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SUMMARY

Title: Leadership expectations, engagement and intention to leave

Key terms: Leadership expectations, engagement and intention to leave

Due to globalisation and resulting work mobility, organisations are forced to compete for talented people. As a result organisations are starting to realise the importance of their human capital, human capital is viewed as the greatest contributor to organisational success. This is evident through the war for talent throughout the world. All organisations are fighting to have the best people as it is believed that talented people add value to the bottom line of the business and give the business a competitive edge.

In an attempt to retain talented people, the needs and expectations of these people must be taken seriously. The main research objective of the study was to investigate leadership expectations (what employees expect from their leaders), to what extent their expectations are met and the impact of these leadership expectations on work engagement and intention to leave.

In the study, both qualitative and quantitative research methods were utilised to achieve the objectives. Focus groups in each department of the factory were utilised to gather information on what employees expect from their leaders. Employees were interviewed and open ended questions were utilised to give employees an opportunity to express themselves. The information gathered from the focus groups was utilised to design a new leadership expectations checklist. The aim of this checklist is to measure leadership expectations and the extent to which those expectations are met. A total sample of 156 \((n=156)\) employees took part in the research.

The result of the study indicated that employees consider the following expectations as important: Relationship with supervisor (ranked as first); Appreciation of good work and Regular feedback (both ranked second); Support from supervisor (ranked third);
Communication (ranked fourth); Studying further (ranked fifth); Independence (ranked sixth); and Coaching (ranked seventh). Results further indicate that leadership expectation met does predict engagement, the more the leadership expectations are met the more the engaged the employees become. Regarding turnover there was a negative relationship between leadership expectation and turnover.

Recommendation to the organisation and for future research were made.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This dissertation focuses on three constructs. Firstly, it deals with employee engagement, highlighting key indicators which stipulate that highly engaged employees lead to increased organisational effectiveness and productivity; it discusses the fundamental characteristics that are crucial to improving work engagement; and it reflects on and quotes various literature studies that were conducted for the same purpose and the findings thereof. Secondly, the aspects of leadership expectation are discussed. The importance of leaders and their ability to “lead others to lead themselves” is discussed in detail. The differences between expectations that are met and those that are not met, and how leaders vary with regard to their own physical, mental and emotional strengths is discussed and highlighted. The third and last aspect, which is named ‘intention to leave’, is discussed in detail, including, but not limited to, intention to leave as a future indicator of organisational turnover, as well as its implication in defining leadership strength and leadership weakness as the main causes of employees’ intention to leave.

1.1 Problem Statement

Globalisation and technology are forces that cause organisations to compete for both natural and human resources. These two forces have changed the nature of business and the structure of society as a whole (Boninelli & Meyer, 2004). This is evident through the war for talent, although trends vary from country to country. In the Western world, the retirement of ‘baby boomers’ (born between 1946 and 1964) is creating a major skills shortage. Specifically in Europe, the problem is even worse due to low birth rates and high immigration rates (Athey, 2008). Based on these challenges, companies all over the world realise that they cannot compete on the global market without a skilled and motivated workforce. As a result, companies are putting more effort into retaining their employees (Athey, 2008).

Globalisation has influenced the role of business across the world, and South Africa is no exception. Since South Africa entered the global market, the country has faced the dilemma
of trying to compete globally, while trying locally to address the imbalances of the past in a highly unbalanced world (Magner, 2007).

In the last decade the nature of political, economic and social changes in South Africa presents a unique challenge to organisation and business leaders in the country. It is imperative to gain an understanding of the present nature of South African society which is economically and socially divided. More importantly, such understanding is essential to be able to run organisations in a complex, diverse and constantly changing environment. South Africa needs leaders to work together across all cultures, sectors and industries with a common goal in mind, namely the success of the broader political economy (Magner, 2007).

Faced with all the above-mentioned problems, South Africa needs leaders of the highest quality, who can not only lead, but also appeal to and inspire employees across cultural diversities and at all levels. This is supported by Shokane, Stanz and Slabbert (2004) who define leadership as the ability to lead oneself and lead others to lead themselves. Shokane et al. (2004) add that leadership is the mental and emotional involvement of employees in a group situation in which organisational decisions are made. Shokane et al. (2004) explicate that the advantages of effective leadership are high productivity, reduced conflict, reduced organisational turnover and reduced absenteeism; it also increases the self-esteem and job satisfaction of employees.

Leadership is the art of creating an environment in which employees are motivated and determined to achieve the goals of the organisation. Creating such an atmosphere depends on the leader (Kokmaz, 2006). Successful leaders are those who make productivity and employee well-being simultaneous priorities (Shokane et al., 2004).

It has been established that leadership has an influence on job performance, work-engagement and turnover intentions (Svensson & Wood, 2005). According to Svensson & Wood (2005) employees leave their leaders, not their companies. Therefore organisational leadership has an impact on the effectiveness of the organisation. Most companies realise that organisational success cannot be achieved by technology alone, but that human capital is the
most important ingredient for organisational success. The importance of human capital is not viewed only as a contributing factor to the success of the organisation, but also as a detrimental factor if it is not looked after. Thus the needs and expectations of employees must be taken seriously (Svensson & Wood, 2005).

It is evident that leaders are not all on the same level of understanding regarding the needs and expectations of employees. In many organisations leaders believe that the most important needs of their employees are related to remuneration. Blake (2006) found that most employees consider the following leadership imperatives to be crucial:

- **Relationship with their leaders:** It has often been emphasised that “people leave managers, not companies”. He further states that most organisations tend to ignore this as they find it easier to increase the employee’s remuneration than to develop leadership skills.

- **Autonomy:** Employees want to be given an opportunity to make decisions.

- **Appreciation:** Most employees want acknowledgment from their leaders. They want their leaders to realise that their contribution is important. They want to know that their opinion matters, they want to be appreciated and respected, and they want to know what is expected of them.

- **Communication:** Leaders are expected to communicate clear objectives and give regular feedback to their employees.

- **Coaching and career advancement opportunities:** The current workforce worldwide has varying demographic profiles. There are also diverse generations, such as generation X (1965–1980) and generation Y (1981–1994). The diverse generations are very competitive and want to stay on top of their game. They want to advance their skills constantly through training. The leaders or managers are the people most qualified to help them with their development since they are familiar with performance levels and the skills gap. This can help employees to develop and grow (Blake, 2006).

Many organisations are heavily reliant on their existing workforces and, in particular, on their value-creation capacities. Their survival depends on their ability to satisfy customer
needs while achieving quality, flexibility, innovation and organisational responsibility through the engagement and commitment of employees (Fay & Luhrmann 2004; Newell, 2002). The key factor leading to competitive advantage in the new world economy is the organisation’s employees (Minervini, Meyer & Rourke, 2003). It is important for managers to develop work engagement, given that disengagement or alienation is essential to the problem of worker’s lack of commitment (Bleeker & Roodt, 2002; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). According to Kahn (1990), work engagement involves the expression of the self through work and other employee-role activities. May, Gilson and Harter (2004) state that there are practical reasons (e.g. turnover and customer satisfaction) as well as humanistic reasons (e.g. motivation and attachment to work) for managers and researchers of organisations to be concerned with work engagement. Harter (2001) found a substantial correlation between work engagement and business outcomes.

According to Keerfoot (2008) employees are the source of the stocks of intellectual capital that organisations require to deliver value to their customers. Furthermore, ‘staff engagement’ is one of the watchwords of the day. Engaged employees will become loyal, highly productive and excited about their work (Keerfoot, 2008). The engagement of employees is generated by the leader. However, it is difficult for employees to be engaged if the leader is not. Employees tend to adopt the behaviour and characteristics of the leader. In each department the level of engagement, friendliness, pride and the atmosphere of happiness is the reflection of the behaviour of the leader (Keerfoot, 2008).

Work engagement is defined as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles [by which they] employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances” (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). Therefore, engaged employees become physically involved in their tasks, cognitively alert and emotionally connected to others when performing their jobs. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) define engagement as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind, characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption.
‘Vigour’ refers to high levels of energy and resilience, willingness to invest effort in one’s work and perseverance in the face of difficulties. ‘Dedication’ refers to strong involvement in one’s work, accompanied by feelings of enthusiasm and significance, and a sense of pride and inspiration (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). ‘Absorption’ refers to a satisfactory state of complete emersion in one’s work, which is characterised by focused attention, time distortion, loss of self-consciousness, effortless concentration, absolute control and intrinsic enjoyment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

Research has been done linking leadership to turnover intention. Kelly, (2007) found that among people who were planning to quit their jobs within one year, only 33% said they were satisfied with their supervisor or leader. Among people who said they planned to stay at least five years with their current employer, 85% were satisfied with their supervisor or leader. One can conclude that leadership behaviour has a great influence on the employee’s decision to stay with or leave the organisation (Kelly, 2007).

Retention of valuable employees is one of the most critical issues confronting leaders in today’s business world. The implications of dysfunctional turnover are enormous for organisations in terms of income, worker morale and competitive advantage. The average turnover cost can range beyond 1,5 times an employee’s annual salary when considering the price of reassigned workload, lost organisational memory and successor recruitment and training (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2008). And in most cases, employee departure is not an isolated event. Instead, turnover is frequently associated with consequential worker behaviours and outcomes which precede the act of leaving itself, namely absenteeism, diminished loyalty, lower job satisfaction and lower productivity (Mayfield & Mayfield, 2008).

It is from these points of view that the researcher decided to study leadership expectations, work engagement and the turnover intention of manufacturing employees.

The following research questions were formulated based on the research problem described above:
• How are the constructs leadership expectations, work engagement and intention to leave conceptualised in the literature?
• What do employees expect from their leaders?
• What is the correlation between leadership expectations, work engagement and intention to leave?
• What recommendations can be made to prevent or manage intention to leave/turnover?

1.2 Research Objectives

The research objectives are divided into a general objective and specific objectives.

1.2.1 General objective

The overall objective of this study was to investigate leadership expectations (what employees expect from their leaders and to what extent their expectations are met) and the impact of these leadership expectations on work engagement and intention to leave.

1.2.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of this research included:

• To conceptualise the constructs of leadership expectations, work engagement and intention to leave.
• To determine what employees expect from their leaders.
• To determine the correlation between leadership expectations, work engagement and intention to leave.
• To make recommendations on how to prevent or manage intention to leave.

1.3 Paradigm Perspective of the Research

Mouton and Marais (1992) believe that a specific paradigm perspective that includes the intellectual climate and the market of intellectual resources directs all research.
1.3.1 Intellectual climate

The ‘intellectual climate’ refers to the variety of non-epistemological convictions that are authorised by a discipline in the specific period. They are convictions, values and assumptions that are not directly connected to the epistemological aims of the specific research practice (Mouton & Marais, 1992). Although these convictions are often not directly testable or are not meant to be testable, the concept does imply underlying testable judgements. In order to determine the intellectual climate of the research, the disciplinary relevance and meta-theoretical assumptions are discussed.

1.3.2 Discipline

This research can be categorised within the limits of the behavioural sciences and more specifically industrial psychology. Industrial psychology can be described as the human behaviour within an organisation, with its primary function being to obtain a better understanding of the relationship between employees and their work, thus improving the situation whenever possible (Meyers, 2007).

Another sub-discipline of industrial psychology is organisational psychology which is concerned with the organisation as a system involving individuals and groups, and the structure and dynamics of the organisation (Bergh & Theron, 2004). The basic aim of this research is to examine leadership expectations, employee wellness and turnover intention, and how these factors affect the organisation as a system.

1.3.3 Meta-theoretical assumptions

Paradigms relevant to this research are firstly, the literature review which is done within the humanistic paradigm, and secondly, the empirical study which is done within the behaviouristic paradigm.
1.3.3.1 Literature review

The literature review focused on exploring employees’ expectations from their leaders, work engagement and intention to leave, and on establishing possible constructs to identify the relationship between these, according to the literature.

1.3.3.2 Empirical study

The empirical study was done within the behaviouristic paradigm which is defined by Grohol (2005) as an approach to psychology based on the proposition that behaviour can be researched scientifically without recourse to inner states. It is a form of materialism, denying any independent significance for the mind. Its significance to this study will be reflected in leadership expectations and whether they impact on the behaviour of the study population.

The second paradigm is the positivistic paradigm which focuses on finding the truth and providing it through empirical means. It is a philosophical position which holds that the goal of knowledge is simply to describe, in some designs to explain and also to predict the phenomena that we experience (whether qualitatively or quantitatively). The purpose of positivism is to observe and measure. In the positivistic view of the world, science is seen as a way to get to the truth, to understand the world enough so that it can be controlled by a process of prediction (Henning, 2007). During this research, leadership expectations, work engagement and turnover intention are the variables that are objectively defined and measured.

1.3.4 Market of intellectual resources

The market of intellectual resources refers to the assumptions with epistemological status as scientific hypothesis, in other words, with their status as knowledge-claims (Mouton & Marais, 1992). It is divided into theoretical and methodological beliefs.
1.3.4.1  **Theoretical beliefs**

Theoretical beliefs can be described as all beliefs that produce testable results regarding social phenomena (Mouton & Marais, 1992). The following theoretical hypotheses served as a starting point for this research and are divided into relevant conceptual definitions, and models and theories.

a.  **Conceptual definitions**

*Leadership expectations* refer to an expected image of mental and emotional involvement with employees in a group and individual situations where organisational decisions are concluded (*World English Dictionary*, 2005).

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) define *engagement* as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind, characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption. Vigour refers to high levels of energy and resilience, willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and perseverance in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to strong involvement in one’s work, accompanied by feelings of enthusiasm and significance, and a sense of pride and inspiration (Maslach et al., 2001). Absorption refers to a satisfactory state of complete emersion in one’s work, which is characterised by focused attention, time distortion, loss of self-consciousness, effortless concentration, absolute control, and intrinsic enjoyment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

*Intention to leave* refers to the employee’s inclination to leave his or her current job and organisation (Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000). Turnover intention can be viewed as more than simply staying away from work for a day. It is conceptualised in the literature as an intention by the employees to stop working sometime in the future. One approach to turnover suggests that turnover is a rational decision, in that employees have found better alternatives (Sieberhagen, 2006).

b.  **Models and theories**

A model is aimed at the simplified illustration of a relationship between the main components of a process. It does not only classify phenomena, but also tries to put in order the relationships among them (Mouton & Marais, 1992).
Based on the above literature, this study could relate to the two-factor theory of Frederick Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959). By means of this theory Herzberg wanted to answer the following question: What do people want from their jobs? This is related to the question of this study, which is: What do employees expect from their leaders? He further identified two factors, namely the “motivators” and “hygiene” factors (Herzberg, 1964). The motivators serve to motivate people and behaviour if they are present; they are distinct from the hygiene factors which lead to dissatisfaction if they are present (Robbins, 2001). For the purpose of this study the importance of employee expectations and the extent to which these expectations are met will be examined. It is assumed that, expectations that are met should lead to happiness in the workplace and the contrary is also possible.

1.3.4.2 Methodological beliefs

Methodological beliefs can be defined as beliefs that make judgements as to the nature and structure of science and scientific research. They include scientific philosophical traditions and the most important methodological models (qualitative and quantitative). For the purpose of this study both qualitative and quantitative research is utilised.

1.4 Research Method

The research method for this study consists of a literature review and an empirical study which encompasses the research design, the participants, the measuring instruments and the statistical analysis followed.

1.4.1 Research design

A mixed method design was used to attain the objectives of this study. Mixed method involves philosophical assumptions which guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data, and a mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research process. Its central premises are that the use of qualitative and quantitative
approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

1.4.1.1 Quantitative data

Quantitative data include closed-ended information such as that found on attitudes, behaviour, or performance instruments. Focus groups were utilised to gather the information from employees, from all departments in the factory. The collection of this kind of data may also involve using a closed-ended checklist, on which the researcher checks the behaviour observed. Sometimes quantitative information is found on documents such as census records or attendance records. The analysis consists of statistically analysing the scores collected by means of the measuring instruments, checklists or public documents to answer research questions or to test a hypothesis (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

1.4.1.2 Qualitative data

Qualitative data consist of open-ended information that the researcher gathers through interviews with participants. The general, open-ended questions asked during the interviews allow the participants to supply answers in their own words (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

For the purpose of this study a semi-structured interview process is used, participants will be given an opportunity to supply answers in their own words. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with a fairly open framework which allow for focused, conversational, two-way communication. A single population is purposively selected and semi-structured interviews are conducted with each individual. Not all questions are designed and phrased ahead of time. The majority of questions are created during the interview, allowing both the interviewer and the person being interviewed the flexibility to probe for details or discuss issues (Henning, 2007).
1.4.2 Participants

A total sample of 156 (n=156) people is drawn from a group of manufacturing employees. From this sample focus groups are drawn together to gather information regarding leadership expectations. The focus groups consist of employees taken from different departments.

1.4.3 Measuring instruments

**Employee expectations checklist:** A checklist of expectations is newly designed using the information gathered from the focus groups with the participants. The participants were asked to compare the “actual” (current expectations) with the “important” (expectations important to the employees). The participants ranked their expectations on a scale of 1 (less important) to 5 (most important).

**The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES):** This scale was developed by Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker (2002), is applied to measure the level of engagement. All items used for the scale use a 6-point agreement-disagreement Likert format varying from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The UWES measures three dimensions, namely vigour, dedication and absorption. It includes statements such as “I am bursting with energy in my work”, “I find my work full of meaning and purpose” and “I get carried away by my work”. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for the three subscales vary between 0,78 and 0,89. Storm and Rothman (2003) obtained alpha coefficients of 0,78 for vigour, 0,89 for dedication, and 0,78 for absorption in a sample of 2 396 members of the South African Police Service (SAPS).

**Turnover intention:** This scale consists of three items that were developed by Sjöberg and Sverke (2000) and which measure the strength of the respondent’s intention to leave his or her present position. “I feel that I could leave this job” is a typical item, with response alternatives ranging from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). A high score thus reflects a strong intention to leave the job. In their study, Brough and Frame (2004) indicated that the reliability of this measuring instrument had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0,82.
1.5 Statistical Analysis

The SPSS program (SPSS Inc., 2007) is used to do the statistical analysis of the data. The validity and reliability of the construct measures in this study are assessed using exploratory factor analyses and Cronbach alpha coefficients. Descriptive statistics (e.g. standard deviation, mean, skewness and kurtosis) and inferential statistics are used to analyse the data.

Cronbach alpha coefficients and inter-item correlations are used to assess the internal consistency and homogeneity of the measuring instruments. Alpha coefficients contain important information regarding the proportion of variance of the items on a scale in terms of the total variance explained by the particular scale. Exploratory factor analysis is most often used to investigate the factor structure of an instrument and the internal reliability of the total sample. Exploratory factor analyses are also conducted to determine the construct validity of the other measuring instruments (Clark & Watson, 1995).

Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients specify the relationship between variables. In terms of statistical significance, the value was set at a 99% confidence interval level ($p \leq 0.01$). Effect sizes (Steyn, 2005) were used to determine the practical significance of the findings. A cut-off point of 0.30 (medium effect: Cohen, 1988) is set for the practical significance of correlation coefficients.

Multiple linear regression analysis is used to determine whether leadership expectations predict engagement and intention to leave.

1.5.1 Research procedure

The research procedure will begin with a thorough literature study to determine what studies have already been carried out and reported in the recent literature. Focus groups in each department of the factory will be utilised to gather information on what employees expect from their leaders. Employees will be interviewed giving them an opportunity to express their views on the matter. This information will be utilised to design a new expectations
checklist. The aim of this checklist is to measure leadership expectations and the extent to which those expectations are met and their importance thereof.

Three of the questionnaires used in the study had already been established to be reliable and valid measuring instruments. After the sample population for the study had been identified, the consent of both the participants and management was obtained by means of distributing consent forms. The participants were allocated sufficient time to complete the questionnaires and these questionnaires are personally collected after the study. Interview time is scheduled with the participants’ consent. The privacy and sensitivity of the participants is protected and they were informed of what would be done with their information afterwards (Henning, 2007).

After the necessary data coding and data analysis had been completed, the data gathered are statistically interpreted. The intention is to present the findings in the form of a research article (see Chapter 2).

### 1.5.2 Ethical considerations

During the research, ethical measures were taken to ensure the safety and confidentiality of the participants. These measures ensured that the employees were protected, and not harmed in any emotional or physical way. Participants were informed about the whole process and given the opportunity to withdraw if they felt uncomfortable. The researcher made sure that respondents participated voluntarily and that there would be no penalty for refusal to participate. Informed consent from all participants was obtained prior to the start of the process. It was ensured that the identity of the participants filling in the questionnaires would be completely protected (Strydom, Fouche & Delport, 1997).

### 1.6 Division of Chapters

The chapters of this mini-dissertation are presented as follows:
Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Research article

Chapter 3: Conclusions and recommendations
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CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH ARTICLE
LEADERSHIP EXPECTATIONS, ENGAGEMENT AND INTENTION TO LEAVE

ABSTRACT

The objective of the study is to investigate leadership expectations that employees have towards their leaders, the impact of the leadership expectations on the engagement levels as well as the impact of the leadership expectations on intention to leave. In the ever changing work environment organisations must capitalise on their human capital. The positive organisation utilises specific expectations to optimise the human capital’s potential. It is therefore important to identify the expectations that contribute to a positive organisation as well as the elements which lead to higher engagement and decreased intention to leave of employees. In the study both qualitative and quantitative research methods were utilised, a sample of \( n=156 \) was taken. Focus groups in each department of the factory were utilised to gather information on what employees expect from their leaders. Employees were interviewed and open ended questions were utilised to give employees an opportunity to express themselves. The information gathered from the focus groups was utilised to design a leadership expectations checklist. The aim of this checklist is to measure leadership expectations and the extent to which those expectations are met. The questionnaires used are Employee Expectations Checklist, Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and Turnover Intention questionnaires. The result indicated 8 factors that employees consider as important leadership expectations. A relationship between leadership expectation and engagement was established. The results further indicated a slight negative relationship between leadership expectation and Intention to leave. Organisations should foster the elements of a positive organisation if they want to boost engagement and decrease intention to leave. The results of this research contribute to scientific knowledge about the effects of a positive organisation to the engagement of employees and intention to leave.
In the past the emphasis was more on quality products, services and equipment to give organisations a competitive edge. However, in the current global market companies realise that people or talent has become their main economic resource. Organisations benefit from talented employees who utilise their skills and knowledge to increase output (Birt, Walis & Winternitz, 2004).

As a result these employees are in high demand as the organisations are more dependant on them. “Talented employees are like the new oil, just like oil the demand far exceeds the supply” (Kelly, 2007). All over the world employees are behaving like customers as they are able to choose which companies they wish to work for. Employers need to promote a powerful and credible reputation for talent management if they are to preserve their talent resources (Kelly, 2007). In organisations characterised by market-driven turnover, employers attempt to retain their core and talented employees but are faced with the challenge of minimising factors that lead to turnover. Organisations that will succeed in the near future are those that motivate and develop their own talented employees (Kelly, 2007).

South Africa is no exception: it faces the prospect of needing to compete globally but certain key challenges have become apparent, such as the ability to be competitive and productive, and the ability not only to cope with and survive economic crises, but also to manoeuvre through challenging economic times today and in the future (Kim, Price, Mueller & Watson, 1996).

The country will be expected to be competitive in dealing with not only its natural resources, but also its human resources. South African companies are faced with the challenge of retaining and developing their own talent as these talented workers carry the knowledge base of the company. Previous research linked turnover to individual characteristics and the working environment, which makes the role of the leader crucial in the retention of employees (Kim, Price, Mueller & Watson, 1996).

Levin, Mor Barak and Nissly (2001) point out that to be successful in retaining workers, employers need to analyse and understand the motivational make-up of their employees. What motivates their employees to stay and what motivates them to leave? The issue of
employee retention affects the performance of the entire company. The ability to retain good employees is rapidly becoming a critical competitive weapon. Organisations are realising that their employees are their most crucial asset.

The war for talent forces organisations to investigate the cause of intention to leave the organisation. In order to be able to retain talent, organisations need to be able to predict intention to leave as it is a strong indicator of actual turnover. Furthermore, variables relating to intention to leave include a sense of powerlessness and lack of engagement (Firth, Mellor, Moore & Louquet, 2004).

The effective management of employee turnover is a central issue that needs to be monitored closely in order to avoid harmful effects, such as high economic costs and disrupted social and communicative structures (Bergiel, Nguyen, Clenney & Taylor, 2009). Employee retention comes from increase in profits, employees’ happiness and productivity, and customer satisfaction (Kaye & Jordan-Evans, 2000). The leaders play a critical role in the empowerment of employees which impacts on the organisation’s labour retention (Kreisman, 2002; Taplin & Winterton, 2007).

It can be concluded that talent is of paramount importance in various companies and organisations. Talented employees strive for high performance, which in turn attracts new talent and creates the means to reward it. Talent also drives improvement in productivity, quality, innovation and customer satisfaction, all of which add value to the bottom line of the company. Research indicates that in the UK employees leave their jobs annually at an estimated cost of 50% to 350% of their basic salary (The Recruitment Communications Company, 2002). Therefore, it is of paramount importance that employers treat their employees’ needs as being as important as those of their customers.

**Work Engagement**

Employee work engagement has been a subject of interest for many researchers and academics. Many researchers are of the opinion that work engagement plays a major role in
releasing employee performance, as well as in the retention of employees (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004). According to research, work engagement is declining and there is more disengagement among employees (Bates, 2004; Richman, 2006). It has been reported that most employees are not engaged; in the US half of the employees are reported not to be engaged. This behaviour leads to the so-called ‘engagement gap’ and this is costing US business US$300 billion a year in lost productivity (Bates, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Kowalski, 2003).

Previous studies indicate that there are distinctive definitions of engagement, although there are certain commonalities that have emerged, such as the expression of self through work and other employee-related roles. Oliver and Rothman (2007) define engagement as “the expression of self through work activities and other employee-role activities”. Engagement is also conceptualised as the meaning and extension of personality and dreams by self expression to work performance. May et al. (2004) refer to the engagement of employees through the physical, emotional and cognitive effect on work-related roles.

Work engagement is also referred to as the emotional and intellectual commitment to the organisation or the amount of discretionary effort employees put into their work. It refers to being psychologically present when performing a role and also involves two further important concepts, namely attention and absorption. Attention means being cognitively available and the time one spends thinking about the job or work. Absorption means being engrossed or engaged in the role (Baumruk, 2004; Richman, 2006).

According to Maslach et al. (2001) and Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter and Taris (2008), engagement is characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy. Engagement is not a temporary state but rather a more persistent effective-cognitive state that is not fixed on a particular object, event or individual.

The Corporate Leadership Council (2004) conceptualises engagement as the degree to which employees commit both rationally and emotionally to something or someone in their organisation, how hard they work, and their retention as a result of their commitment.
Bakker et al. (2008) did a study on a group of Dutch employees who occupied different positions. The research indicated that engaged employees have high levels of energy and self-efficacy. As a result they influence the events that take place in their lives. Due to their optimistic attitude, they create their own positive feedback in terms of appreciation, recognition and success. The high energy levels also emerge in their social environments, such as sports, creative hobbies and volunteer work (Engelbrecht, 2006). Engaged employees get exhausted after a long day but they associate their exhaustion with positive accomplishment.

Engelbrecht (2006) did a study on how engagement translates into behaviour. It was found that engaged employees keep up the spirits at the workplace, especially at a time where morale is low and frustration is widespread. They serve as an inspiration, are service minded, are willing to go the extra mile, have a positive attitude towards their work and are happy about the effort they put into their work. Engaged employees regularly experience positive emotions, including happiness, joy and enthusiasm, experience better psychological and physical health, create their own jobs and personal resources, such as support from others, and transfer their engagement to others. Positive emotions broaden people’s thinking and good health facilitates people’s performance as they can utilise all their resources physically and psychologically (Engelbretch, 2006).

In addition Towers Perrin (2003) identified certain variables that impact positively on behaviour and organisational performance. These are: strong leadership, accountability, autonomy, a sense of control over one’s environment and opportunity for development and advancement. These factors impact positively on employee attitudes such as engagement and intention to leave. Research also indicates that highly engaged employees outperform others. In addition, engagement is the key to performance and retention. Highly committed employees try 57% harder, perform up to 20 percentile points better and are 87% less likely to leave than employees with low levels of engagement (Towers Perrin, 2003).
In a business executive survey, Cantrell and Benton found that 72% of leaders view engagement as an integral constituent of business success. They claim that engaged employees are more creative, productive and profitable. Therefore, engagement predicts employee outcome, organisational success and financial performance (Saks, 2006), thus adding great value to the bottom line of the business. Companies and leaders play a fundamental role in improving the engagement level of their employees.

US research findings indicate that increasing individual engagement increases performance by 20% and reduces intention to leave by 87% (Pricewaterhouse Coopers, 2008). Llorens, Salanova, Bakker and Schaufeli (2006; 2007), found that engagement, self-efficacy and task resources create a positive spiral which leads to improved work performance in the future. Engagement is crucial to the business because it predicts productivity, job satisfaction, motivation, commitment and low turnover intention (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2003; Bakker et al., 2008).

Engaged employees are aware of the business context, they work with colleagues to improve performance in their jobs and that benefits the organisation (Pricewaterhouse Coopers, 2008). Research further indicates that engagement is linked to performance in terms of revenue growth: organisations with engaged employees showed a growth of more than 6%, together with customer satisfaction and loyalty, profitability, better productivity, and low labour turnover.

Engagement can play an enormous role in performance: it is the ultimate prize for employers today. Engagement is not about the remuneration, it is more about how employees feel about their work experience, their satisfaction and how they are treated. The executives of New Century Mortgage in the US decided to do a survey of their company to find out how many people were engaged (The Corporate Leadership Council, 2004).

They utilised the information from the survey to come up with a plan of action to improve engagement, which included key aspects such as challenging and meaningful work, fairness, training, opportunity for advancement, sharing responsibility for decisions and outcomes, and
a culture that supports individual creativity and values team work, which led to positive results and improvements. After implementation of the plan, they tracked the revenue for different departments. The accounts of actively disengaged executives produced an average of 28% less revenue than those who were fully engaged. Those who simply showed up and went through the motions but lacked that extra spark generated 23% less revenue than the other groups (The Corporate Leadership Council, 2004).

According to Richman (2006), an engaged employee possess the following positive characteristics:

- They are energised, committed and work hard to help the company succeed.
- They utilise their energy, skills, experience and creativity to satisfy customers and deliver results.
- They say that they work for the firm because they want to, not because they have to.
- They see their role as following through to make sure that the problems they identify get solved.
- They are action-orientated and know how to take intelligent risks.
- They believe they have a stake in the company.
- They exert extraordinary effort to do whatever it takes to make and keep the company successful, while embracing the company’s culture.

(May et al. 2004, Nelson and Simmons 2003, and Olivier and Rothman 2007) found that the factors that stimulate employee engagement are opportunity for meaningful work, feeling of competence, and confidence about work and influence (including self-determination and impact).

Engagement has positive consequences for the organisation and it is believed that there is a relationship between engagement and business outcomes (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). The concept is therefore relevant to employee well-being and work behaviour, and it is also beneficial to the organisation in that it predicts intention to leave the organisation (Saks, 2006).
Leadership Expectations

Currently, businesses are faced with the challenge of obtaining the best employees and retaining them. This is a major concern as it impacts on the bottom line of the business. Research indicates that in order to be able to retain talent, employers need to understand what their employees want or expect. Researchers believe that if you give employees what they want, all will be well. However, it is not that simple because research also shows that employers struggle to identify what their employees want. In fact there is a misalignment between what aspects are important to employees and how highly employers rank those aspects (Blake, 2006; Tough, 2006). Table 1 gives a ranking of what employees want and what managers think employees want in order of importance:

Table 1

List of employee and employer expectations (Tough, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What employees want (in order)</th>
<th>What managers think employees want (in order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Good wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Promotion/growth opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good wages</td>
<td>Interesting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting and challenging work</td>
<td>Personal loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Tactful discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/growth opportunities</td>
<td>Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td>Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful discipline</td>
<td>Involvement in decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stevens (2010) discusses four different expectations that employers need to match up to in order to keep their employees engaged:

- **A need to be cared for:** Employees want to know that their employers care about them. Tough-minded caring is essential for leading and developing a powerful workforce.
- **A need to grow:** Stevens (2010) believes that it is important to develop employees by building a development culture.
• **A need to contribute:** Employees feel empowered if they know that they are contributing to something big which makes a difference and adds value.

• **A need for meaning:** Employees prefer meaningful work; they want to feel that they are adding value and their contribution means something. If the work is meaningless or has no purpose, it leads to employee dissatisfaction.

Raffoni (2010) did a survey on what employees expect from their managers. The following 12 expectations were found: focus employees; equip employees with the necessary resources to perform their duties; understand them (what they want and what makes them tick); care about them; help them to see that their roles have meaning and add value to the organisation; give them opportunities for growth and development; listen to their views; help them to see the importance of their jobs; help them to feel proud of their achievements; build mutual trust between the employer and the employees; give regular feedback; and provide challenging work. Great organisations achieve sustainable growth and profits because they optimise the potential of their employees and in this way achieve competitive advantage.

From her research Heathfield (2010) found that money is one of the most important expectations and motivators of employees. People work for different reasons – some for personal mission, some for challenge, some for the interaction – but the bottom line is that people work for money. Money provides all the basic needs that any human being requires; to underplay the role that money plays in an employee’s life would be a mistake. Companies would risk losing all their best talent. Money provides basic motivation. However, previous research indicates that people want more from work than money. A study by Heathfield (2010) clearly demonstrates this. Money was indicated as the most important motivation in the survey. In addition Tough (2006) also find wages as 5th in the least of important expectation. However, personal time and attention from the supervisor was cited by many workers as the most rewarding and motivating factor.

Heathfield (2010) thinks that employee expectations are situational, i.e. that they differ from person to person. She is also of the opinion that employees want control of their work: they
want autonomy in decision making; they want measurable and achievable goals to be set; and they want challenging and worthwhile work, recognition and appreciation.

Through motivation and fulfilling employees’ expectations, organisations are able to satisfy their employees and reduce their staff turnover. Due to the diversity of the workforce it is imperative that leaders understand the expectations of their workforce members in order to retain them. Research also indicates that satisfaction differs depending on age. A total number of 432 respondents completed a survey reflecting their views. In a survey, Shatat, El–Baz and Hariga (2010) identified a total of 12 expectations for generation Y:

- **Compensation based on recognition and compensation** – recognition provides employees with the internal motivation to work harder.
- **Communication** - 61% of respondents emphasised the importance of communication from the top down and vice versa.
- **Work – life balance** - 90% of respondents emphasised the importance of work–life balance.
- **Training** - because it makes employees feel competent to fulfil their functions, statistics indicate that training of employees decreases voluntary turnover.
- **Commitment** - 90% of respondents indicated that commitment is very important, a high level of commitment gives a company a competitive edge.
- **Recognition** - 89% of respondents agreed that recognition of their performance means a lot to them.
- **The job itself** – employees prefer to feel like they are contributing to something bigger than themselves.
- **Autonomy** - which gives employees an opportunity to make decisions. Eight out of 10 respondents stated that this was important.
- **Teamwork** – co-operation from co-workers to get the job done is very important. This causes employees to develop a sense of trust and 75% of respondents agreed that this was important.
- **Technology** - 86% of respondents considered technology as important; members of generation Y were born in the era when technology came to play an increasingly important role in our lives.

- **Clarity of tasks** – role clarity plays an important role in employee’s performance.

- Generation Y enjoys multitasking and 88% of respondents indicated that they view multi-skilling as important.

On the basis of her research, Raffoni (2010) compiled a list of six things that employees expect from their leaders:

- **Role clarity**: Employees want to be given clear parameters of what to do. Role clarity is crucial for employee engagement (Harter et al., 2002; Russell, 2008; Saks, 2006; Steele & Fullagar, 2009). When expectations are not clarified, this impact negatively on employee engagement and employees express negative emotions like boredom and resentment (Harter et al., 2002). It is evident that increasing the clarity of expectations increases positive emotions that lead to engagement of employees (Russell, 2008). When roles are not clearly defined, it is probable that an employee’s intention to leave that job will increase because of the lack of engagement (Steele & Fullagar, 2009).

- **Discipline**: Employees want their leaders to give them regular feedback – good or bad.

- **The work itself**: This translates into the need to “get me excited”. Employees need to be given interesting work and to be kept interested in their work. This will also help them grow; all employees want to feel that they are benefiting from their work.

- **Strong leadership**: Strong leaders bring strength to an organisation by providing a characteristic that others do not have and the company sorely needs. Employees want leaders who provide clear expectations and a picture of the desired outcome, with goal setting, feedback and an appropriate structure or framework.

- **Autonomy**: Involvement in decision making makes employees feel that they have an effect on the organisation; this increases their feeling of empowerment. In addition, Dewettinck & Ameijde (2007) put emphasis on the importance of autonomy.
- **Being set up to win**: Indecisive leaders who keep people in the wrong roles, set unrealistic expectations, retain unproductive team members or change direction unfairly just frustrate everyone and make people feel defeated. The role of the leader is to make people succeed; when this is done, everybody wins.

It is imperative that employee expectations are clearly communicated and understood; meeting expectations contributes to the retention of talent and also contributes to a productive and efficient workplace. Research on leadership expectations seem to agree on certain leadership expectations as very important. Such as supervisor support, communication, career advancement opportunities, role clarity, work itself and autonomy (Raffoni, 2010; Heathfield, 2010; Blake, 2006 & Tough, 2006).

### 2.3 Intention to Leave

The topic of intention to leave an organisation and staff turnover is currently the subject of a great deal of research due to its impact on organisational effectiveness globally. According to Dollar and Broach (2006), intention to leave might be used as a leading indicator for future turnover. A rise in the proportion of employees expressing their intention to leave might signify a rise in real turnover. Most executives indicate that their greatest challenge is to attract and retain talent. This has become a vital concern based on the following impacts on organisations. Jones (2005) lists the following impacts:

- Loss of key players affects co-operate productivity.
- The cost recruitment, hiring and time-to-productivity is steep, especially for higher professional staff.
- The cost of vacancies, particularly in peak periods, can impact negatively on shareholder value.
- Loss of top talent to the competition can lessen competitive advantage.
- High attrition affects the morale of the remaining workforce.
- Frequent staff changes and new, inexperienced employees cause customer dissatisfaction.
The costs associated with turnover are substantial, such as loss of production, management’s time, low levels of employee morale, lower job satisfaction, lowering of customers’ perception of service quality and recruitment costs (Gray et al., 2000; Gustafson, 2002). In addition, a high turnover can lead to erosion of the company’s knowledge base, which is crucial for giving the company a competitive edge in the market (Coff, 1997).

Leadership within the organisation plays a crucial role in creating a healthy working environment which has a positive impact on the retention of employees. Gustafson (2002) found that employees want decision-making power, proper communication, shared vision, teamwork, advancement opportunities and support from superiors. If employees recognise that they are needed and hence valued, they are less likely to leave.

‘Intention to leave’ is the employee’s view that he or she would like to leave his or her current employment (Kahumuza & Schlechter, 2008; Yoshimura, 2003). It refers to the ultimate cognitive stage in the decision-making process of an employee, where quitting and job hunting take place actively (Park & Kim, 2009).

Organisational stability has been indicated as having a high correlation with low turnover. Employees are likely to stay in an environment which is predictable.

Kelly (2007) stated that there is a significant change that companies need to undergo to ensure their survival in the years to come. It is repeatedly asserted that successful organisations of the future will be the ones that will be able not only to attract talent, but also to nurture and retain it by offering a compelling working environment and a sophisticated succession strategy. Sophisticated talent requires sophisticated talent management. Managers need to understand the motivational make-up of individual employees so that they can offer a productive career, support and development, and coach, motivate and develop their talent.

Johnston (1995) found supervisory and organisational support to be a significant predictor of behavioural intentions, implying that high organisational support will lead to intention to stay and low organisational support will lead to intention to leave. Mayfield and Mayfield (2007)
are of the opinion that a leader who uses motivational language when speaking to his or her employees usually has employees who tend to stay longer. In addition, where employees feel that they are being cared for and supported, they feel an obligation to put more effort into helping the organisation to reach its goal.

Alam and Mohammad (2010) did a study on nurses in Malaysia and found that intention to leave is a behaviour that has always been influenced by the leader or supervisor. The better the relationship between leaders and their subordinates, the better and more effective the working environment will be. Gallup (2006) conducted research into turnover in 44 organisations and found that people quit their work for different reasons. For example, 32% left for better career opportunities or promotional opportunities, 22% for better pay, 22% for lack of job fit and 17% because of dissatisfaction with management or the general work environment.

In addition, Blomme, Tromp and Rheede, (2008) found certain elements that were predictors of intention to leave. Job content was identified to be the most significant, followed by promotional opportunities and salary. The more employees perceive their jobs as challenging, varied and comprehensive, the less likely they are to leave the organisation. Hay (2002) found that employees are more likely to leave if they perceive a lack of clear direction on the part of management. International research done on this subject indicates that 74% of dissatisfied employees feel that their companies do not have clear direction.

Although turnover is a challenge for any organisation, a certain amount of turnover is healthy as older employees leave and new employees join, bringing with them new ideas. This helps employers keep the organisational culture churning (Shahnawaz & Jafri, 2009).

Weisberg (1994) states that an employee’s intention to leave is considered a critical signal of quitting. According to Grobler, Wärnich, Carrell, Elbert and Hatfield (2006), turnover costs South Africa several millions of rand a year through decreased productivity, increased accidents and quality problems. Taplin and Winterton (2007) found that organisations with a low record of turnover encompassed leaders who perceived turnover as a costly expense and
so took a proactive approach in dealing with the problem. High avoidance of Turnover is an outcome that a positive, healthy organisation avoids since it is disruptive and consequently costly (Grobler et al., 2006).

According to Jones (2005), decreasing turnover by retaining talent is a major challenge. Changes in the working environment have accelerated in the past few years and these changes including the necessity to take part in the global market. Employees’ demands are starting to take new and different forms. This necessitates that companies should put in place retention and succession planning strategies. Companies that had an average turnover of 1 to 5%, hired lower numbers of new employees and had lower numbers of staff leaving all had proper retention (89%) and succession planning strategies (84%) in place. Saks (2006) reported a relationship between engagement and intention to leave. In addition, Kgomo and Swarts (2010) proved a significant relationship between retention and engagement.

From the literature a relationship between leadership expectations, engagement and intention to leave has been described. Figure 1 proposes a conceptual model of the relationship between these constructs based on Hertzberg’s two-factor theory (Hertzberg, 1959).

**Figure 1:** Schematic representation of the present study based on Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Hertzberg, et al 1959)
According to Herzberg’s two-factor theory, also known as motivation-hygiene theory, the individual’s relation to work is basic and one’s attitude towards work can establish success or failure (Herzberg, 1964). Herzberg investigated what makes people feel good or bad about their work and “what do people want from their jobs”. He also identified motivators that impact positively on the employee’s attitude, such as promotion, growth and development, recognition, responsibility and achievement (Robbins, Judge, Odendaal & Roodt, 2009). The motivational factors further lead to satisfaction of employees, which contributes to organisational performance. The motivation of employees is a key aspect that managers need to tackle as it affects productivity. Most companies, in an attempt to retain their talent, put measures in place to address the hygiene factors leading to employee satisfaction.

Abbasi and Holman (2002) identify employee turnover as an issue that puts company goals in jeopardy. Companies suffer severe losses due to turnover, including declining productivity, lower employee morale and disrupted customer relations. This makes it crucial for companies to create a favourable working environment in order to mitigate the effect of turnover. Some advantages of a favourable working environment are higher job satisfaction, lower intention to leave, job autonomy, challenge, control, personal growth, good relationship with superior and colleagues, a feeling of importance and encouragement from co-workers. Bhatnagar (2007) suggests that career-development support in the form of nurturing relationships and processes that ensure that job roles are closely aligned with career aspirations generally enhance employee engagement.

The premise of this study is that employees have certain expectations of their leaders and that these expectations impact on the employees’ attitudes, which in turn impact on the employees’ engagement and intention to leave. Therefore, leaders are expected to create a positive environment by sharing their power, enabling employees by giving them autonomy, greater responsibility and challenging work, offering development opportunities and feedback, and providing guidance through coaching. It is imperative that employers be aware of what their employees expect from them because what is important to one employee may
not be important to the next. When leaders eventually understand what, inspire their employees that will contribute greatly to their retention strategy.

**Aim of this Study**

Based on the above discussion, the following aim was set for this study: *to establish whether there is a relationship between leadership expectations, engagement and intention to leave.* Figure 2 illustrates the conceptual model for the study.

![Conceptual model for this research](image)

**Figure 2:** Conceptual model for this research

Based on the above problem statement and the literature review, the following hypotheses were formulated:

**H1:** There is a practically significant relationship between leadership expectations and employee engagement.

**H2:** There is a practically significant relationship between leadership expectations and intention to leave.

**H3:** Leadership expectations predict employee engagement.

**H4:** Leadership expectations predict intention to leave.

**METHOD**

**Research design**

A mixed method design was used to attain the objectives of this study. Mixed method involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data, and a mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research.
process. Its central premises are that the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (Creswell & Clark, 2007).

Participants

A total sample (n = 156) of people was drawn from a group of manufacturing employees. From this sample, focus groups were formed and meetings were held with these groups to gather information regarding leadership expectations. The focus groups or sample consisted of employees taken from different departments and at lower (unskilled) and intermediate level (semi-skilled). In the production department the employees work three different shift, therefore they are divided into blue, yellow and red shift. The focus groups consisted of 10–15 people per group. The same employees that the researcher held focus groups with were the same employees that completed the questionnaire. Table 2 lists the characteristics of the participants.

The participants raised issues about what they expect from their leaders in order to empower them and create a favourable working environment. Their expectations were noted and a questionnaire entitled Leadership Expectations was compiled.
Table 2

**Characteristics of the Participants (n = 156)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24 yrs and younger</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25–35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Up to Grade 11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2–5 yrs</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6–0 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11–20 yrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Blue team</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow team</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red team</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powder coating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Die shop &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-permanent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the participants were males (83.9%) and African (73.3%). The ages of participants ranged from 24 years and younger (9.0%), to 36–45 years (26.3%), to 46–55 years (7.1%), with the majority of participants (57.6%) being between 25 and 35 years. The education level was mostly Grade 12 (51.5%), followed by Grade 11 (35.8%), diploma (10.3%) and degree
(1,9%). (70, 5%) and had between 2 and 5 years of service. They were drawn from seven different departments: the blue team (20, 5%), yellow team (20, 5%), red team (23, 1%), Warehouse (7, 1%), Maintenance (5,8%), Die shop and Maintenance (8,3%), and Powder coating (14,7%). (98, 7%) were permanently employed.

**Measuring battery**

The following instruments were used in the empirical study:

- **Employee expectations checklist**: A checklist of expectations was newly designed using the information gathered from the focus groups with the participants. The participants were asked to compare the “actual” (current expectations) with the “important” (expectations important to the employees). The participants ranked their expectations on a scale of 1 (less important) to 5 (most important).

- **The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)**: This scale, as developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002), is applied to measure the level of engagement. All items used for the scale, use a 7-point agreement-disagreement Likert format varying from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The UWES measures three dimensions, namely vigour, dedication and absorption. It includes statements such as “I am bursting with energy in my work”, “I find my work full of meaning and purpose” and “I get carried away by my work”.

- **Turnover intention**: This scale consists of three items that were developed by Sjöberg and Sverke (2000) and which measure the strengths of the respondent’s intention to leave his or her present position. “I feel that I could leave this job” is a typical item, with response alternatives ranging from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). A high score thus reflects a strong intention to leave the job.

**Procedure**

Focus groups drawn from different departments were utilised to gather information on what employees expect from their leaders. The employees were asked open-ended questions and were given an opportunity to voice their opinions in their language of choice. The themes
that came up during the focus group sessions were communication, a good working relationship with their superiors, appreciation for good work, opportunities to study further, getting regular feedback, independence, coaching and support. This information was utilised to design a new checklist which measured leadership expectations and the extent to which those expectations are met.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis was carried out using the SPSS program (SPSS Inc., 2007). Descriptive statistics (e.g. mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis) were used to analyse the data. A factor analysis was performed on each of the constructs to determine the factor loading, as well as communalities and percentage variance. Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to assess the internal consistency, homogeneity and unidimensionality of the measuring instruments (Clark & Watson, 1995).

Correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationship between the variables. Multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses of the study.

Results

For the purpose of the study, LE importance stands for the leadership expectations (what employees expect from their leaders) and LE fulfilment stands for the extent to which these expectations are met. In the eight questions below, LE importance is represented by the first graph of each question and LE fulfilment by the second graph of each question.
**Communication:** About 91% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of the respondents answered that communication is important and the extent to which they are getting it is 73.6% (Agree and Strongly Agree).
Relationship with superior: 97% (Agree and Strongly Agree) answered that this expectation is important and 85.3% indicated that the expectation is being met (Agree and Strongly Agree).

Appreciation of good work: About 94% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of respondents answered that this expectation is important and 90% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.
Studying further: About 90.4% (Agree and Strongly Agree) answered that this expectation is important and 51.2% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.
Regular feedback: 94% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of the respondents answered that this expectation is important and 66.7% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.

Independence: 85% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of the respondents answered that this expectation is important and 77% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.
Coaching: 78% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of the respondents answered that this expectation is important and 66% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.
Support from supervisor: 93% (Agree and Strongly Agree) of the respondents answered that this expectation is important and 71% (Agree and Strongly Agree) that this expectation is being met.

Result Summary

The results indicated that employees expect communication, a good working relationship with their superiors, appreciation for good work, opportunities to study further, getting regular feedback, independence, coaching and support. The above graphs indicate that the importance of these expectations is ranked as follows: (1) Relationship with supervisor; (2) Appreciation of good work and Regular feedback (same score); (3) Support from supervisor; (4) Communication; (5) Studying further; (6) Independence; and (7) Coaching.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach Alpha Coefficient and Pearson’s Correlation for LE Importance, LE Fulfilment, Engagement and Intention to Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LE importance</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>0,44</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LE fulfilment</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>0,68</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,50**+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engagement</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>0,33++</td>
<td>0,30+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intention to leave</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,11</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>-0,12</td>
<td>-0,13*</td>
<td>-0,56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Statistically significant \( p < 0,01 \)
+ Correlation is practically significant \( r > 0,3 \) (medium effect)
++ Correlation is practically significant \( r > 0,5 \) (large effect)

The descriptive statistics are given in Table 3. For the purpose of this study the researcher, used the mean totals of the questionnaires were utilised. The results show the following mean percentages: LE importance = 3,4% (SD = 0,44); LE fulfilment = 2,9% (SD = 0,68) (in this particular study Cronbach alpha coefficients of 0,75 to 0,87 were obtained); Engagement = 4,7% (SD = 1,26) (in this study a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0,83 was obtained); and Intention to leave = 2,3% (SD = 1,11%) (in this study a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0,83 was obtained).

The results indicate a practically significant positive correlation of 0,5 (large effect) between LE importance and LE fulfilment. A practically significant positive correlation relationship of 0,3 (medium effect) between LE importance and Engagement was found. A statistically significant but negative relationship of -0,13 between LE fulfilment and Intention to leave was detected.

Engagement correlated positively with LE importance and fulfilment: a practically significant relationship of 0,3 medium effect was detected. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is accepted.
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A statistically significant but negative relationship of -0.13 between Intention to leave and LE fulfilment was detected. *Therefore, hypothesis 2 is partially accepted.*

Table 4

*Multiple Regression Analysis with Engagement as Dependent Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Importance</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Importance</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Fulfilment</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant $p < 0.05$

A multiple regression analysis with Engagement as a dependent variable and LE importance and LE fulfilment as independent variables was carried out. The results show that LE importance predicted 11% of the variance in Engagement ($p < 0.05$). Step 2 of the analysis shows that adding the independent variable LE fulfilment increase the predicted variance in Engagement with 3% to a total of 13%. It can be concluded that leadership expectations predict engagement. *Therefore, hypothesis 3 is accepted.*
A multiple regression analysis with Intention to leave as a dependent variable and LE importance and LE fulfilment as independent variables was carried out (see Table 5). The results show that LE importance predicted 2% of the variance in Intention to leave but was not significant (p = 0.11). Step 2 shows that when the independent variable LE fulfilment is added it still predicts 2% of the variance in Intention to leave and also not significant. It can be concluded that leadership expectations do not predict Intention to leave. Therefore, hypothesis 4 is rejected.

**DISCUSSION**

The overall objective of this study was to investigate what employees expect from their leaders, to what extent their expectations are met, and the impact of this on engagement and intention to leave. Cronbach alpha coefficients ranging from 0.75 to 0.88 were obtained. All the questionnaires used had an acceptable alpha coefficient higher than the norm, which means all the questionnaires used were valid and reliable (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994).

The results indicated that employees expect communication, a good working relationship with their superiors, appreciation for good work, opportunities to study further, getting regular feedback, independence, coaching and support. Most respondents view *communication* as important and their experience is that their superiors communicate sufficiently with them.
They also view a good working relationship with their supervisors as important and in fact do experience a good relationship with their supervisors.

Appreciation for good work was rated as very important and most respondents experience high levels of appreciation from their superiors. They also indicated that opportunities to study further are very important to them, but this expectation is being met only on average. This could be because not enough training and development is taking place and so employees are in need of more study opportunities. Regular feedback was also rated as being extremely important and respondents were of the opinion that they are only getting minimum feedback. The employer could improve by providing more feedback to employees. The results showed that the employees Value independence and their superiors gives them high independence to perform their tasks. For the majority of respondents coaching is as an important expectation and they experience minimum coaching from their superiors. They also view support from supervisor as highly important and the results show that they experience minimum support from their supervisors.

The above findings are substantiated by (Raffoni, 2010; Heathfield, 2010; Blake, 2006 & Tough, 2006), who also found that supervisor support, communication, career advancement opportunities, role clarity, work itself and autonomy are very important leadership expectations. They further emphasise the role of leadership expectations into employee retention and organisational productivity.

Pearson’s correlation indicates that LE importance is strongly related to LE fulfilment. This means that for most respondents there was a direct correlation between leadership expectations (those they view as important) and the fulfilment of these leadership expectations. Regarding the relation of LE importance to engagement, the respondents felt that there was a direct correlation with engagement. They felt that if their leadership expectations were met, that would impact on their engagement.

LE fulfilment also correlated positively with engagement; results indicated a correlation between fulfilment of expectations and engagement. If their leadership expectations were
met, the level of engagement would also increase. LE fulfilment correlated negatively with intention to leave indicating that the fulfilment of expectations would decrease the level of turnover intention.

A multiple regression analysis with Engagement as a dependent variable and LE importance and LE fulfilment as independent variables was carried out. The results show (step 1 and 2) that LE importance predicts Engagement and LE fulfilment also predict Engagement. It can be concluded that leadership expectations predict engagement. Harter et al., 2002; Russell, 2008; Saks, 2006; Steele & Fullagar, (2009) indicate that expectations like role clarity have a big impact on employee engagement. If such expectations are not met employees express negative emotions like boredom and resentment (Harter et al., 2002). It is evident that increasing the clarity of expectations increases positive emotions that lead to engagement of employees (Russell, 2008). When roles are not clearly defined, it is probable that an employee’s intention to leave that job will increase because of the lack of engagement (Steele & Fullagar, 2009).

A multiple regression analysis with Intention to leave as a dependent variable and LE importance and LE fulfilment as independent variables was carried out. The results (step 1 and 2) show that LE importance and LE fulfilment predicted a very low variance in Intention to leave but was not significant. It can be concluded that leadership expectations do not predict Intention to leave. The findings of this study regarding leadership expectation and Turnover Intention are in contrary to findings of other researchers. Heathfield (2010) is of the opinion that when fulfilling employees’ expectations, organisations are able to satisfy their employees and reduce their staff turnover. Raffoni (2010) is of the opinion that when employee expectations are clearly communicated and understood; meeting expectations contributes to the retention of talent and also contributes to a productive and efficient workplace.
REFERENCES


about what employees want from work employee motivation.htm


May, D.R., Gilson, R.L. and Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness,


Park, J.S & Kim, T.H. (2009). Do types of organisational culture matter in nurse job satisfaction and turnover intention, leadership in health services, (22), 20-38


CHAPTER 3
CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to draw conclusions, make recommendations and list the limitations regarding the results of the empirical study. Conclusions are drawn from the research objectives, the limitations of the study are then discussed and recommendations are made for the organisations and future research.

3.1 CONCLUSION

The overall objective of this research was to investigate leadership expectations (what employees expect from their leaders and to what extent are their expectations met), and the impact of these leadership expectations on engagement and intention to leave. Based on the theoretical as well as empirical results of the previous chapter, the following conclusions can be drawn:

The first objective of the study was to conceptualise the constructs of leadership expectations, work engagement and intention to leave.

Work engagement: Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) and Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, (2008) conceptualise engagement as characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy. Research suggests that engagement is not a temporary state but rather a more persistent effective-cognitive state that is not fixed on a particular object, event or individual (Kahn, 1990). May, Gilson, & Harter (2004) conceptualise engagement as the manner in which employees express or suppress their true selves in their work roles. This is manifested through the physical, emotional and cognitive dimension. Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) define engagement as a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind, characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption.

‘Vigour’ refers to high levels of energy and resilience, willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and perseverance in the face of difficulties. ‘Dedication’ refers to strong involvement
in one’s work, accompanied by feelings of enthusiasm and significance, and a sense of pride and inspiration (Maslach et al., 2001). ‘Absorption’ refers to a satisfactory state of complete emersion in one’s work, which is characterised by focused attention, time distortion, loss of self-consciousness, effortless concentration, absolute control, and intrinsic enjoyment (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990).

**Intention to leave:** This is the employee’s view that he or she would like to leave his or her current employment (Kahumuza & Schlechter, 2008; Yoshimura, 2003). Intention to leave refers to the ultimate cognitive stage in the decision-making process of an employee, where quitting and job hunting takes place actively (Park & Kim, 2009). Saks (2006) suggests that the level of engagement predicts intention to leave an organisation.

*The second objective was to determine what employees expect from their leaders.*

**Leadership expectations:** Blake (2006) did a on leadership expectation where he emphasised important expectations such as, Relationship with their leaders, Autonomy, Appreciation, Communication and career advancement opportunities as imperative leadership expectation. Tough (2006) and Stevens (2010) added on the researching by identifying caring for employees, good working conditions, discipline and job security as essential leadership expectation. In this research a qualitative study was done using the focus groups to acquire information on what employees expect from their leaders. The following themes were found: employees expect communication, good working relationship with their superior, appreciation for good work, opportunities to study futher, getting regular feedback, independence, coaching and support from their leaders.

Lastly Heathfield, (2010) and Tough (2010) added it’s crucial that companies do not overlook the importance of good wages. Organisations needs to start by ensuring that the wages are fair and in accordance with the market then all the other expectations may follow. Great organisations achieve sustainable growth and profit because they optimise the potential of their employees, and that leads to the achievement of competitive advantage.
The third objective of the study was to determine the correlation between leadership expectations, engagement and intention to leave.

Shatat, El-Baz and Hariga (2010) are of the opinion that if leaders meet and/or fulfil their employees’ expectations, the employees will be more motivated and intention to leave will be minimised. It has been established that leadership has an influence on job performance, work engagement and turnover intentions (Svensson & Wood, 2005). The results of the empirical research show that there is a practical and significant relationship between leadership expectations and engagement. However, no correlation was found between leadership expectation and intention to leave except for a small statistical significant negative correlation between leadership fulfilment and intention to leave. The findings of this study confirm that leadership expectation and engagement has a positive correlation of medium strength which confirms literature that leadership and engagement are correlated. According to Russell (2008) it is evident that increasing the fulfilling of expectations increases positive emotions that lead to engagement of employees. Leadership importance and intention to leave have no significant correlation but the fulfilment of expectations and intention to leave have a slight negative correlation. Therefore, if expectations are not fulfilled that might influence the intention to leave slightly.

3.2 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The first limitation of the research was the research design. A cross-sectional research approach limits the study as no casual inferences can be made. Cross-sectional survey design allows the identification of the existence of relationships between variables, but implies that more complicated forms of infrequent connections could not be examined. Prospective longitudinal and quasi-experimental research designs are needed to further validate the interpreted relationships within this study.
Another potential limitation could be that the respondents did not trust the confidentiality statement on the cover of the questionnaire and this might have influenced the results. This might be due to past experiences, as the company was undergoing a transaction phase and there was a lack of stability. The employees were not responding well to the change process and that made them sceptical of management.

Since the study was done on a fairly small sample, the results cannot be generalised.

Furthermore, the research was based on interaction in the focus groups and later on filling in questionnaires. Throughout the process English was utilised and this may have been a barrier that could have hindered the effectiveness of the process. Given the factory setting, the majority (about 80%) of the participants had an educational background of Grade 11–12 or very little formal education at all. As a result the researcher had to translate the questionnaire to the respondents to ensure understanding. This could have resulted into two things: firstly, the translation may not have been clear enough; and secondly, the original interpretation and meaning of the items may have been misunderstood.

A very low percentage of the respondents were from different races (73.7% were African). This might have been the cause of the potential language barrier. Respondents from different ethnic groups could have interpreted the questions differently from the actual meaning. The questionnaires should at least be translated into one African language.

A lack of literature studies specifically on leadership expectations can be viewed as a limitation.

3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Despite the various limitations, a number of recommendations could be made to the organisation (factory) involved in the research, as well as recommendations for future research.
The challenges that organisations face due to the diversity of their workforces are huge. Organisations have to seriously consider understanding their employees’ expectations by taking a dynamic approach. Meeting these expectations will make the employees not only more creative, but also more productive and drive the organisation forward.

3.3.1. Recommendations for the organisation

The empirical results show that leadership expectations do predict work engagement but not intention to leave. Although this study did not indicate leadership expectations to predict intention to leave literature suggest that by increasing engagement intention to leave might be viewed less favourable. Therefore, in order for the organisation to increase the level of engagement it needs to meet employee expectations and apply the following guidelines as indicated by the literature as well as the empirical research of this study:

- **Advancement opportunities:** It is imperative for organisations to provide individual growth opportunities and career growth. When employees are given advancement opportunities they feel that they are being taken care of. Research indicates that a lack of advancement opportunities is the main reason that employees leave an organisation.

- **Recognition:** People generally like to be appreciated for their efforts. Research indicates that recognition contributes to the commitment of employees. Employees who feel appreciated are more likely to be engaged in their jobs.

- **Leadership capability:** This refers to the management’s concern for its employees and the way it treats them. It implies fairness, respect and support. Research indicates that employees leave managers, not companies. An employee’s relationship with his or her superior plays an important part in the employee’s decision to stay or leave the organisation.

- **Work itself:** This refers to the extent that work provides an employee with autonomy, decision-making power, variety, challenges and growth opportunities, as well as to regular feedback on performance.

- **Social support:** Support is one of the contributors to job satisfaction and general well-being. The amount of social support employees receive is associated with low
levels of depression and lower turnover intentions (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk & Schenk, 2003; Towers Perrin, 2003).

3.3.2 Recommendations for future research

- Research should be done on a bigger sample to gain a better understanding of leadership expectations.
- Research should also be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of any interventions undertaken in order to understand leadership expectations, promote staff retention and build a strong, sustainable workforce.
- Research needs to be done on a sample with a higher literacy level to avoid the respondents misinterpreting the meaning of the questions.
- The concept of leadership expectations has not yet been well researched; therefore further research is required to explore the concept more.

It is important to ensure that the leaders understand what their employees expect from them in order to avoid investing on assumed expectations that does not fulfil the purpose. Leaders need to communicate to their workforce and find out what expectations are most important to them and utilise that feedback to come up with an action plan that will fulfil employees’ expectations.

The action plans that the leaders employ within the business should be aimed at increasing engagement and decreasing intention to leave. Research indicates that engagement contributes to the enhancement of work-life and promotes the well-being of employees (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Bakker et al. (2008) indicates that engaged employees have high levels of energy and self-efficacy. Saks (2006) found that engaged employees are more creative, productive and profitable. Therefore, engagement predicts employee outcome, organisational success and financial performance. US research findings indicate that increasing individual engagement increases performance by 20% and reduces intention to leave by 87% (Pricewaterhouse Coopers, 2008). In order for organisations to have a chance
in the ever changing world of work they need to ensure that they retain their valuable assets, which is their talented workers. In order to do that, their expectations need to be addressed.
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APPENDIX 1: THE QUESTIONNAIRES
# SECTION 1
LEADERSHIP EXPECTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication is an important part of my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 My superior communicates sufficiently with me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A working relationship with my supervisor is important to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 I have a good working relationship with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It’s important to me that I get appreciation for my good work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 My supervisory appreciates my good work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in studying further.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 My supervisor gives me an opportunity to study further</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Regular feedback is important to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 My supervisor gives me regular feedback</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I value independence in doing my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 My supervisor gives me independence in doing my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I value coaching in doing my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 My supervisor provides me with coaching to enable me to do my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is important to me that I get support from my supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 My supervisor gives me support that enables me to do my job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 2

**TURNOVER INTENTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>I feel that I want to leave this job.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>I am actively looking for other work or jobs at another organisation.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>If I was completely free to choose, I would leave this job.</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3

THE UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE (UWES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I am bursting with energy in my work.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I find my work full of meaning and purpose.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Time flies when I’m working.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I feel strong and vigorous in my job.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 When I am working, I forget everything else around me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My job inspires me.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I feel happy when I am engrossed in my work.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I am proud of the work that I do.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I am immersed in my work.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 In my job, I can continue working for very long periods at a time.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 To me, my work is challenging.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 I get carried away by my work.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 I am very resilient, mentally, in my job.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 It is difficult to detach myself from my job.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 I always persevere at work, even when things do not go well.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>