser as cited in Field, 2005).

Only one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1 was obtained. The scree plot also suggested that a single factor should be extracted. The factor matrix (see Table 4.33) indicated that all the items loaded satisfactorily (> 0.50) on one factor and this factor accounted for 71.98% of the variance.
Table 4.33

Results of exploratory factor analysis: Individualised consideration sub-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>578.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Matrix</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead112</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead114</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead118</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead120</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method:
Principal Axis Factoring

a. 1 factor extracted.
6 iterations required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Variance Explained</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Initial Eigenvalues</td>
<td>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>78.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>8.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>8.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>3.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
4.4 BIVARIATE CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Since the aim of the study was to predict intention to quit, the relationship between the following independent variables and intention to quit (dependent variable) were investigated using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (see Table 4.34). There was a moderately (see Guilford’s guidelines, Table 3.3) significant, negative correlation between organisational trust and intention to quit ($r = -0.419$, $p < .001$), with high levels of organisational trust associated with low intention to quit. Similarly, the bivariate correlation analysis found a low significant, negative correlation between psychological empowerment and intention to quit ($r = -0.353$, $p < .001$), with high levels of psychological empowerment associated with low intention to quit. Furthermore, there was a moderately significant, negative correlation between perceived organisational support and intention to quit ($r = -0.507$, $p < .001$), with high levels of perceived organisational support associated with low intention to quit. The bivariate correlation analysis also found a moderately significant, negative correlation between organisational justice and intention to quit ($r = -0.522$, $p < .001$), with high levels of organisational justice associated with low intention to quit. There was a moderately significant, negative correlation between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit ($r = -0.517$, $p < .001$), with high levels of affective organisational commitment associated with low intention to quit. The bivariate correlation analysis also showed a low significant, positive correlation between psychological contract violation and intention to quit ($r = 0.369$, $p < .001$), with high levels of psychological contract violation associated with intention to quit. Lastly, there was a low significant, negative correlation between transformational leadership and intention to quit ($r = -0.266$, $p < .001$), with high levels of transformational leadership associated with low intention to quit.

Table 4.34
Bivariate correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUST</th>
<th>EMPOW</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>ORGJUST</th>
<th>ITQ</th>
<th>AFFCOMM</th>
<th>PCV</th>
<th>TFL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>Pears on Correlation</td>
<td>1 **</td>
<td>.745 **</td>
<td>.821 **</td>
<td>.833 **</td>
<td>-.419 **</td>
<td>.658 **</td>
<td>-.185 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>207</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOW</strong> Pears on Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>- .35*</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>- .04**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POS</strong> Pears on Correlation</td>
<td>.821*</td>
<td>.707**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.817**</td>
<td>- .50**</td>
<td>.711**</td>
<td>- .09**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORG. JUSTICE</strong> Pears on Correlation</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>.622**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- .52**</td>
<td>.734**</td>
<td>- .09**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITQ</strong> Pears on Correlation</td>
<td>- .419*</td>
<td>- .353**</td>
<td>- .50</td>
<td>-.522**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.517**</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFC OMM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears on Corre-</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>- .522</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears on Corre-</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pears on Corre-</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lation</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>9**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

It was decided to conduct a standard multiple regression analysis to determine which of the seven independent variables were significant predictors of intention to quit (see Table 4.34). The regression model in this case indicated that the seven independent variables in combination had a significant effect on intention to quit (F = 26.131, p < .001) (see Table 4.35). The model under investigation explains 47.9% of the variance in intention to quit. The Standard multiple regression analysis showed that perceived organisational support (t = -2.28; p < .05); organisational justice (t = -4.56; p < 0.01); affective organisational commitment (t = -1.997; p < 0.05); psychological contract violation (t = 7.37; p < .01); and transformational leadership (t = 3.37; p < 0.01) are significant predictors of intention to quit. The results also indicated that organisational justice makes the strongest unique contribution to explaining intention to quit (Beta = -.538). However, it was found that organisational trust and psychological empowerment were non-significant predictors of intention to quit. The regression analysis results also showed low possibility of multi-collinearity (tolerance value > 0.10) (Pallant, 2010). The analyses are depicted in Table 4.35. Thus, partial support was found for Hypothesis 20, stating that each of the independent variables would explain a significant proportion of the variance in intention to quit.

Note: Trust = Organisational trust; Empow = Psychological empowerment; POS = Perceived organisational support; Org. Justice = Organisational justice; ITQ = Intention to quit; AFFCOMM = Affective commitment; PCV = Psychological contract violation; TFL = Transformational leadership
Table 4.35
Results of the standard multiple regression analysis

Results of the ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8012.844</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1144.692</td>
<td>26.131</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>8717.485</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>43.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16730.329</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: INTENTION TO QUIT
b. Predictors: (Constant), TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP, PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT VIOLATION, AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT, PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT, PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT, ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE, TRUST

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.692a</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>6.619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unstandardised Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.851</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.523</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-2.278</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESULTS OF THE MEASUREMENT AND STRUCTURAL MODELS

When using the PLS approach to structural equation modelling, a two-step process is suggested (Chin, 1998). The first stage evaluates the outer model (i.e. measurement component). The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the measurement quality of the constructs to be used in the evaluation of the inner model (i.e. structural component). The path coefficients, marked in red, were significant (see Fig 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-4.557</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-1.997</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>7.372</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>3.371</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 RESULTS OF THE MEASUREMENT AND STRUCTURAL MODELS

When using the PLS approach to structural equation modelling, a two-step process is suggested (Chin, 1998). The first stage evaluates the outer model (i.e. measurement component). The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the measurement quality of the constructs to be used in the evaluation of the inner model (i.e. structural component). The path coefficients, marked in red, were significant (see Fig 4.1).
Note: TFL = Transformational leadership; OJ = Organisational justice; TRUST = Organisational trust; EMP = Psychological empowerment; POS = Perceived organisational support; ITQ = Intention to quit; COMMIT = Affective organisational commitment; PCV = Psychological contract violation.

Figure 4.1: The PLS Path Model 1
Table 4.36
Composite Reliability, Cronbach’s Alpha, and AVE (Model 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Manifest Variables</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Trust</strong></td>
<td>Trust in the leader ($\alpha = 0.96$)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in the organisation ($\alpha = 0.97$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Perceived competence ($\alpha = 0.86$)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived control ($\alpha = 0.83$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal internalisation ($\alpha = 0.87$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organisational Support</strong></td>
<td>($\alpha = 0.94$)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Quit</strong></td>
<td>($\alpha = 0.92$)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Justice</strong></td>
<td>Distributive ($\alpha = 0.93$)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactional ($\alpha = 0.99$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural ($\alpha = 0.93$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Organisational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>($\alpha = 0.89$)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Contract Violation</strong></td>
<td>($\alpha = 0.92$)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Idealised Influence ($\alpha = 0.95$)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation ($\alpha = 0.91$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation ($\alpha = 0.93$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualised Consideration ($\alpha = 0.91$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.36 it is clear that all the variables meet the quality criteria associated with an acceptable outer model (i.e. measurement model). This is based on the fact that all the variables have acceptable reliabilities (composite reliabilities above .60 and Cronbach’s Alphas above .70), as well as average variance extracted (AVE above .50).

Table 4.37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>root AVE</th>
<th>Divergent Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** The structural model shows a high level of divergent validity since each variable in the model represents a unique construct.

**4.7 PLS Results: Validating the Structural (Inner) Model**

Table 4.38 presents the $R^2$ values of the endogenous variables in the model. The $R^2$ values ranged between 0.70 and 0.94. The lowest value was that of Perceived Organisational Support (0.70), which indicates that the whole model accounted for only 70% of the reported variance in Perceived Organisational Support. For the other two outcomes of Intention to Quit and Psychological Empowerment, the former also obtained a strong $R^2$ value (0.70),
whilst the amount of variance explained for the latter was also a strong R2 value (0.73). The highest R² value was that of Transformational Leadership (0.94) indicating that the total model explains about 94% of the variance reported in the TL subscale. Structural models are assessed by the R² values (in table 4.38) and the path coefficients (presented in table 4.39). Nineteen paths were hypothesised in the study. A non-significant path was observed between psychological empowerment and intention to quit as hypothesised (Hypothesis 5) stating a negative relationship between the two variables. Since this hypothesis was not statistically supported, the path showing a direct relationship between psychological empowerment and intention to quit was therefore removed to test for an indirect relationship between the two constructs through organisational trust. As shown in table 4.39, only 5 of the 19 hypothesised paths were found to be statistically non-significant. Significant paths are indicated in red in figure 4.1.

Table 4.38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>Path coefficient SmartPLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership to Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Organisational Justice</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment to Organisational Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Justice to Affective Organisational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Justice to Intention to Quit</strong></td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Justice to Perceived Organisational Support</strong></td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Justice to Organisational Trust</strong></td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organisational Support to Affective Organisational Commitment</strong></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organisational Support to Intention to Quit</strong></td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Organisational Support to Organisational Trust</strong></td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment to Intention to quit</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 4.39 that the majority of proposed path coefficients are significant. However, the following paths were not significant:

- Psychological Empowerment and Intention to Quit
• Transformational Leadership and Perceived Organisational Support
• Organisational Trust and Affective Organisational Commitment
• Organisational Trust and Intention to Quit
• Affective Organisational Commitment and Intention to Quit

In Model 1, a non-significant path was observed between psychological empowerment and intention to quit. Thus, Hypothesis 5, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was not supported. However, it was decided to further explore the following indirect relationship:

  o Psychological empowerment influencing Intention to Quit indirectly through organisational trust

The path showing a direct relationship between psychological empowerment and intention to quit was therefore removed to test for an indirect relationship between the two constructs through organisational trust. The results of the interrelationships between the latent variables in the adapted PLS Path Model 2 are depicted in Figure 4.2.
Note: TFL = Transformational leadership; OJ = Organisational justice; TRUST = Organisational trust; EMP = Psychological empowerment; POS = Perceived organisational support; ITQ = Intention to quit; COMMIT = Affective organisational commitment; PCV = Psychological contract violation.

Figure 4.2: The PLS Path Model 2

The PLS path modelling results based on structural model 2 are indicated in Table 4.40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path coefficient SmartPLS</th>
<th>Bootstrap lower SmartPLS</th>
<th>Bootstrap upper SmartPLS</th>
<th>Significance of SmartPLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership to Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Organisational Justice</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership to Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r 1</td>
<td>r 2</td>
<td>r 3</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Empowerment to Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice to Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice to Perceived Organisational Support</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Justice to Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support to Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>Path Coefficients</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organisational Support to Organisational Trust</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Trust to Psychological Contract Violation</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Contract Violation to Intention to Quit</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 4.40 that the majority of proposed path coefficients are significant.

The following paths are not significant:

- Transformational Leadership and Perceived Organisational Support
- Organisational Trust and Affective Organisational Commitment
Organisational Trust and Intention to Quit
Perceived organisational support and intention to quit

4.8 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LATENT VARIABLES

The results related to both the outer model (measurement model) and the inner model (structural model) associated with the conceptual model provided evidence of both significant and non-significant associations between the paths (see Model 2). At this stage it was necessary to test the relationships between the endogenous and exogenous latent variables in order to assess whether these linkages specified at the conceptualisation phase were in fact supported by the data (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). In order to assess these relationships, three relevant issues had to be looked at. The first issue was to examine the signs of the parameters representing the paths between the latent variables to determine whether the direction of the hypothesised relationships was as theoretically determined. Secondly, it was essential to investigate the magnitudes of the estimated parameters because this provides important information regarding the strength of these relationships. Lastly, the squared multiple correlations ($R^2$) indicate the amount of variance in the endogenous variables that is explained by the latent variables that are linked to it (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000).

4.8.1 Relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit.
The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 1, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was not supported. The multiple regression analysis also could not confirm Hypothesis 1 ($t = 3.371, p < .01$) (see Table 4.35). However, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, negative correlation between transformational leadership and intention to quit ($r = -.266, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis 1.

4.8.2 Relationship between perceived organisational support and intention to quit
The PLS analysis found a non-significant relationship between perceived organisational support and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 2, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was not supported. The multiple regression analysis, however, confirmed Hypothesis 2 ($t = -2.278, p < .05$) (see Table 4.35). Furthermore, the
bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, negative correlation between perceived organisational support and intention to quit ($r = -.507, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis 2.

**4.8.3 Relationship between psychological contract violation and intention to quit**

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between psychological contract violation and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 7, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The multiple regression analysis also confirmed Hypothesis 7 ($t = 7.372, p < .01$) (see Table 4.35). Similarly, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between psychological contract violation and intention to quit ($r = .369, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 7.

**4.8.4 Relationship between organisational trust and psychological contract violation**

The PLS analysis found a significant, negative relationship between organisational trust and psychological contract violation (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 17, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was supported. Similarly, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, negative correlation between organisational trust and psychological contract violation ($r = -.185, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 17.

**4.8.5 Relationship between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment**

The PLS analysis found a non-significant relationship between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 12, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was not supported. However, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment ($r = .658, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis 12.

**4.8.6 Relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit**

The PLS analysis found a non-significant relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 6, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was not supported. The multiple regression analysis also could not confirm Hypothesis 6 ($t = 1.782, p > .05$) (see Table 4.35). However, the bivariate correlation analysis
indicated a significant, negative correlation between organisational trust and intention to quit ($r = -.419, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis 6.

### 4.8.7 Relationship between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit

The PLS analysis found a significant, negative relationship between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 3 was supported. The multiple regression analysis also confirmed Hypothesis 3 ($t = -1.997, p < .05$) (see Table 4.35). Similarly, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, negative correlation between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit ($r = -.517, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 3.

### 4.8.8 Relationship between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 10, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. Furthermore, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment ($r = .711, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 10.

### 4.8.9 Relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational trust

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational trust (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 13, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, positive correlation between perceived organisational support and organisational trust ($r = .821, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 13.

### 4.8.10 Relationship between organisational justice and organisational trust

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and organisational trust (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 14, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, positive correlation between organisational justice and organisational trust ($r = .833, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 14.
4.8.11 Relationship between organisational justice and intention to quit

The PLS analysis found a significant, negative relationship between organisational justice and intention to quit (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 4, stating a negative relationship between the two variables, was supported. The multiple regression analysis also confirmed Hypothesis 4 ($t = -4.557$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.35). The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, negative correlation between organisational justice and intention to quit ($r = - .522$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 4.

4.8.12 Relationship between organisational justice and perceived organisational support

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and perceived organisational support (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 9, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, positive correlation between organisational justice and perceived organisational support ($r = .817$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 9.

4.8.13 Relationship between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 11, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. In addition, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment ($r = .734$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 11.

4.8.14 Relationship between psychological empowerment and organisational trust

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organisational trust (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 16, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, positive correlation between psychological empowerment and organisational trust ($r = .745$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 16.
4.8.15 Relationship between transformational leadership and organisational justice

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational justice (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 18, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. Furthermore, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and organisational justice ($r = .709$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 18.

4.8.16 Relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support

The PLS analysis found a non-significant relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 8, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was not supported. However, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support ($r = .589$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis 8.

4.8.17 Relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 19, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. The bivariate correlation analysis also indicated a significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment ($r = .445$, $p < .001$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 19.

4.8.18 Relationship between transformational leadership and organisational trust

The PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational trust (see Table 4.40). Thus, Hypothesis 15, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, was supported. Similarly, the bivariate correlation analysis indicated a significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and organisational trust ($r = .737$, $p < .001$) (see Table 4.34). Therefore, overall support was found for Hypothesis 15.
4.9 SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to report on the results obtained from this study. The chapter commenced with the determination of all the following statistical analyses: Item analysis, dimensionality analysis, bivariate correlational analysis, standard regression analysis and PLS analysis. This was followed by the discussion of the relationships between the latent variables of the study in order to determine the statistical outcome of the hypothesised relationships. The following chapter discusses the general conclusions drawn from the results in greater depth. Recommendations for future research and possible managerial implications will be presented in conclusion.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 of this study presented a detailed discussion of the relationships between intention to quit and the following variables: transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, perceived organisational support, organisational justice, organisational trust, psychological contract violation, and affective organisational commitment. Chapter 3 presented the methodology that was employed in conducting this research. This was followed in Chapter 4 by the presentation of the data analysis and research results. The current chapter comprises a discussion of the results obtained from the data analysis in relation to existing literature; a summary of and conclusions from the study; and identifies the managerial implications of the research findings. Recommendations for future research studies are furthermore presented and the limitations of the study are finally stated.

5.2 AIM OF THE STUDY

The main aim of this study was to determine the influence of identified constructs on employees’ intention to quit an organisation. This has become necessary in the face of prohibitive financial and other costs that are associated with high turnover rates. It is therefore important for managers to understand the factors that are antecedent to an employee’s intention to quit an organisation, rather than dealing with the aftermath of turnover. This study therefore identified some important constructs (Transformational Leadership, Intention to Quit, Perceived Organisational Support, Psychological Contract Violation, Organisational Trust, Affective Organisational Commitment, Organisational Justice and Psychological Empowerment) that impact on an individual employee’s intention to quit his/her present employment.

In view of this broad aim of the study, relationships were postulated between the selected individual constructs and the extent of the impact they exert on intention to quit as a dependent variable.
In order to achieve this broad aim, the following specific objectives – primary and secondary – were stated to provide a guided direction for conducting the study.

**Primary objectives:**

4) To identify and evaluate the relationships that exist between selected variables that are antecedents (predictors) to employees’ intention to quit;

5) To conceptualise these predictor variables within the framework of a structural model; and

6) To conduct an empirical study in order to establish the relationships between the selected antecedents of intention to quit and retention of knowledge workers in organisations.

**Secondary objectives:**

The primary objectives were to be achieved through the following secondary objectives:

4) To review existing literature on selected antecedents of intention to quit in order to achieve the first primary objective;

5) To validate the conceptualised structural model of the selected antecedents of intention to quit using Structural Equation Modelling to achieve the second primary objective; and

6) To design a research methodology that could be followed in conducting of the empirical study.

Nineteen substantive hypotheses were derived from the literature study presented in Chapter 2, in order to empirically evaluate the postulated relationships. The results of investigating these hypotheses are discussed in terms of the findings obtained through the data analysis process discussed in Chapter 4.

**5.3 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS**

To realise the objectives of this study, it was important to first ensure that the measurement scales utilised in this study to assess the relationships were construct valid and internally reliable. It was necessary to establish the validity and reliability of the measurement scales to ensure that sound statistical results would be attained when further analyses were performed. The statistical analysis process is discussed in detail in Chapter 3, while the results thereof are reported in Chapter 4.
The research findings are discussed in the following section.

5.3.1 Conclusions regarding reliability analysis

The reliability coefficients of all the scales were determined to ensure that each item contained in the measuring instruments contributed to the internal consistency of each scale. Nunnally (1978) indicates that only instruments with a modest reliability coefficient can be used to collect data for testing hypotheses. A Cronbach alpha (which indicates the reliability content of measuring scales) of above 0.70 is generally considered acceptable (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Pallant, 2010). Item-total correlations of above 0.20 were also considered as indicators of internal consistency (Nunnally, 1978).

The results of the reliability analyses in the present study were satisfactory and acceptable in accordance with the above-mentioned guidelines. All scales achieved reliability scores that exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70. The results also indicated that all items presented achieved an Item-Total correlation above the recommended threshold value (0.20). It was thus concluded that all the measurement instruments could be considered reliable for data collection and hypothesis testing.

5.3.2 Conclusions regarding dimensionality analysis

The purpose of the dimensionality analysis was to confirm the uni-dimensionality of each scale and subscale and, if necessary, to remove items with insufficient factor loadings. To examine this uni-dimensionality assumption, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed on all the measurement scales. The results showed that all the measurement scales used in this study satisfied the uni-dimensionality assumptions. Furthermore, it was found that all the items comprising the measurement scales demonstrated highly satisfactory factor loadings on the first factor. Factor loadings of items on the factor they are designed to reflect are considered satisfactory if they are greater than 0.50 (Kinnear & Gray, 2004). In this study, all the factors loadings for each item comprising the measurement model achieved the > 0.50 level, except for one POS item (sup42) with a factor loading of 0.42. This is an indication that each item successfully explains the total variance scores on the respective variable.

5.4 INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

This section provides information that assists in determining whether the theoretical relationships indicated at the conceptualisation stage were in fact supported by the data. The
section that follows provides a discussion regarding the interpretation of the results on the basis of the refined structural model.

5.4.1 The relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit
The bivariate correlation analysis found a low (see Guilford’s guidelines, Table 3.3), but significant negative correlation between transformational leadership and intention to quit ($r = -0.266$, $p < .01$), thus providing support for Hypothesis 1. However, the PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit (see Table 4.38) while the multiple regression analysis also could not confirm Hypothesis 1 ($t = 3.371$, $p < .01$ (see Table 4.35). Overall, only partial support was found for Hypothesis 1.

The implication of the PLS result is that there is a tendency that transformational leaders would increase the propensity of their subordinates’ intention to quit. This result is unexpected and may be attributed to the possibility that transformational leaders could, through their inspiring and empowering behaviour, develop subordinates’ self-efficacy and self-confidence. If their aspirations for superior work performance are not met by their current employer, the possibility exists that these empowered and highly inspired employees would activate their search for better career opportunities in other organisations. Furthermore, this finding suggests that transformational leaders would rather have an indirect positive impact on their subordinates’ intention to quit through mediating variables such as organisational justice, affective organisational commitment and organisational trust.

This finding is consistent with similar findings in separate studies conducted within the South African context (Kahumuza & Schlechter, 2008; Pieterse-Landman, 2012). Both studies found an indirect negative correlation between transformational leadership and intention to quit through perceived organisational support. According to Kahumuza and Schlechter (2008), operational managers act as agents or representatives of the organisation and assume managerial responsibilities such as directing, coordinating and motivating subordinates in order to achieve organisational goals. The degree to which they are perceived to perform these managerial responsibilities well has been found to have a negative correlation with intention to quit (Kahumuza & Schlechter, 2008). Other authors (e.g., Pieterse-Landman, 2012; Vancouver, Millsap, & Peters, 1994; Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991) found a decreasing effect on intention to quit among organisational members when all categories of employees concur with the propositions and vision of the leader on how to achieve with regard to the ways that organisational goals could be achieved. The possibility thus exists that subordinates
become emotionally attached to a leader who is able to inspire faith, trust, respect and pride among his/her followers (Pieterse-Landman, 2012). Pieterse-Landman contended that such behaviour by the leader becomes “idealised and manifests in collective values and actions within the organisation, as the leader provides a compelling vision, mission and high standards for emulation” (p. 11), thus reducing subordinates’ intention to leave the organisation.

Wells and Peachey (2010) and Bycio, Hacket and Allen (1995) similarly reported a significantly negative relationship between all the dimensions of transformational leadership behaviours and turnover intentions. A South African study by Pieterse-Landman (2012) also reported a significantly negative relationship between transformational leadership and intention to quit ($r = -0.47, p < 0.01$). Pieterse-Landman argued that the firm establishment of transformational leadership behaviours among organisational leadership constitutes a conscious retention strategy. This argument is supported by an earlier expression by Buckingham and Coffman (2005) that employees do not quit organisations, but rather leave their managers. Given the avalanche of literature (see Section 2.2.8.4) and the partial support found in this research, it can reasonably be concluded that subordinates will be less likely to exit from the organisation if they align themselves with the vision and leadership style of their leader.

### 5.4.2 Relationship between perceived organisational support and intention to quit

The bivariate correlation analysis provided evidence of a moderately negative correlation between perceived organisational support and intention to quit ($r = -0.507, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of perceived organisational support associated with low intention to quit, thus supporting Hypothesis 2. The multiple regression analysis also confirmed Hypothesis 2 ($t = -2.278, p < .05$) (see Table 4.35). However, the PLS analysis found a non-significant relationship between perceived organisational support and intention to quit (see Table 4.38). Partial support therefore was found for Hypothesis 2. The non-significant relationship found in the present study between POS and intention to quit is consistent with similar research findings (Imran, Ali & Islam, 2014; Paillé, Bourdeau & Galois, 2010; Tumwesigye, 2010). One possible explanation for this finding could be attributed to the influence of a mediating variable (trust). Trust is an essential element in an employment relationship and it is expected that employees will seek alternative employment once they perceived that they are not receiving sufficient care and support from the organisation. The
mitigating effect of trust as a mediating variable could thus explain the non-significant relationship between POS and ITQ in this study. Tumwesigye (2010) and Imran et al. (2014) could not establish a direct relationship between POS and turnover intentions, but rather through the presence of organisational commitment. A similar argument can also be proffered for the non-significant relationship that was found between perceived organisational support and intention to quit in the present study. In terms of the structural model, the relationship between perceived organisational support and intention to quit is the result of the interactive effect among the different antecedents of intention to quit (e.g. affective commitment (Garland, Hogan, Kelley, Kim & Lambert, 2013); organisational trust (Trussell, 2015); and psychological contract violation (Arkesteijn, 2011). The PLS results indicated that perceived organisational support may rather influence intention to quit indirectly through affective organisational commitment (Islam et al., 2013).

Findings from both Imran et al. (2014) and Islam et al. (2013) are consistent with Karatepe and Karadas (2012) who reported that POS influences turnover intentions, not directly, but through the mediating effect of affective commitment. The arguments in support of the various findings by the authors cited above are derived from the theory of organisational support which postulates that employees, when they perceived support from their organisation, reciprocate by means of positive job-related outcomes such as job satisfaction and commitment, which ultimately decrease their intention to leave the organisation (Ahmed, Ismail, Amin & Islam, 2014; Islam et al., 2013).

The results partially support Hypothesis 2 and concurred with previous studies by Tuzun and Kalemci (2012), Perryer, Jordan, Firns and Travaglione (2010), Kahumuza and Schlecther (2008), and Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002). Loi et al. (2006) argued that employees would resort to alternative search for employment if they did not perceive sufficient care and support from their organisation. Organisations institute various employee support programmes that are directed towards the advancement of their employees’ professional development and wellbeing. Such support programmes could include educational sponsorship, study leave, and child-care facilities within the work premises for nursing mothers. These support programmes give employees a sense of belonging and a feeling that their contributions are being recognised by the employer; an expression that promotes positive feelings towards the organisation. This expression thus potentially decreases employees’ intention to leave the organisation (Meyer & Smith, 2000; Pattie, Benson & Baruch, 2006; Tanksy & Cohen, 2001).
Organisational support theory states that behaviours by supervisors that benefit subordinates translates to increased perceived organisational support and, in turn, creates a sense of obligation in employees to assist the organisation in achieving its goals. This behaviour further entrenches commitment which is an antecedent of turnover (Rhoades et al., 2001). Because supervisors represent direct contact between employees and the organisation, and act on behalf of the organisation in directing and evaluating employees’ performance, the latter tend to attribute supervisory support to that of the organisation, rather than to individual supervisor (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006). Consistent with Maertz et al. (2007), Tuzun and Kalemci (2012) reported that, with high supervisory support, perceived organisational support is considered less important in predicting turnover. This, however, becomes a significant determinant of turnover when supervisory support is absent.

Tumwesigye’s (2010) findings showed a negative relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover intentions. This finding is supported by Okello-Ouni (2004) who established an association between high perceived organisational support and low turnover intentions and actual turnover. Deriving from the social exchange theory and hedonistic approach-avoidance theory (Blau, 1964; Setton et al., 1996), the results of the studies presented above provided evidence to suggest that employees who believe that their organisations showed little or no care for their wellbeing have a higher tendency to leave the organisation and seek better employment in another organisation. Employees who perceive a sense of care and recognition of their contributions to the organisation will most probably sustain their membership of the organisation.

Other studies found a weak direct relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover, with POS only influencing turnover intention through organisational commitment (Allen et al., 2003). However, Paille et al. (2010) failed to establish a relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover intentions, consequently providing support for the PLS analysis in the present study (see Table 4.38). These results presented a direct contradiction to many existing empirical findings regarding perceived organisational support and intention to quit. Prevailing dynamics in the labour market could provide a possible explanation for these research results. Employees in an economy that is experiencing recession (such as South Africa) may find it difficult to find an alternative job even though they may not receive the necessary support from the organisation. Availability of alternative job opportunities therefore constitutes an important deciding factor in the perceived organisational support and turnover intentions analysis.
5.4.3 Relationship between psychological contract violation and intention to quit
The bivariate correlation analysis showed a low positive correlation between psychological contract violation and intention to quit ($r = .369$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of psychological contract violation associated with intention to quit. The multiple regression analysis also confirmed Hypothesis 7 ($t = 7.372$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.35), while the PLS analysis found a significant, positive relationship between psychological contract violation and intention to quit (see Table 4.38). All the analyses commonly found support for Hypothesis 7, which predicted a significant positive relationship between psychological contract violation and intention to quit. Shahnawaz and Goswami (2011), Robinson and Rousseau (1994), and Turnley and Feldman (2000) variously arrived at research outcomes consistent with those of this study. In practical terms, however, it could be argued that not too many employees within the South African labour market would quickly react to psychological contract violation by a spontaneous activation of intention to quit as alternative employments are not readily available, thus making job mobility difficult. South Africa’s economy is currently experiencing a high rate of unemployment resulting from slow economic growth. It is therefore expected that most employees with relative job security would be willing to endure a reasonable experience of psychological contract violation during economic recession that is characterised by retrenchments rather than resorting to turnover intention (Shahnawaz & Goswami, 2011). This finding is similar to findings by Suazo, Turnley and Mai-Dalton (2005) who found a positive and significant relationship between psychological contract violation and employee turnover, given that employees’ intention to quit is dormant during economic recession when people with jobs consider themselves privileged (Shahnawaz & Goswami, 2011).

5.4.4 Relationship between organisational trust and psychological contract violation
The bivariate correlation analysis indicated a slight but significant negative correlation between organisational trust and psychological contract violation ($r = -.185$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with a high level of organisational trust associated with low psychological contract violation. The PLS analysis also showed a significant negative relationship between organisational trust and psychological contract violation (see Table 4.38), thus providing support for Hypothesis 17. This finding supports similar findings by Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly (2003) who found a negative association between trust and psychological contract violation. Employees develop trust in the organisation through the social exchange process which provides a context within which employees interpret management actions, organisational processes and procedures relative to their own expectations or what the
organisation has promised to do (Whitener, 2001). Intention to quit becomes dormant when trust relationships between an organisation and its employees prevail; however, emotions take over once there is perceived breaches to the psychological contract (Bal & Smit, 2012). Employees expect managers to rationalise perceived breach of the psychological contract in order to mitigate their reactions; failure, however, triggers anger and lack of trust in the organisation (Parzefall & Coyle-Shapiro, 2011).

Breaches of the psychological contract potentially reduce trust in the organisation whereas absence of trust can also cause a perception of contract breach (Atkinson, 2007; Kramer, 2006). Research findings by Shahnawaz and Goswami (2011), however, were incongruent with the findings of the present study. A non-significant relationship between trust and psychological contract violation was found among both private and public sector employees in India. The findings of the current study could find expression within the argument presented by Mayer and Gavin (2005) that followers who do not trust their leaders will redirect energy towards concealing their misdeeds or mistakes. This statement corroborates the argument that many behavioural failures experienced by organisations can be linked directly to the manifestation of a lack of trust and psychological contract violation between leaders and followers.

5.4.5 Relationship between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment

The bivariate correlation analysis provided evidence of a moderate, but significant, positive correlation between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment ($r = .658, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of organisational trust associated with affective organisational commitment. However, the PLS analysis, with a non-significant relationship between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.38) did not find support for Hypothesis 12. Partial support was therefore found for Hypothesis 12.

The non-significant relationship between organisational trust and affective commitment found in this study is supported by the critically important finding by Perry (2004) that trust in the supervisor was weakly related to affective organisational commitment. It can therefore be assumed that increasing employee trust in supervisors alone may have only a direct and non-significant impact on organisational commitment and does not represent an important route by which increasing employees’ affective commitment to the organisation could be improved. It is important, however, to emphasise that the outcome of the present study (and indeed that of Perry, 2004) does not necessarily conclude that trust in the supervisor is not an
important factor in building organisational commitment. Instead, the results only showed a non-direct statistical relationship and there are circumstances in organisational settings in which trust in the supervisor may affect other variables (e.g., empowerment, participative leadership and organisational justice) that are more closely related to organisational commitment.

The significant positive bivariate relationship between organisational trust and affective organisational commitment that was found in the present study is supported by similar findings by Celep and Yilmazturk (2012) and Sinclair (2013), which reported organisational trust as a significant predictor of organisational commitment. The authors explained that trust in both the organisation and supervisor will significantly influence employees’ commitment to the achievement of organisational goals. It is expected that employees will develop trust in supervisors who value their efforts and general contributions to the organisation and show concern for their wellbeing; trust their ability; and delegate authority to them (Zhang, Tsui, Song, Li & Jia, 2008). Employees, through the process of social exchange and reciprocity, acknowledge the trust placed in them by the supervisor by assisting the organisation in meeting important goals (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard & Werner, 1998). On the other hand, employees engage in withdrawal activities and less voluntary behaviours when they experience a lack of trust in the organisation (Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper & Duffy, 2002).

**5.4.6 Relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit**
The bivariate correlation analysis showed a moderate, but significant, negative relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit \( r = -.419, p < .01 \) (see Table 4.34), with a high level of organisational trust associated with low intention to quit. However, the PLS analysis indicated a non-significant relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit (see Table 4.38). The multiple regression analysis similarly could not find support for Hypothesis 6, which stated a significant negative relationship between organisational trust and intention to quit. The hypothesis is therefore partially supported. The non-significant relationship found between organisational trust and intention to quit both in the PLS path and regression analysis seems strange and does not lend itself to any easy explanation and literature support. One possible explanation could be attributed to the influence of the values of POS and psychological contract violation, both of which are related to organisational trust and intention to quit. While low POS can reduce the influence of trust on intention to leave if employees do not feel that the organisation provides sufficient support for their wellbeing in exchange for their input, employees’ trust in the organisation to fulfil its promises will also
reduce if they have previously perceived a breach or violation of their psychological contract. This explanation is supported by Schoorman et al. (2007, p. 346) who argued that “the level of trust is an indication of the amount of risk that one is willing to take”. Since employees take a risk in giving their trust as there is no guarantee that this would not be breached, it is important that organisational managers make an effort to sustain this trust (Paillé et al., 2010). Indeed, the perception of a breach (real or imaginary) of trust may immediately lead to general mistrust of the organisation, thus eliciting attitudes and behaviours that are detrimental to the organisation (Zhao et al., 2007). The influence of both POS and PCV could therefore account for the weak relationship found in the PLS path between organisational trust and intention to quit.

Previous studies (e.g., Batchelor, 2013; Cho et al., 2009; Fruend, as cited in Trussel, 2015; Hansen, Dunford, Boss, Boss & Angermeier, 2011; Riggle et al., 2009; Trussell, 2015), however, found significant negative relationships between organisational trust and intention to quit, thus providing support for the bivariate correlation results of the present study. The common explanation of the findings by the authors is that intention to quit decreases significantly when employees assume higher levels of individual trust in their organisations. Further studies (e.g., Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky, 2005; Wanous, Reichers & Austin, 2000) explain that employees will most likely remain with an organisation that cares for their wellbeing and supports their welfare and personal development. Employees, on the contrary, who do not receive support from the organisation and mistrust the organisation will develop turnover intentions and may, in addition, display negative behaviours towards the organisation.

5.4.7 Relationship between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit

The bivariate correlation analysis showed a moderate, but significant, negative correlation between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit (r = −.517, p < .01) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of affective organisational commitment associated with low intention to quit. The PLS analysis indicated a significant, negative relationship between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit, while the multiple regression analysis also confirms Hypothesis 3, therefore overall support was found for the hypothesis. The finding of the present research concurred with other research outcomes (e.g., Perryer, Jordan & Firns, 2010; Tumwesigye, 2010) which variously found a significant and negative correlation between all the dimensions of organisational commitment and turnover intentions.
This suggests that increase in the level of emotional bond and other dimensions of organisational commitment will decrease employees’ motivation to leave their organisation.

Further findings in support of a significant, negative relationship between affective organisational commitment and intention to quit could be found in a study conducted by Kuean, Kaur and Wong (2010) which identified affective commitment as the strongest predictor of turnover intention. The authors argued that employees who are emotionally attached to an organisation will be less likely to want to quit. This argument is supported by Iverson and Buttigieg (1999) who reported employee affective commitment as the most influential factor in enhancing organisational outcomes and retention.

5.4.8 Relationship between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment

The bivariate correlation analysis indicated a high significant, positive correlation between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment ($r = .711$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of perceived organisational support associated with affective organisational commitment. The PLS analysis similarly showed a significant, positive relationship between perceived organisational support and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.38). Support was therefore found for Hypothesis 10 which stated a significant positive relationship between the two variables. These findings concurred with Meyer et al.’s (2002) argument that perceived organisational support possibly provides the mechanism through which other work experience variables (e.g., organisational justice) influence affective commitment. The above findings could be located within the context of the organisational support theory which posits that employees reciprocate the organisation’s concerns for their wellbeing through sustained committed to the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Grant, Dutton & Rosso, 2008). The argument is that a quality leader-member exchange relationship will translate to affective commitment, both to the supervisor and the organisation in general.

Consistent with previous studies, Tumwesigye (2010) reported a positive relationship between perceived organisational support and all three dimensions of organisational commitment (affective, normative and continuance). The implication of these findings is that employees who feel that their organisation values their contribution and cares about their wellbeing will reciprocate this gesture by engaging in higher levels of affective, normative and continuance organisational commitment. These findings further find support in other research outcomes (e.g., Currie & Dollery, 2006; Pazy & Ganzach, 2009). Other studies
conducted within the African context (e.g., Onyinyi, 2003; Makanjee, Hartzer & Uys, 2006) similarly reported a positive correlation between perceived organisational support and organisational commitment. It will therefore benefit organisational managers to create a positive working environment and implement strategies that enhance employee support in order to maintain a highly committed workforce.

5.4.9 Relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational trust
The bivariate correlation analysis found evidence of a high positive correlation between perceived organisational support and organisational trust ($r = .821, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of perceived organisational support associated with organisational trust. The PLS analysis also indicated a significant, positive relationship between perceived organisational support and organisational trust (see Table 4.38). Thus, Hypothesis 13, stating a significant positive relationship between the two constructs, was supported. This finding reinforces similar findings by previous researchers (e.g., Chen, Aryee & Lee, 2005; Ristig, 2009; Stinglhamber et al., 2006; Wong et al., 2012). Various researchers established that perceived organisational support has a significant impact on trust in the organisation. The rationale for these research outcomes is that employees who receive sufficient support from the organisation are most likely to develop trust in the organisation. Perceived organisational support is an indication of commitment and respect for the employees, and results in the demonstration of higher levels of trust towards the organisation (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000). Other studies also contended that trust in the organisation acts as an antecedent to POS (Canipe, 2006; Ferres et al., 2004) to the extent that when employees trust their organisation, they tend to assess and accept the policies and work practices of the organisation in a positive manner. This positive evaluation of the organisation will, over time, perpetuate employees’ perception of organisational support, thus creating a sustainable culture of trust. This culture of trust is an essential element in the management and building of work teams in a highly diversified work environment such as in South Africa.

5.4.10 Relationship between organisational justice and organisational trust
The bivariate correlation analysis found a high positive correlation between organisational justice and organisational trust ($r = .833, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of organisational justice associated with organisational trust. The PLS analysis similarly found a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and organisational trust (see Table 4.38), thus providing overall support for Hypothesis 14. The findings of the present study further confirms similar findings (e.g., Bidarian & Jafari, 2012; Rubin, 2009) of
employees having a high level of trust in an organisation if transparent and fair treatment is
demonstrated in all organisational processes and proceedings. It can therefore be argued that
employees increase their level of trust when they perceive a sense of justice on the part of the
organisation. Managers relating directly with employees (on behalf of the organisation) and
their actions, or lack of it, provide a basis upon which trust can be established in the
organisation. Paying attention to the employees and being responsible toward their needs in a
fair manner may assist in developing confidence between managers and their subordinates.

In relation to distributive justice, Pillai, Schriesheim and Williams (1999) assert that
employees exhibit improved levels of trust if the distribution of organisational rewards is
perceived as fair. Based on Adams’ (1965) equity theory, Bews and Uys (2002) contended
that, even though an organisational outcome may appear favourable, it may fail to stimulate
perceptions of fairness or trust among employees if they perceive lack of integrity in the
process through which such outcomes are achieved (e.g., Bews & Uys, 2002). Employees’
feelings of trust are likely to suffer a setback if they perceive preferential or discriminatory
treatment of members in the distribution and awarding of opportunities in the organisation
(Mark & Thornhill, 2003).

5.4.11 Relationship between organisational justice and intention to quit
The bivariate correlation analysis showed a moderate, but significant, negative correlation
between organisational justice and intention to quit ($r = -.522$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with
high levels of organisational justice associated with low intention to quit. The PLS analysis
similarly indicated a significant, negative relationship between organisational justice and
intention to quit (see Table 4.38), while the multiple regression analysis also confirmed
Hypothesis 4 ($t = -.4.557$, $p < .01$) (see Table 4.35).

The finding of the present study corroborates similar findings by Nadiri and Tanova (2010).
The fairness of the manner in which rewards are distributed and procedures adopted in the
decision-making process concerning the wellbeing and career development and progression
are of outmost importance to employees. It then follows that a perception of unfairness in the
way organisational outcomes are distributed among members could stimulate turnover
intentions (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). The rationale of the research findings could also be
located within the background of the equity theory (Adam, 1965), which posited that
employees conduct a comparative input-reward ratio analysis in order to determine the degree
of organisational justice. Individual employees who perceive inequity in the distribution of
rewards among members of the organisation are most likely to engage in withdrawal activities (e.g., absenteeism, reduced productivity, sabotage), which gradually leads to a decision to finally leave the organisation if the perceived inequity is not addressed. Further research findings similarly provided evidence of a negative and significant relationship between dimensions of justice such as distributive, relational or interactional justice and intention to quit (Aghaei, Moshiri & Shahrbanian, 2012). The authors contended that interactional, procedural and informational justice has a pronounced impact on an employee’s turnover intention compared to other forms of justice.

5.4.12 Relationship between organisational justice and perceived organisational support
The bivariate correlation analysis found a high positive correlation between organisational justice and perceived organisational support ($r = .817, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of organisational justice associated with perceived organisational support. The PLS analysis similarly found a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and perceived organisational support (see Table 4.38). Thus, Hypothesis 9, which stated a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and perceived organisational support, was supported. A number of previous studies (e.g., Loi et al., 2006; Wayne, Shore, Bommer & Tetrick, 2002; Wong et al., 2012) arrived at findings similar to those of the present study. In another study, Loi, Hang-yue and Foley (2006) found a significant relationship between organisational justice and commitment through the mediating role of perceived organisational support. It is important for organisations to implement measures that show sufficient support and fairness to employees in order to enhance their retention. This is particularly important in a work environment like that in South Africa with a notable history of racially segregated employment practices which grossly disadvantaged black people in terms of training, career advancement and organisational support. Contemporary workplace practices therefore require that employees who were previously disadvantaged be supported in order to redress past injustices.

Ngo, Tang and Au (2002) and Pillai et al. (2001) particularly emphasised the importance of distributive justice which they contended represent a salient role in employees’ evaluation of their organisations. This contention was supported by Loi, Hang-yue and Foley (2010) who extended existing perceived organisational support literature by confirming distributive justice as a significant resource in social exchange between employees and their organisations. Loi and colleagues suggested that organisations should take appropriate action
to ensure provision of distributive justice in managing their employees, and similarly provide a comparison standard in order to avoid perceptions of distributive injustice.

5.4.13 Relationship between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment

The bivariate correlation analysis provided evidence of a high positive correlation between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment ($r = .734, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of organisational justice associated with affective organisational commitment. The PLS analysis also indicated a significant, positive relationship between organisational justice and affective organisational commitment (see Table 4.38). Hypothesis 11, stating a positive relationship between the two variables, consequently was supported. This finding of the present study reinforces that of Crow, Lee and Joo (2012) and Ohana (2014), who found a strong correlation between all dimensions of justice (procedural, distributive, interactive and informational) and affective organisational commitment. Meyer et al. (2002) similarly provide evidence of a stronger correlation between organisational justice and affective commitment in relation to the other two components of commitment. This research outcome could find operational expression within the context of the social exchange theory (Lavelle, Rupp & Brockner, 2007; Peterson, 2004) on the one hand, and organisational justice theory (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel & Rupp, 2001) on the other hand. Both theories provided context background for the relationships between organisational justice and commitment. Employees commit themselves to their organisations in the hope that the organisation will treat them with fairness in all its processes and procedures (Cohen, 2007).

This positive link between the various forms of organisational justice and commitment has been confirmed by a plethora of empirical studies (e.g., Cohen & Veled-Hecht, 2010; Farndale, Hope-Hailey & Kelliher, 2011). The justice environment-commitment relationship framework explains that a prevailing good justice climate in an organisation is an indication that the collective interests of the employees are protected (Roberson & Colquitt, 2005). This framework provides employees with some form of assurance that their future economic interests in the organisation are protected. This sense of economic guarantee from the organisation encourages employees to also increase their commitment to the organisation in terms of the social exchange principle of reciprocity (He & Brown, 2013; Janssen, Muller & Greifeneder, 2011). A further positive implication of the justice climate is its propensity to consolidate the social identity of organisational members as fair treatment by the organisation.
reinforces the social status and develops pride among organisational members (Tyler & Blader, 2003). The resulting favourable group relationships and interactions portray the organisation as one of justice and equity and this extends to its external clients (e.g., customers, suppliers, etc.). In return for such fair behaviour, employees are willing to compensate the organisation through increased commitment (O’Reilly & Aquino, 2011). It can then be concluded that employees who feel strongly about fairness in the procedures by which organisational rewards are allocated and the level of interaction between all members of the organisation are most likely to remain affectively committed to the organisation.

5.4.14 Relationship between psychological empowerment and organisational trust
The bivariate correlation analysis provided evidence of a high positive correlation between perceived psychological empowerment and organisational trust ($r = .745, p < .010$ (see Table 4.34), with high levels of psychological empowerment associated with organisational trust. The PLS analysis also indicated a significant, positive relationship between psychological empowerment and organisational trust (see Table 4.38). Hypothesis 16, stating a significant, positive correlation between the two variables was thus supported. This finding derived support from previous studies (e.g., Ergeneli, Ari, & Metin, 2007; Huang, 2012; Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2005) that similarly reported significant and positive correlations between psychological empowerment and organisational trust. Laschinger and Finegan (2005) contended that employees who perceive their work environment as empowering demonstrate increased levels of trust. The authors further noted that, when the work environment is empowering and employees perceive a climate of justice, respect, and trust, it can be reasonably expected that they would experience greater job satisfaction and commitment to the organisation. Kluska, Laschinger-Spence and Kerr (2004) have noted that psychological empowerment includes feelings of competence, autonomy, job meaningfulness, and an ability to impact the organisation. It is therefore expected that employees who are empowered are more committed to the organisation, take responsibility for their work performance, and are better able to execute their jobs in an effective manner (Degner, 2005).

Rosabeth Moss Kanter's (1993) model of organisational empowerment provides a framework for creating meaningful work environments. According to this theory, empowerment is promoted in work environments that provide employees with access to information, resources, support, and the opportunity to learn and develop. Empowerment is developed when organisations provide an enabling work environment that meaningfully engages employees and potentially enhances their professional development and growth (Erickson,
Hamilton, Jones & Ditomassi, 2003). Thus, empowerment is a gradual process that develops over a period of time as employees assume greater responsibility in the organisational decision-making process and autonomy in task execution. In a study by Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian and Wilk (2001), staff nurses felt that structural empowerment resulted in higher levels of psychological empowerment, which, in turn, strongly impacted on their trust in management. This enhanced trust subsequently had a positive influence on their commitment to the organisation.

5.4.15 Relationship between transformational leadership and organisational justice
The bivariate correlation analysis indicated a high positive correlation between transformational leadership and organisational justice ($r = .709, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of transformational leadership associated with organisational justice. The PLS analysis also found a significant, positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational justice (see Table 4.38), therefore support was found for Hypothesis 18. This finding, to a large extent, provides support for similar findings by Bacha and Walker (2013) who found a positive relationship between distributive, procedural, and interactional fairness and all the dimensions of transformational leadership.

Some of the attributes that define an effective transformational leader are trustworthiness and integrity (Palanski & Yammarino, 2009). A leader’s efforts to inspire subordinates will not be effective if such a leader lacked the necessary integrity (Bacha & Walker, 2013). It is therefore logical to conclude that a transformational leader will be perceived as fair when he/she demonstrates the ability to inspire, motivate, and create a sense of optimism and enthusiasm in subordinates in the process of communicating the organisation’s vision (Bacha & Walker, 2013). The attributes indicated above thus provide an essential basis for a positive and significant relationship between inspirational motivation and fairness. Transformational leaders furthermore stimulate their subordinates intellectually by motivating and involving them in the decision-making process and providing them with the opportunity to solve problems using innovative ideas (Bacha & Walker, 2013). One of the attributes of a transformational leader emphasised by Bacha and Walker is the ability to treat each follower individually (individualised consideration) by taking into consideration the needs of individual employees. Such a leadership orientation recognises that individuals in the workplace have distinct socioeconomic and psychological needs that are different from those of the group. Such individualised attention and treatment creates an atmosphere of personal
satisfaction, a sense of fairness and happiness in the workplace as employees are rewarded on the basis of their individual skills and competencies.

5.4.16 Relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support

The bivariate correlation analysis found a moderate, but significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support (POS) ($r = .589, p < .01$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of transformational leadership associated with perceived organisational support. However, the PLS analysis indicated a non-significant relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support (see Table 4.38), therefore partial support was found for Hypothesis 8. The non-significant relationship between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support is the result of the interactive effect among the different antecedents of intention to quit. The PLS results indicated that transformational leadership may rather influence POS indirectly through organisational justice.

A reasonable search of extant literature has not discovered empirical studies that evaluated the statistical significance between transformational leadership and perceived organisational support as presented in the PLS path in the present study. What is prevalent in extant literature is the moderating role between POS, job performance and other antecedents of intention to quit such as transformational leadership (empowering leader); organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB); empowerment; and organisational justice. A study conducted by Hassan and ul-Hassan (2015) showed a positive and significant relationship between transformational leadership, OCB and reduced withdrawal behaviour. This finding by Hassan and colleague suggest that employees reveal more citizenship behaviours in response to the empowering approach of their leaders. Some of the behaviours exhibited by empowered employees include punctuality at work; observing short break periods; and giving advance notice of inability to attend work. The authors further examined the potential mediating role of POS in the relationships between leader-member-exchange; transformational leadership; organisational justice; and employee behavioural outcomes using the procedure described by Baron and Kenny (1986). The results of the study showed a partial mediating role played by POS in the relationship between transformational leadership, job performance, OCB and decreased work behaviour. Building on the leader-member-exchange theory, Hassan and ul-Hassan affirmed that demonstration of POS resulted in employees’ decision to improve on
their performance as a way of compensating the organisation for treating them in a favourable manner.

The results of the present study found partial support in a meta-analytic assessment of organisational support theory (OST) conducted by Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart and Adis (2015). The results showed a strong relationship between POS and transformational leadership. This finding is supported by the organisational support theory which suggests that transformational leaders display better POS by supporting the needs of their subordinates and inspiring them to be more committed to achieving organisational goals, unlike in transactional leadership. Transformational leadership and perceived organisational support are considered to have a strong and positive influence on work outcomes, such as increased commitment and low turnover intent (Connell, Ferres & Travaglione, 2003).

One important attribute of a transformational leader is the ability to effectively communicate with, and encourage feedback from subordinates, thus promoting both top-bottom and bottom-top communication strategies. The bottom-up communication approach provides an effective channel through which subordinates convey their concerns to senior management. Employees therefore regard this strategy as an indication that management cares about their wellbeing and value input to policy formulation by subordinates (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011; Neves & Eisenberger, 2012). The two-way approach to organisational communication that provides low-level employees with an opportunity to present their needs to management is seen as a form of socio-emotional support and employees tend to reciprocate such a gesture by increasing their commitment to and efforts at achieving organisational goals (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). A number of empirical studies have shown that employees with high POS perceive a strong obligation to assist the organisation to achieve its objectives; showed stronger affective commitment to the organisation; and had high expectations of reward for improved performance, all of which are associated with increased work performance (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

5.4.17 Relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment

The bivariate correlation analysis provided evidence of a moderate, but significant, positive correlation between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment ($r = .445$, p
< .001) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of transformational leadership associated with psychological empowerment. The PLS analysis similarly indicated a significant, positive relationship between the two variables (see Table 4.38). Hypothesis 19 was therefore supported. There is a vast amount of empirical support for this result from the present study. Available research outcomes, for example, indicate significant and positive relationships among dimensions of transformational leadership and dimensions of psychological empowerment (e.g., Allameh et al., 2012; Aucamp, 2014; Gumuslugle & Ilissu, 2008; Ismail, Mohammed, Sulaiman, Mohamad & Yusuf, 2011; Krishnan, 2012; Otaghsara & Mohseni, 2010). These authors argue that one way of demonstrating affirmation of subordinates’ competence and ability to independently engage in meaningful work is for the leader to encourage innovation in problem-solving; to grant autonomy in task performance; and forming a coherent work group. It is based on this line of argument that empirical studies such as the one conducted by Al-Swidi, Nawawi and Al-Hosam (2012) reported a significant relationship between transformational leadership and empowerment. A study by Krishnan (2012) similarly reported significant positive correlations between empowerment and all the dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., idealised influence; intellectual stimulation; inspirational motivation; individualised consideration). However, Meyerson and Kline (2008) reported non-significant correlations between psychological empowerment and all the dimensions of transformational leadership, which is in direct contrast with the present study which found a significant correlation between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment.

In attempting an explanation of the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment, Roux (2014) suggests a possible impact of the idealised influence dimension of transformational leadership on the meaning dimension of psychological empowerment. Avolio et al. (2004) contend that a transformational leader may, by way of idealised influence, develop followers’ perceptions of having meaningful work, which is achieved by realigning followers’ personal values with that of the organisation (Jung, Yammarino & Lee, 2009; Roux, 2014).

Regarding the relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment, Roux (2014) further explains that the inspirational motivation dimension of transformational leadership may impact on the meaning dimension of psychological empowerment. According to Bass (1997), inspirational motivation involves communicating a
stimulating vision that aligns organisational goals with the work values of followers. This congruence in work values inculcates a sense of meaningful work engagement in the followers (Roux, 2014). Roux (2014) furthermore established a relationship between the individualised consideration dimension of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment (more specifically, the competence dimension). Yukl (2013), in listing attributes of individualised consideration, included providing support, encouragement and coaching to followers. The essence of the transformational leader providing mentoring and coaching to followers is to develop a sense of self-confidence and independence, which is associated with the self-determination dimension of psychological empowerment. Roux (2014) also explained that a relationship between transformational leadership and psychological empowerment could be achieved through the intellectual stimulation dimension of transformational leadership. In this regard, Roux posited that employees’ level of self-confidence and competence could be enhanced when they are able to achieve higher work goals set by their managers. Such achievements serve as a booster at the level of employees’ psychological empowerment and competence.

5.4.18 Relationship between transformational leadership and organisational trust
The bivariate correlation analysis showed a high positive correlation between transformational leadership and organisational trust ($r = -.737, p < .001$) (see Table 4.34), with high levels of transformational leadership associated with organisational trust. The PLS analysis similarly indicated a significant, positive relationship between the two variables (see Table 4.38). Hypothesis 15 was therefore supported. Previous research findings (e.g., Lee, 2008; Tierney & Farmers, 2002) provided evidence consistent with the findings of the present study. The authors stated that leaders will assign higher and more challenging but achievable responsibilities to subordinates whom they have mentored and coached, and in whose competence they have established sufficient trust. Further research outcomes (e.g., Bartram, Casimir, Waldman & Yang, 2006; Braun, Peus, Weisweiler & Frey (2013) showed a positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational trust. Employees develop trust in leaders who relate to them in an open and truthful manner (Ilies, Morgeson & Nahrgang, 2005). Furthermore, ethical leaders build trust by personally displaying a high moral standard with integrity and involving employees in the decision-making process. This trust sustains a more transparent process of dealing with difficult problems, in part because of values shared between leaders and followers. Aucamp (2014), citing Whitener, similarly posited that trust in the leader is facilitated by the attributes exhibited by transformational
leadership, which include credibility, consistency between words and behaviour (i.e., walking the talk) and integrity. Subordinates also develop trust and exhibit confidence in the leader whose intentions and motives are considered to be transparent and, more importantly, who demonstrates concern for their needs (i.e., individualised consideration) (Bartram et al., 2006).

Related studies further confirmed that transformational leaders characteristically engage in an open-door policy and behave in a manner that portrays the team as a reliable and trustworthy entity. Followers who experienced this level of transparency and trust from their leader will tend to reciprocate by increasing their own trust in the leader (Dionne, Sayama, Hao & Bush, 2010). This culture of reciprocal trust between the leader and team members encourages individual members to take more personal risks, which increase the mutual trust in the team (Arnold, Barling & Kelloway, 2001; Aucamp, 2014). The propensity to take risks is dependent on the degree to which an individual employee can predict the reactions of the leader (Thau, Bennett, Mitchell & Marrs, 2008). Thus, the position expressed by Thau and colleagues provides support for the positive correlation between transformational leadership and organisational trust that was established in the present study.

5.5 LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this study, the nature of the relationship between selected constructs of antecedents to intention to quit was investigated. Although valuable insights were obtained about the relationship between the constructs involved, it is important to consider some limitations of this study for the purpose of providing information on how future studies may contribute to the questions addressed through this research.

A non-probability sampling procedure and cross-sectional research design were used in the current study. The sampling procedure thus poses concern about the representativeness of the respondents and, by implication, the ability to generalise the results of this study. The concern with generalisability or external validity is particularly strong in quantitative research using a cross-sectional research design (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A further concern that is associated with the issue of a cross-sectional (correlational) study is the nature of the data, which poses a threat to internal validity because it prevents direction inferences regarding causality. Causal conclusions made from cross-sectional research designs are never more than inferences, since such conclusions are based on a once-off measurement (Moorman, 1991). A
superior alternative to cross-sectional design is longitudinal design which is better for testing causality because the phenomenon under investigation is measured over a reasonable period of time (Moorman, 1991). Also of concern and a limitation to the present study is the inadequate sample size which is considered unsuitable for analysis using advanced multivariate techniques such as LISREL. This statistical technique, which requires a larger sample size, would have been a preferred structural equation modelling technique to PLS because of its statistical robustness.

One of the shortcomings often associated with the measurement process is the assumption by researchers that instruments that are statistically tested and validated possess the ability to accurately and precisely measure the phenomenon under investigation and produce research outcomes that are reliable. Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 168) have described this as an “artificial and spurious sense of precision and accuracy”. This assertion is located within the argument that “the connection between the measures developed by social scientists and the concepts they are supposed to be revealing is assumed rather than real” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 168). A further concern about measuring instruments is the assumption that respondents understand the concepts and attach similar meanings to statements in the questionnaire. This is not so because of the tendency among individual respondents to interpret questionnaire statements differently (Bryman & Bell, 2011), even when alternative answers are provided. The questionnaire used for data collection in the present study relied heavily on its validity and reliability content, thus falling within the shortcomings that have been described above. Closely related to the preceding limitation is the exclusive use of the self-report rating method, which could influence the reliability and validity of data. Self-ratings may suffer from pollution, but this is also true of other sources of criterion data. Nevertheless, it cannot be guaranteed that the criterion ratings were unbiased, although Turnipseed (2002) accepts that the use of self-reported measures is justifiable when the relationships examined are directed at variables reflecting the psychological conditions of people at work (as in the present study), but it is still important to detect the presence of a common variance bias.

Another limitation that is related to the one discussed in the preceding paragraph is the criticism that is generally endemic in quantitative studies – i.e. the tendency by researchers to assume a fixed disposition of the variables they are investigating without considering the real-life experiences of the respondents (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The underlying assumption of the present study was that all the variables investigated apply equally to the different
categories of respondents. However, the real-life experiences of individual respondents or groups regarding the variables investigated in relation to the construct of turnover intention cannot be said to be the same, given the organisational, social and group dynamics that determine the behaviour of employees within an organisational setting.

A further limitation of this study was that the conceptual model did not make provision for moderating variables or additional mediators between the various constructs investigated, which might have resulted in non-significant relationships in the PLS paths between constructs such as transformational leadership and POS; organisational trust and intention to quit; and POS and intention to quit. It would therefore be necessary for future studies to consider investigating more mediating and moderating variables in order to provide a better explanation for the non-supported hypotheses.

Similarly, only eight constructs were investigated in the present study, which suggests that other significant mediators could have been excluded in the process of investigating the relationships between the selected antecedents of intention to quit. Future research can therefore expand the scope of the conceptual model to include other substantive moderating/mediating variables (e.g., labour market dynamics, demographic characteristics and person-organisation fit). Of equal important consideration for future studies is the evaluation of the influence of the dimensions of constructs such as organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactive); psychological empowerment (perceived competence, perceived control and goal internalisation); organisational trust (trust in the leader and organisation); and transformational leadership (idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualised consideration). Individual analysis of these dimensional constructs could provide a better understanding of the relationship between the overall constructs and intention to quit.

Employees’ intention to quit an organisation is, by its very nature, a sensitive construct that is often influenced by social desirability. This social phenomenon is perceived to be a veritable source of error in any social research of the current nature. Closely related to the sensitive nature of employees’ intention to quit an organisation is the issue of honesty amongst respondents. Although all practical efforts were made in order to mitigate this factor, there is no guarantee that the respondents were completely honest in their responses to the questions.

The composition of respondents in this study cut across language and educational backgrounds. The questionnaire items were composed in English language without
consideration for the respondents’ proficiency in the use of English which, to some of them constitutes a second or third language. This could affect the level of understanding and interpretation attached to the questions asked, and influence their responses. Misinterpretation of questionnaire items and the resulting responses due to language barrier constitutes a possible limitation to the validity of this study.

Given the limitations and scope of the present study, it is envisaged that other scholars will be inspired to conduct further investigation of the relationships between the constructs that have currently been investigated. Such future studies could, for example, use an exclusive or homogeneous (rather than across-job levels) sample (e.g. managerial levels or non-managerial employees) using a longitudinal research design and adopting a mixed-methods (e.g. qualitative and quantitative methods) research strategy.

Furthermore, the phenomenon of intention to quit and its numerous antecedents have, over the years, attracted a plethora of studies, and yet remains a dynamic construct of investigation in the field of contemporary organisational psychology. To this extent, a consortium of researchers could conduct a meta-analytical evaluation of notable studies by scholars in the field. This could provide scholars in the field of organisational psychology with a compendium of literature and handy research references (see Kurtessis et al., 2015).

5.6 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY
The study has made the following theoretical and empirical contributions to employee retention management:

- The current study has produced a conceptual model which offers a unique way of understanding the complex way in which the selected variables are interrelated. This new understanding has led to the incorporation of both organisational and individual variables in a single model explaining existing relationships between the selected constructs and intention to quit.
- The conceptual model of the present study is unique in the sense that it combines selected variables that are considered significant in understanding the complex relationships among antecedents of intention to quit in a single model. No such structural model exists in the literature of organisational psychology, particularly within the context of a developing economy such as South Africa. It thus presents a new direction for the empirical understanding of the relationships between the constructs investigated.
The uniqueness of the present study potentially provides a framework and direction for future research in the area of employee retention management.

On the overall, the present study will advance our current knowledge in the field of organisational psychology by testing theory and offering new empirical evidence to explain the relationships among the constructs investigated. It is important to recognise that empirical evidence from this study is new and therefore represents an important contribution to the existing body of knowledge and practical interventions to enhance employee retention programmes in organisations.

The following section presents the managerial implications of the present study.

5.7 Managerial implications

A considerable amount of theoretical work has previously been done to understand the concept of intention to quit; nevertheless, broad analysis of the concept’s antecedents such as conducted in this study and the resultant implications are rare. The essence of the broad analysis in this study is to suggest that main antecedents of intention to quit can be altered and used by management as a panacea for managing such intentions. The necessity for management to understand the factors (stimuli) that prompt employees to consider quitting an organisation were firmly established earlier in this study. Such an understanding will enable management to act proactively in reducing actual employee turnover rather than managing the damaging consequences of the phenomenon.

Employee turnover antecedents (transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, organisational justice, perceived organisational support, organisational trust, affective organisational commitment and psychological contract violation) that have been analysed in this study could be deliberately incorporated as part of the broad strategic HR policy of the organisation without necessarily designing and directing specific retention programmes at individuals or a category of employees with perceived intention to quit. In general, the conceptual model of this study provides practical insight and a scientific basis for the formulation of a HR policy based on the statistical and retention strength of individual variables that have been analysed (see Chapter 4). Based on this model, management may consider it most important to capacitate management employees who exercise leadership functions in their interpersonal skills, as most of the antecedents of turnover intentions are motivated by or associated with leadership behaviours.
The study has demonstrated that managers would have a positive impact on the employee retention strategy of the organisation if they were selected and trained to become transformational leaders that would have a positive influence on the organisational justice climate, which would consequently have a positive effect on employees’ perceived organisational support, and their affective organisational commitment. Alternatively, transformational leaders can be trained to have a positive impact on the retention strategy through their influence on the psychological empowerment of employees; their trust in the organisation; and the decreasing psychological contract violation of employees. The results indicated further that a good starting point for implementing an effective retention strategy would be to train transformational leaders to develop a culture of fairness and justice in the organisation and to develop mechanisms to decrease employees’ perceptions of the violation of the psychological contract between employees and the organisation.

Implementation of the managerial implications of this study as articulated in the above paragraphs require that organisations adopt an effective strategic retention approach. This approach will not only assist organisations in retaining high performing employees, it could also enhance its brand in the labour market as an ‘organisation of choice’ for premium job seekers. A strategic retention programme requires that managers understand the costs of high-turnover rate – both financial and non-financial. The implications of these costs have been theoretically established in this study. It is expedient for such a programme to consider a ‘cost-benefit analysis’ before a meaningful intervention strategy is developed. In order words, the cost of intervention should not outweigh the cost and consequences of employee turnover to the organisation. Such analysis is important as not all turnovers are detrimental to organisational performance (e.g., functional turnover) (Stovel & Bontis, 2002). The strategic retention initiative should take into consideration the employee turnover antecedents included in the structural model of this study and targeted at high-performing and premium employees, rather than the entire workforce.

5.8 Conclusion
This research found varying strengths and directions of relationships between all the constructs that were investigated (see Section 5.4). These results provided significant empirical and theoretical contributions to existing literature and meaningfully advanced the frontier of knowledge in the broad field of organisational psychology. Similarly, the managerial implications of this study are located within the context of the research outcomes
which provides organisational managers with practical and effective tools that could assist in the early identification, intervention and management of turnover intentions.

The results of the study (see PLS Path Model 2 and Table 4.40) indicate both less complex and more complex paths consisting of the following significant sequences:

- Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through POS, through affective organisational commitment to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through affective organisational commitment to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through organisational justice to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through psychological empowerment through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit
- Transformational leadership through organisational justice, through POS, through trust, through psychological contract violation to impact intention to quit

On the basis of the multiple regression results, the two most important predictors of intention to quit are organisational justice and psychological contract violation. Organisations that want to prevent intention to quit should therefore start with practical interventions promoting organisational justice and decreasing psychological contract violation.

In summary, while the results of this study have mostly confirmed findings of previous studies, it also established some new and interesting directions in the relationships between certain constructs (e.g., trust and perceived organisational support) and intention to quit.
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