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SUMMARY

Title: The experience of the manager as people developer in a petrochemical organisation

Key terms: The manager as people developer (MPD), work engagement, subjective well-being, performance, turnover intention

In the context of an ever-changing global environment, organisations must strive even harder than before to inspire employees to deliver outstanding results that will lead to a sustainable future. Engaged employees will deliver long term value, but most will not reach their full potential without a manager who understands and is committed to increase engagement in others. Managers are the key influencers to create meaningful engagements.

The aim of this study was to investigate if employees’ experience of their managers as people developer (MPD) will have an effect on work engagement, and if work engagement will have an effect on subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The study also considered the possible mediating effect of work engagement. The primary focus therefore has been on the relationship between MPD and work engagement. Secondly, the study examined the relationship between MPD, subjective well-being, performance and turnover.

The study followed a descriptive, cross-sectional and quantitative approach. The following measuring instruments were used: the Leader Empower Behaviour Questionnaire (LEBQ), the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ), the Work Engagement Scale (WES), the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS), the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), the Affect Balance Scale (ABS), and the organisations performance rating scale. These instruments were used to test whether the measures of the constructs were consistent with the understanding of the nature of the constructs; also whether the data fitted the hypothesised measurement model. Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was used to examine the structural relationships between the constructs.

The results showed that significant relationships existed between MPD and work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. No significant relationship was found
between performance and turnover intention, and performance and subjective well-being. Regression analyses indicated that MPD had significant predictive value towards work engagement and turnover intention, and work engagement had significant predictive value towards turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance. An indirect effect was found from MPD (via work engagement) on subjective well-being and turnover intention, but an indirect effect from MPD on performance (via work engagement) was not found. Work engagement was found to have a direct effect on performance. It was therefore found that work engagement was a strong antecedent to subjective well-being and turnover intention. The implication of the results is that where managers coach and develop employees, it will lead to higher levels of work engagement and lower levels of turnover intention.

Recommendations were made to be applied in practice, as well as for future research.
CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the research was to determine employees’ (direct reports) experience of their managers as people developers (MPD) and the relationship with work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The study also investigated whether MPD will have an effect on work engagement and whether work engagement will have an effect on subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The possible mediating effect of work engagement was also considered.

In this chapter, the problem statement is discussed, after which the research objectives are set. This will be followed by an explanation of the research method and the division of the chapters.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Globalisation, technological change, and economic fluctuations have fundamentally altered business environments and are challenging effective management (Shults, 2009). The turbulent times have a domino effect on organisations where there is a tendency of paying more attention to management and employee dysfunctions (Du Plessis, 2009). The world is trying to fix the situation by focusing on political and military solutions as well as new economic initiatives, whilst managers are left to struggle with the workplace realities (Ladyshewsky, 2009). One of the realities in business today is the “war for talent” and the renewed interest it generates in the relationships between knowledge creation, human capital, and economic growth. It is therefore critical for organisations to grow and develop their intellectual capital to stay globally competitive (Burke & El-Kot, 2010).

It has become necessary to perform at an above-average level to survive and achieve success in business (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). Significant challenges are also faced by South African managers who need to maintain manager-employee relations for optimal performance (Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Ellinger (2013)
emphasised the critical supporting role that managers are expected to undertake to empower employees to be successful. Considering the more difficult and stressful times of a competitive global business context, the role of managers will be challenged (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

In the petrochemical organisation where the study was conducted, managers provide employees with opportunities to develop their skills. However, focused individual training and coaching support are limited. Managers are faced with the challenge of implementing a competitive talent sourcing strategy to build a sustainable talent pipeline for current and future needs. A sound performance management system is in place and individuals are given recognition accordingly, but this does not guarantee the necessary work engagement and commitment to stay. Developing individuals is one of the important roles of managers today (Ladyshewsky, 2009). Managers have many skills in their toolkit, especially mentoring and coaching and providing feedback to support employees (Ellinger, 2013; Knobel, 2008). Considering the challenges and the opportunities managers are facing, one of the key constructs that will be researched is the manager as people developer (MPD). This study focused on employees’ (direct reports) experience of their manager as people developer and the relationship with work engagement, turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance.

Whittington and Galpin (2010) made reference in their work to a study done by Gallup on levels of employee engagement. It was stated that less than 30% of the corporate workforce is truly engaged in their work, feels a profound connection to the company and works with passion. This is also true for work engagement, as engaged employees will have a positive outlook, and display high levels of energy and connectivity towards their work (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). When managers support employees to grow and develop, they will be more likely to be engaged (Harter & Adkins, 2015). Work engagement is characterised by vigour, dedication and absorption and is usually best predicted by job resources (e.g., autonomy, supervisory coaching, and performance feedback) and personal resources (e.g., optimism, self-efficacy, and self-esteem) (Bakker et al., 2008). Furthermore, work engagement is predictive of job performance and client satisfaction (Bakker et al., 2008).
Stander and Rothmann (2008) stated that organisations need to create working environments where people can optimise their potential and add value. Where there is not enough focus on people development, employees could feel disempowered (Schultze & Steyn, 2007). Rath and Conchie (2008) are of the opinion that where managers are strong in the development of people, they will recognise and harness potential. When managers display behaviours of good communication and performance management, employees will be more engaged and the overall performance of the business will increase (Harter & Adkins, 2015). Researchers should therefore not underestimate the impact of positive organisational behaviour and the role of managers in South Africa as they can create a workplace where employees experience the necessary hope, optimism, resilience and satisfaction (Du Plessis, 2009). Organisations and their managers should seek ways to assist employees in navigating the ever-challenging work environment by developing employee strengths, rather than dwelling on the negative and trying to fix weaknesses (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009).

Emerging research in positive psychological capital (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007) could be an indication that there is value in management scholars pursuing employee positive deviance. Research has mostly examined negative deviance in organisations and positivity and its outcomes have remained largely unexplored (Luthans et al., 2007). Positive organisational scholars have suggested that the bias toward the negative (stress, work overload, work-life imbalance, unethical behaviour) should be counter-balanced with more attention to the virtuous side of organisations (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003).

Fisher (2010) stated that individuals are happier when they believe that their work performance has increased. Gavin and Mason (2004) postulated that individuals can only experience general satisfaction with their lives if they are happy at work. Studies indicated that not only his or her job satisfaction, but also the overall life satisfaction of an employee relates to high performance levels. Therefore, where employees report high levels of happiness or well-being, they will also report high levels of job performance (Jones, 2006; Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007). Happiness in the workplace can lead to positive individual and organisational outcomes in that employees display higher levels
of work engagement and job satisfaction (Fisher 2010). Therefore, promoting employees’ psychological well-being is intrinsically good and also a good way to promote individual and organisational performance (Wright et al., 2007). Employees’ status, job satisfaction, skills usage and goal-directed activity are all associated with their well-being (Carr, 2011). Certain types of work situations facilitate happiness that leads to higher levels of productivity; therefore it could be said that happy people are more productive. In this regard, positive affect was found to be positively linked to task performance (Thian, Kannusamy, & Klainin-Yobas, 2013).

Fleming and Asplund (2007) postulated that a key factor in the distinction between productive and unproductive workplaces is the quality of the workplace manager and his or her ability to meet a core set of employees’ emotional requirements. Where these conditions of engagement are met, higher levels of performance are evident. Therefore, managers could be the key to positive workplaces, productivity and higher performance (Hodges, 2010).

Coetzee, Berg, and Schreuder (2010) indicated that factors such as talent retention and internal and external vacancies contribute to high levels of employee turnover. Disengaged employees will stay during economic slowdown, but when the opportunities emerge as the economy bounces back, those talented yet disengaged employees will be the first to leave (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Investing the necessary time, effort and resources in creating an engaged workforce will ultimately reduce the cost of replacement later (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Managers play a vital role in supporting organisations to promote work engagement, satisfaction with life and performance.

Focusing on strengths and correcting weaknesses will allow managers to treat human resources as a capital investment, especially since downsizing, restructuring, outsourcing, and other lean-and-mean human resource slashing approaches have become the norm (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). Looking ahead, companies need to be more deliberate in understanding which capabilities truly impact business performance, aligning their training accordingly (Gryger, Saar, & Schaar, 2010). Managers who believe in the importance of human resources need to illustrate how the investment in human resources
can be measured, developed, and leveraged for a return on investment (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010). Investing in human resources is becoming more evident and organisations need to rethink the way they engage their employees (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010).

In response to a tougher business environment and the need to outperform competitors and excite customers, the petrochemical organisation in question had been going through various restructuring and downsizing practices over the last couple of years. Downsizing is a response in times of economic downturn; however, companies tend to cut jobs in both good and bad times in order to boost financial performance and to increase stakeholder value (Jung, 2014). The petrochemical organisation followed a process of voluntary retrenchments, restructuring and re-engineering of jobs. The integrated employee survey that was conducted in 2013 revealed low employee engagement and low employee performance. The results also indicated poor leadership, a lack of trust, limited growth and development opportunities, low accountability and poor performance.

The risk of fewer people to address increased work load could potentially result in existing employees also deciding to leave. When job demands are high, employees will need job resources (feedback on their performance, team support, and supervisory coaching) to cope (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Whittington and Galpin (2010) postulated that when the economy is at risk, disengaged employees will stay, but when the economy is strong, high potential employees with high disengagement levels will be the first to resign.

Work engagement in organisations could potentially contribute to the psychological well-being of employees (Rothmann, 2013). Employee satisfaction is regarded as a predictor of overall life satisfaction; when employees are unhappy in their everyday living, they will also display this unhappiness at work (Mafini, 2014; Zhao, Qu, & Ghiselli, 2011). Shuck and Reio (2014) found that when employees experience negative emotions due to limited peer or managerial support, they will most likely not experience positive emotions. Poor work engagement will lead to a decrease in employee well-being and productivity.
Based on the discussion, the job demands-resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011) was used as framework for the study. The JD-R model displays two underlying psychological processes. The first process argues that a health impairment process, poorly designed job or chronic job demands (e.g. overload, emotional demands) will lead to the exhaustion of employees’ mental and physical resources and could lead to the depletion of energy (i.e. a state of exhaustion) and health problems (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011). The second process is motivational in nature. It is argued that job resources have motivational potential and could lead to high work engagement, low cynicism, and excellent performance. In essence, job resources could foster employee growth, learning and development (intrinsic motivation) or play an extrinsic motivational role by meeting needs for autonomy, skill and relatedness (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011). For the purpose of this research, MPD - that is skills development and coaching - will be employed as a job resource with work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and intention to leave as outcomes.

The proposed model in Figure 1 displays the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

![Figure 1. The conceptualised model](image)

When job demands are high, employees will need job resources such as collective peer support, feedback, and supervisory coaching. Job resources could result in increased work
engagement and this again could potentially lead to positive individual and organisational outcomes. The study was expected to find support for a hypothesised model in which MPD would have an effect on work engagement, and work engagement would have an effect on subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

The following research questions were formulated based on the research problem:

- How are different constructs and the relationships of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention conceptualised in literature?
- What is the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention?
- Does MPD have a predictive effect on work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention?
- What is the effect of work engagement on the relationship between MPD, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention?

1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1.3.1 General and Specific Objectives

The general objective of this study was to explore the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention in a petrochemical organisation in South Africa.

The specific objectives of this research are to:

- Conceptualise the constructs and the relationships of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention in literature.
- Investigate the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.
- Determine if MPD is an antecedent for work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.
• Determine if work engagement will indirectly affect the relationship between MPD, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

1.4 RESEARCH METHOD

The research study consisted of two phases, namely a literature review and an empirical study. The literature review was conducted on MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention and their relationships. Relevant articles (1988 – 2015) were consulted; with the focus on more recent literature (2009 – 2015). The following literature sources were consulted:

• Library catalogues
• Academic journals
• Internet search engines (Ebscohost, Emerald, Nexus, PsycArticles, PsycInfo, SAePublications, Sabinet and Science Direct)
• Text books
• Business journals
• Subject-related articles
• Dissertations and theses

1.4.1 Research Design

The purpose of the research design was to plan and structure the project to enhance the validity of the research findings (Mouton & Marais, 1996). A quantitative research approach was followed to obtain the data. Quantitative research is a form of conclusive research that involves a large representative sample (Struwig & Stead, 2001). A cross sectional survey design was used to reach the research objectives and questionnaires were used to collect the data (De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, & Delport, 2005).
1.4.2 Research Participants

The participants in the study, otherwise referred to as the study population, were employees from a petrochemical company. Participants were encouraged to take part and the study population comprised managerial and non-managerial employees. All the participants completed leadership training. A convenience sample was used to collect the data. A total population size of \((N = 500)\) was targeted in this study, of which 229 employees completed and returned the questionnaires (response rate of 46%). Participants represented employees from different racial groups (African, Indian, Coloured and White), gender and occupational levels.

1.4.3 Research Procedure

The consent of the Company Psychology Forum to conduct the survey was obtained before the questionnaires were disseminated. The letter explained the purpose, benefits, risks, discomforts, and precautions of the study. Participants were made aware of additional permission that they needed to give the researcher to follow up their last merit evaluation with the Human Resource department. The questionnaire took approximately 30-40 minutes to complete. Data collection took approximately a month; thereafter data analyses followed.

1.4.4 Measuring Instruments

To identify the biographical characteristics of the participants, a self-constructed Biographical Questionnaire was used. This was complemented with the demographic information relevant to the sample and the objectives of the research study. Participants provided information pertaining to their race, gender, age, qualification, service years, occupational level and last performance evaluation rating.

Manager as People Developer (MPD): MPD was measured by selected items from the Leadership Empowerment Behaviour Questionnaire (LEBQ; Konczak, Stelly, & Trusty, 2000) and the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000). Both scales were scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1
(strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The skills development and coaching for innovative performance dimensions were used from LEBQ. Examples of items from the scale included: ‘My manager provides me with frequent opportunities to develop new skills’ and ‘My manager is willing to risk mistakes on my part if, over the long term, I will learn and develop as a result of the experience’ (Konczak et al., 2000). Konczak et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.70 and 0.88. From the ELQ the coaching dimension was used and examples of items from the scale included: ‘Encourages work group members to express ideas/suggestions’ (Arnold et al., 2000). Arnold et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.89 and 0.94.

**Work Engagement:** Work engagement was measured by means of the *Work Engagement Scale* (WES; Rothmann, 2010). The WES consists of nine items that reflect the three components of Kahn’s (1990) conceptualisation of work engagement, namely cognitive, emotional and physical engagement. All items were scored on a seven-point frequency scale ranging from 1 (almost never or never) to 7 (always or almost always). Cognitive engagement was measured by three items (e.g. ‘I am rarely distracted when performing my job’); emotional engagement by four items (e.g. ‘I am enthusiastic about my job’); and physical engagement by four items (e.g. ‘I am full of energy in my work’). The WES reported the following alpha coefficients for the three scales: Physical engagement = 0.80; emotional engagement = 0.82; and cognitive engagement = 0.78 (Rothmann, 2010).

**Turnover Intention:** The *Turnover Intention Scale* (TIS; Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000) was utilised to measure turnover intention. The TIS consists of three items and was scored on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Examples of items include: ‘I am actively looking for other jobs’ and ‘I feel I could leave this job’. The TIS reported a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.83 (Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000).

Subjective well-being was measured by satisfaction with life and the positive and negative affect schedule.
Satisfaction with Life: The *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a measure of life satisfaction developed by Ed Diener and colleagues. The SWLS consists of five items and measures life satisfaction. All items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). Examples of items include: ‘I am satisfied with my life’ and ‘If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing’. Diener et al. (1985) reported coefficient alphas of 0.87 and a 2-month test-retest stability coefficient of 0.64 to 0.82.

Affect Balance Scale: The *Affect Balance Scale* (ABS; Bandburn, 1969) is widely used as a measure of social psychological well-being. The purpose of the Affect Balance Scale (ABS) is to assess positive and negative affect as indicators of life satisfaction and/or well-being (Bradburn, 1969). The ABS comprises two components, namely a positive and negative affect component. Each component has five items and is scored by responding yes or no. Examples of positive items include: ‘Particularly excited or interested in something’ and ‘Proud because someone had complimented you on something you had done’. Examples of negative items include: ‘So restless you couldn’t sit long in a chair’ and ‘Very lonely or remote from other people’. Bradburn (1996) reported test-retest reliabilities of 0.83, 0.81 and 0.76. Internal consistency reliabilities for Positive Affect range between 0.55 and 0.73 and for Negative Affect between 0.61 and 0.73. Validity indicated that positive affect correlated with single-item indicators of happiness from 0.34 to 0.38 and with corresponding values for negative affect at -0.33 and -0.38 (Bradburn, 1969).

1.4.5 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out with the statistical programs for Social Sciences, namely SPSS version 22.0 (IBM Corporation, 2012) and the Mplus version 7.3 statistical modelling program (Muthén, & Muthén, 1998-2012). Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in Mplus and to analyse the distribution of the scores, descriptive statistics (e.g. means and standard deviations) were used. Raykov’s measure of composite reliability was used to assess the internal consistency of the measuring instruments (Raykov, 2004). To specify the relationships between the variables, Pearson correlation
coefficients were used. The level of statistical significance was set at \( p < 0.05 \) and a cut-off point for correlation coefficients was set at \( r \geq 0.30 \), representing a medium effect; and \( r \geq 0.50 \), representing a large effect (Raykov, 2004).

Structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to test measurement and structural models. The following Mplus indexes were used in the study:

1. Absolute fit indices, Chi-square statistics (the test of absolute fit of the model), and Root-Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA);
2. Incremental fit indices, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI); and
3. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (Hair, Black, Babin, & Andersen, 2010).

For a close fit between the model and the data, acceptable values for TLI and CFI should be higher than 0.95, with RMSEA values lower than 0.08. The weighted-least-squared-adjusted-for-means-and-variances (WLSMV) estimator was used due to the categorical nature of the data and therefore no AIC and BIC scores could be calculated.

1.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Prior to the commencement of the study, ethical clearance was obtained from all role players. The Ethics Committee of the North-West University as well as the Psychology Forum of the petrochemical organisation approved the proposed research. The ethics checklist of Optentia Focus Area of the NWU (Vaal Triangle Campus) was followed to ensure that participants were not at risk at any stage of the research. An informed consent form was part of the questionnaire to ensure that participation in the study was voluntary. The researcher guaranteed that information gathered during this research project would at all times remain confidential. Information gathered was stored in a controlled environment and access to this information was limited to the research group only.

1.6 CHAPTER DIVISION

The chapters in this mini-dissertation were presented as follows:
• Chapter 1: Introduction, problem statement, research objectives, research design and research methodology.
• Chapter 2: Research article.
• Chapter 3: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations.

1.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter 1 provided the contextual background about employees’ experience of their managers as people developers and the relationship with work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. Managers need to show how the investment in human resources can be measured, developed, and leveraged for a return on investment; organisations need to understand which skills, knowledge and attributes will impact the bottom line of the organisation and bring their training in line with this insight. The chapter also outlined the research problem and objectives of this study.

Chapter 2 provided the literature review about MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention, including the conceptual model and the hypothesised relationship between the constructs.

Chapter 3 outlined conclusions and limitations of the study, and provided recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH ARTICLE
The Experience of the Manager as People Developer in a Petrochemical Organisation

ABSTRACT

Orientation: The study tests a conceptual framework that suggests a positive relationship between the manager as people developer (MPD), work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

Research purpose: The aim of this study was to investigate if employees’ experience of their managers as people developers would have an effect on work engagement, and if work engagement would have an effect on subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The study also considered the possible mediating effect of work engagement.

Motivation for the study: The study fills the gap in literature focusing on the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

Research approach, design and method: Convenience sampling was used for the purpose of this study. The sample comprised individuals working in a petrochemical company in South Africa (N = 228). Participants comprised managerial and non-managerial employees. The study followed a descriptive, cross-sectional and quantitative approach utilising electronic questionnaires to gather data regarding employees’ perceived experience of managers as people developers.

Main findings: The results showed that significant relationships existed between MPD and work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. MPD positively related to work engagement, subjective well-being and performance; and negatively to turnover intention. No significant relationship was found between performance and turnover intention and performance and subjective well-being. Work engagement positively related to subjective well-being and performance, and negatively to turnover intention. Turnover intention had a negative relationship with subjective well-being. Regression analyses indicated that MPD had significant predictive value towards work engagement and turnover intention; and work engagement had significant predictive value towards turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance. An indirect
effect was found from MPD (via work engagement) on subjective well-being and turnover intention; whilst an indirect effect from MPD on performance (via work engagement) was not found. Work engagement was found to have a direct effect on performance. It was therefore found that work engagement was a strong antecedent to subjective well-being and turnover intention. The implication of the results is that where managers coach and develop employees, it will lead to higher levels of work engagement and lower levels of turnover intention.

**Practical implications/managerial implications:** Direct supervisors and managers are the main contact with employees and when they coach and develop employees, it will lead to higher levels of work engagement and lower levels of turnover intention. Organisations should therefore educate their managers to invest time and effort in their high potential candidates and rethink the way they engage their employees.

**Contribution/value add:** With this study employees’ experience of their managers as people developers is explored within the South African context. It would be worthwhile if organisations develop the coaching skills of managers as this will contribute to higher levels of work engagement.

**Key terms:** The manager as people developer (MPD), work engagement, subjective well-being, performance, turnover intention.
INTRODUCTION

In the global economy, one of the important prerequisites for economic competitiveness is the delivery of unique products and services. Schwab and Sala-i-Martin (2011) are of the opinion that South African companies are not up to standard when evaluated as global players. The South African workforce is consistently rated poorly on aspects of staff training and the capacity of management to ensure the constant upgrading of workers’ skills to meet product and service requirements. Another challenge for organisations is the attraction and retention of skilled employees (Koketso & Rust, 2012). Considering the “war for talent”, South African organisations will have to attract and retain skilled employees in order to be competitive and attain world-class status (Rothmann, Diedericks, & Swart, 2013). Mendes and Stander (2011) stated that organisations need to adapt their business models to ensure that their employees are empowered and engaged.

According to Anitha (2013), work engagement refers to employees’ testimony towards their organisations’ values and beliefs. Anitha further stated that employees who display work engagement will go the extra mile to deliver high performance work as they will take responsibility for organisational goals and also motivate fellow employees to realise organisational success. According to Kahn (1992), engagement captures an employee’s psychological presence, or “being there”. Psychological presence relates to the extent that an employee is alert, engaged, and focused on the task at hand. Engagement plays a key role towards employee and organisational success.

Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) examined engagement in South Africa, with specific focus on the aspects that influence work engagement, and found that job resources were positively associated with work engagement. They found that job resources relate to work engagement and the elements of vigour, dedication and absorption can be associated with the support and opportunities that are provided by organisations. According to Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008), job resources may play either an intrinsic motivational role (by fostering the employee’s growth, learning and development), or an extrinsic motivational role (by being instrumental in achieving work goals). Regarding the intrinsic motivational role, job resources may fulfil the basic needs of employees in
terms of autonomy, skill, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Rothmann and Pieterse (2007) researched the correlation between work engagement and job resources and came to the conclusion that the prospects of development, with specific reference to learning opportunities and autonomy, will predict a strong relationship. Job resources, such as social support and feedback, may reduce the effects of job demands (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). The same applies to managers. Successful organisations will focus on managers who extend engagement efforts to all levels of the organisation (Whittington & Galpin, 2010), while contributing to the psychological well-being of employees (Rothmann, 2013).

Research has found that employee satisfaction is an indication of overall life satisfaction. It has been found that people who are dissatisfied with their lives and activities outside the work will also be unhappy at work (Zhao, Qu, & Ghiselli, 2011). According to Shuck and Reio (2014), when workers experience a lack of support from their colleagues and managers, they will most likely experience undesirable feelings at work. These undesirable emotions will result in reduced work engagement and a decline in employee well-being and productivity. The opposite is also true - life satisfaction is positively related to personal and work-related factors (Mafini, 2014). Research places emphasis on workplace flexibility, skills utilisation, teamwork, remuneration and autonomy as factors that determine life satisfaction. Therefore, promoting employees' psychological well-being is intrinsically good and a well-intentioned way to promote individual and organisational performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 2004). Research has shown that happy people are more productive as certain work situations can lead to happiness that leads to productivity (Carr, 2011). Carr further stated that job satisfaction, skills usage and goal-directed activity all supplement well-being. When employees are unhappy at work, it could contribute to unhealthy relationships with their supervisors as well as increase their intention to quit (Yang, Tradway, & Stepina, 2013).

One of the main reasons for employees leaving organisations is their relationship with their managers. People tend to leave managers and not organisations (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). When employees are not happy with their work situation, it is anticipated that they will be more willing to leave the organisation (Cohen, 1999). From an organisation’s
perspective, employee turnover is costly and understanding and managing the factors that influence employees’ intention to leave could be beneficial (Morrell, Loan-Clarke, & Wilkinson, 2004). A lack of job satisfaction, position, professional challenge and perceived performance have also been listed as key reasons why employees leave organisations (Cohen, 1999).

On the other hand, when employees experience engagement, they will display higher levels of job performance. Anitha (2013) showed that a strong correlation exists between work engagement and performance and that employee performance directly influences the performance of the organisation. This is supported by Christian, Garza and Slaughter (2011) who also found that high levels of employee engagement will lead to improved job performance. According to Liu and Batt (2010), supervisors play a vital role in improving the performance of employees through the utilisation of coaching and standard management practices. Supervisory support and performance feedback predict work engagement and engagement will mediate the relationship with turnover intention (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

There are limited studies on the manager as people developer (MPD). Supervisory coaching and performance feedback have been identified as important elements of MPD and a predictor of work engagement. Considering the effect of development or coaching, the objective of the study was to understand how employees’ experience of their managers as people developers will affect their work engagement; also whether work engagement will have an effect on turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance. The literature study, empirical study, discussion and limitations and recommendation of the study will follow.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**The Manager as People Developer**

Developing individuals is the core role of managers today. It could be argued that this is the most important job of a manager as employees experience managers as genuine when
they show interest in their development (Knobel, 2008). Knobel also stated the first step for any manager who wants to develop others would be to consciously choose to become a developer of others.

Stander and Rothmann (2008) are of the opinion that:

To be able to be a good people developer, managers should be coached and developed themselves to delegate authority, hold employees accountable for outcomes, lead by example, encourage subordinates, show concern for others’ feelings, allow participative decision-making, share information, and coach and mentor people (p. 12).

Only where managers are empowered to be people developers will they be able to empower their staff. As mentioned, MPD will be the focus of this study. Coaching has been identified as an important element of MPD. Coaching can play an important role in accomplishing both manager and employee success (Chen, Ai, & You, 2014).

The performance benefit of coaching is recognised by organisations (Jorgensen, 2012). Coaching is as an essential skill required by managers in the workplace (Ellinger, Hamlin, & Beattie, 2008; Ladyshewsky, 2009). Ladyshewsky (2009) stated that coaching can be conceptualised as: “A short-term developmental interaction focused on performance, goal-setting, providing practical application, feedback and teaching as components” (p. 293). In essence, the objective of coaching is to help employees grow and develop and to improve performance (Liu & Batt, 2010). Coaching therefore creates the platform for employees to learn and grow (Ladyshewsky, 2009). Managers with good coaching skills will enhance organisational performance (Jorgensen, 2012). This is supported by Huang and Hsieh (2015) who stated that where managers create the right organisational conditions for employees to learn, grow, develop and perform, they will not only enhance their performance and self-management of their occupations, but also add value to the organisation’s bottom line.

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) identified a key quality of an effective manager as the ability to develop others. A true manager will show a keen interest in assisting his
followers. Furthermore, he will help them to understand their strengths and limitations and assist them to acquire the necessary skills to achieve their personal and organisational goals. He will act as coach and give them timely and constructive feedback in order to grow and improve (Goleman et al., 2002). This is supported by Knobel (2008) who postulated that managers need to invest time and effort in developing those around them. This can only be done if managers take responsibility for improving performance through their people and develop their own coaching and feedback skills. The importance of the manager as coach is emphasised by Ladyshewsky (2009) who identified coaching as one of the core managerial skills and an integral part of the performance management process. Coaching has an enormous performance benefit. Organisations that invest in the training of their managers as coaches ensure that employees receive the necessary support to grow and develop and to enhance their work performance (Jorgensen, 2012). Goleman et al. (2002) stated that coaching could help subordinates improve their work performance and this could have a direct effect on the organisational climate and productivity.

Empowerment of others is also recognised as a key function of managers today and plays a vital role in developing employees (Gildenhuys, 2008). The manager as people developer could partly be linked to leadership empowerment behaviour. Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) identified six dimensions of leadership empowerment behaviour, namely delegation of authority, accountability for outcomes, self-directed decision-making, information sharing, skills development, and coaching for innovative performance as behaviour that will empower people. Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000) identified five dimensions in this regard, namely coaching, informing, leading by example, showing concern/interacting with the team, and participative decision making. For the conceptualisation of the manager as people developer, the focus will be on skills development and coaching.

Managers who utilise their coaching skills, share information, and focus on the skills development of their subordinates will improve employees’ self-determination and interest in their work (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). When performance expectations are mutually agreed upon, it provides the basis for the development of a high quality relationship between the manager and his followers (Whittington & Galpin, 2010).
Managers are the main contact with employees and when they engage employees, work engagement will be positively impacted (Whittington & Galpin, 2010).

**The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model**

In this study the job demands-resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti & Bakker 2011) will be used as basis to integrate the findings. The JD-R model is a theoretical framework with flexibility in that all job characteristics can be modelled using two different categories, namely job demands and job resources. The theoretical framework is used in an occupational environment and is aligned to jobs. The JD-R theory triggers two independent procedures; on the one hand, health impairment, and on the other, a motivational procedure. The first procedure argues that job demands (e.g. overload, emotional demands) could lead to exhaustion and the second procedure that job resources could lead to higher levels of work engagement and performance, due to its motivational probability (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

The MPD can be viewed as a job resource in that where managers coach and develop employees, it will positively influence work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Job resources are therefore one of the key drivers of work engagement leading to outcomes of well-being and happiness (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) reported that where work engagement is missing, it could be due to a lack of job resources and an increase in work load, leading to ineffective performance. Employees who utilise job resources will effectively show higher levels of work engagement and perform better. It could therefore be stated that job resources will lead to enduring work engagement; and enduring work engagement, in turn, will be an important predictor of job performance (Bakker, 2014). This was supported by the results from Chung and Angeline (2010) that showed that employees will show increased engagement and performance if they receive the appropriate supporting resources. Therefore, it could be concluded that work engagement is an important notion as it predicts significant outcomes for employees and organisations.
Work Engagement

Work engagement was initially developed to capture the affective-motivational state of employees regarding their jobs. Work engagement was defined as “...a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterised by vigour, dedication, and absorption” (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002, p. 74). Vigour is characterised by high levels of energy. Mental resilience is displayed while working and there is a willingness to invest effort in one’s work, persisting in the face of difficulty. Dedication relates to strong involvement in one’s work, experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption, the third dimension of work engagement, is characterised by being happily engrossed in one’s work. In short, work engagement can be defined as the overall experience of the job as perceived by an employee (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

Engagement is defined as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Kahn emphasised that employees will become physically involved in work activities, displaying their values and beliefs, creativity and feelings. Kahn (1990) laid the foundation for work engagement as a psychological state. He stated that engagement captures an employee’s psychological presence, or “being there” (Kahn, 1992). Psychological presence relates to the extent that an employee is alert, engaged, and focused on the task at hand. This is supported by Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) who stated that engaged employees will put more into their work as they identify with it. They express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performance (Kahn, 1990; Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010). Work engagement plays a key role towards employee and organisational success.

Rothbard (2001) defines engagement as “one’s psychological presence in or focus on role activities” (p. 656). Relating to Kahn’s notion that engagement and psychological presence involve being attentive and focused on a role, he identified two critical components of engagement, namely attention and absorption. Attention is defined by a person’s cognitive availability and the amount of focus time that is spent on a role.
Absorption is defined by the intensity of the person’s focus and the level to which a person is engrossed in a role. Empirical evidence to date suggested that engagement as defined by Kahn is a strong component, describing performance as an outcome on an individual level (Rich, LePine, & Grawford, 2010).

Work engagement is different to concepts such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Where the focus of job satisfaction and organisational commitment is on employees’ attitudes toward their jobs and the organisation, work engagement represents an attitude toward work itself (dedication). Employees who are satisfied with their job are usually more committed to the organisation and will display enthusiasm about work activities (Bakker, 2014). Research has also shown that job resources are a key indicator of work engagement, specifically relating to high job demands (Hakanen Perhoniemi, & Toppinen-Tanner, 2008). Barbier, Hansez, Chmiel, and Demerouti (2013) focused on two specific job resources, namely opportunities for development and perceived supervisory and organisational support. A strong relationship was found with work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). When job demands are high, employees will need job resources (feedback on their performance, team support, and supervisory coaching) to cope (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Job resources also have a positive influence on personal resources such as positive self-beliefs, self-efficacy, optimism, and self-esteem and in return this will lead to vigour, dedication and absorption (Bakker, 2011). Work engagement in organisations could potentially contribute to the psychological well-being of employees (Rothmann, 2013).

**Subjective Well-being**

Psychologists have done extensive research to understand subjective well-being and factors that could potentially influence it. In the past research focused on overall happiness, in relation to marriage, wealth, spiritual belief and demographic groups (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). Researchers also tried to understand why people are happy and what processes influence subjective well-being (Veenhoven, 1994). Progress has been made in understanding the components of subjective well-being, the importance
of adaptation and goals, temperament and personality, and the cultural influences on well-being (Diener, 2000).

Van Hoorn (2007) noted that although subjective well-being and happiness are sometimes used synonymously, they are not the same. Reference is made to the work of Diener and colleagues (1999) who defined subjective well-being as “a broad category of phenomena that includes people’s emotional responses, domain satisfactions, and global judgments of life satisfaction” (p. 277). Subjective well-being, therefore, is defined as a person’s cognitive and affective evaluation of his or her life and consists of an affective part and a cognitive part. The affective part represents the presence of positive affect (PA) and the absence of negative affect (NA). The affective part is led by feelings and emotions, while the cognitive part is an information-based appraisal of whether one’s life measures up to the expectations of an ‘ideal’ life (Diener, 1994). Watson, Clark, and Tellegan (1988) defined positive affect and negative affect as two individual elements; however, related to each other. PA refers to the experience of positive emotions and people with high PA will display high passion, energy, and gratifying engagements. Employees who display NA experience negative feelings over a period and in different circumstances (Watson et al., 1988). Thian, Kannusamy, and Klainin-Yobas (2013) found that PA was positively linked to job satisfaction; however, PA alone is not sufficient to achieve an optimal level of work engagement. A certain level of NA is needed to critically evaluate tasks, goals and potential challenges. Furthermore, they found that PA was positively linked to job performance. Bosman (2005) found that employees who experience higher levels of NA and lower levels of PA will experience a decrease in work engagement and higher levels of fatigue and disconnect. Arthaud-Day, Rode, Mooney, and Near (2005) confirmed that positive- and negative affect, together with satisfaction with life, form part of subjective well-being.

Satisfaction with life theory is seen as part of the subjective well-being theory and is rarely included in research (Erdogan, Bauer, Truxillo, & Masfield, 2012; Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012). Satisfaction with life, according to Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin (1985), is a cognitive judgmental process. Life satisfaction will indicate the extent to which a person judges the overall quality of his or her life (Veenhoven, 1991).
Veenhoven (1994) indicated that happiness is one of the measures of subjective well-being. The Orientation to Happiness Scale developed by Peterson identified pleasure, engagement and meaning as indicators of happiness and found that high scores relate to high life satisfaction (Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005).

Graves, Ohlott, and Ruderman (2007) defined life satisfaction as a measure of one’s appraisal of life in general, whilst Ye, Yu, and Li (2012) defined life satisfaction as an individual evaluation about the quality of life. Considering the positive factors, organisations could benefit from high levels of life satisfaction. As indicated before, the study will be placed within the JD-R (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011). Subjective well-being will therefore be an individual outcome as a result of work engagement and indirectly as a result of MPD. In this study satisfaction with life, PA and NA form part of subjective well-being.

**Performance**

Many dimensions of performance exist, but for the purpose of this study performance will be defined as the accomplishment of assigned tasks in accordance with the organisation’s expectations, being evaluated through the performance appraisal process (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Ahmad, Lemba, and Wan Ismail (2010) refer to performance appraisal as a process designed to evaluate, manage and improve individual performance. During this process organisational and individual expectations are discussed and the focus is on employee achievements, learning and development needs. According to Ladyshewsky (2009), a clear distinction should be made between performance appraisal and performance management. The former is more focused on evaluating performance against key indicators, where the latter focuses on improving performance through a coaching relationship. However, Fletcher (2001) emphasised that it is important for managers to assess their employees and develop their skills as this will enhance individual and organisational performance.

Anitha (2013) indicated that work engagement had a significant impact on employee performance and performance will have a positive organisational outcome in that it will
lead to higher productivity and economic growth. Bakker, Demerouti, and Verbeke (2004) found that engaged employees were rated higher by peers on performance and came to the conclusion that engaged employees perform better and were willing to go the extra mile. Schaufeli, Taris, and Bakker (2006) found in a study done on a wide range of occupations that work engagement was related positively to performance. Bakker (2009) identified four reasons why engaged workers perform better than non-engaged workers. Engaged employees: (1) often experience positive emotions, including happiness, joy, and enthusiasm; (2) experience better psychological and physical health; (3) create their own job and personal resources (e.g., support from others); and (4) transfer their engagement to others.

Research done by Demerouti et al. (2001) indicated that job resources that are self-reported and observed (managers who give support, feedback on work output and governing own work) predict dedication. In addition, research done by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) indicated that a positive link exists between work engagement and job resources (performance feedback, social support, and supervisory coaching). Barbier et al., (2013) found that an increase in performance expectations will predict higher work engagement. Performance expectations act as an internal stressor that will lead to increased effort at work in order to ensure that expectations are met. Spending effort at work refers to vigour and vigour is a major component of work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) also found that work engagement has a mediating effect on the relationship between job resources and turnover intentions.

Disengaged employees will stay during economic slowdown, but when opportunities emerge as the economy bounces back, those talented yet disengaged employees will be the first to leave (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Ahmad et al. (2010) showed that turnover intention has a positive correlation with performance assessment. Performance assessment has a negative and a positive component. On the one hand, it can lead to motivation, and on the other, it can lead to punishment. When assessment scores are influenced by motivation such as recognition, it will lead to higher job satisfaction and a reduction in turnover intention. When workers perceive their performance assessment to be influenced by punishment, it will result in a reduction in turnover intention. Therefore,
a strong correlation exists between performance and turnover intention (Ahmad et al., 2010). For the purpose of the study performance will be an organisational outcome as a result of MPD.

**Turnover Intention**

Employees’ intentions to stay or leave their employer have been identified as one of the key predictors of voluntary turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Rothmann et al., 2013). Intention to leave could be the most important antecedent of employee turnover (San Park & Hyun Kim, 2009). According to San Park and Hyun Kim (2009), when employees start to look for alternative job opportunities, the cognitive stage in the decision-making process is activated, resulting in the intention to leave. Cohen and Golan (2007) defined turnover as the voluntary separation of an individual from an organisation. Turnover relates to employees’ dissatisfaction and when employees are dissatisfied with their jobs, they will find alternative employment (Cohen & Golan, 2007).

The effect that managers have on employees was researched by Kouzes and Posner (2002) who stated: “A key factor why people stay in organisations is their managers. It’s equally important in why people leave organisations. People, in fact, don’t generally quit companies, they quit managers” (p. 283).

It is important to understand why employees have the intention to leave. Some of the causes for turnover could be overall job demands, limited resources and the internal process occurring prior to well-being (Rothmann et al., 2013). Cohen (1999) revealed in his study among professionals that work-related variables relating to employees’ professional status, work challenges, perceived performance and job satisfaction, rather than their personal characteristics, will have an effect on turnover intention.

Cohen and Golan (2007) identified job satisfaction to be a strong predictor of absenteeism; and organisational commitment is related to turnover intention. Krausz, Koslowsky, Shalom, and Elyakim (1995) found that intention to leave was a better predictor of actual turnover. An individual’s articulation of his or her intention to leave
will indicate turnover intention (Cohen & Golan, 2007). Therefore, on the one side absenteeism and poor performance can be an antecedent of turnover; and on the other side an excellent rewards process can support a high performance culture (Cohen & Golan, 2007).

It was found that when managers are provided with empowering leadership training and development programs, it positively impacts employee engagement. When employees perceive their managers as having an empowering leadership style, they will feel more empowered and the feelings of empowerment will leave them more motivated, leading to stronger feelings of connection and relatedness to the organisation (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011). Stander and Stander (2010) stated that managers need to focus on skills development and coaching as this could support employees’ decision to stay, as people development and meaning contribute strongly to predicting employees’ intention to leave or stay. Investing the necessary time, effort and resources in creating an engaged workforce will ultimately reduce the cost of replacement later (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Turnover intention will therefore be an organisational outcome as a result of work engagement and indirectly as a result of MPD.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The literature study reviewed the relationships between the constructs of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. Positive relationships were anticipated, except with turnover intention. Based on the review of the literature, the conceptual framework of the study is graphically depicted in Figure 1 which reveals the relationships between the different constructs.
The following hypotheses are put forward in this study:

**Hypothesis 1:** Positive significant relationships exist between employees’ experience of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being and performance.

**Hypothesis 2:** Negative significant relationships exist between employees’ experience of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance, and turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 3:** Employees’ experience of MPD predicts work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 4:** Work engagement predicts subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

**Hypothesis 5:** Work engagement has an indirect effect on the relationship between MPD, subjective well-being, performance, and turnover intention respectively.
RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design comprises the research approach, research strategy and research method.

Research Approach

The study followed a descriptive, cross-sectional and quantitative approach utilising online questionnaires to gather data regarding employees’ perceived experience of managers as people developers (Salkind, 2009). The survey method was used due to its empirical nature and ability to produce large amounts of data in an economical and time-effective way. The hypotheses are supported by existing theory and the data analysis was done by making use of a correlation approach.

Research Strategy

Considering the general objective of the study (to explore the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention in a petrochemical organisation in South Africa), it was decided to investigate employees’ perceived experience of their managers as people developers and the impact on individual outcomes (subjective well-being) and organisational outcomes (turnover intention and performance).

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Participants

A population of 500 employees comprising managerial and non-managerial employees was targeted of which 229 employees completed and returned the questionnaires (response rate of 46%). Of the 229 questionnaires, 228 were usable for data analysis. Table 1 displays the characteristics of the sample. The mean age was 41.5 years. The sample consisted of 149 (65.4%) males and 79 (34.6%) females. The two dominant language groups were Afrikaans (58.3%) and English (21.1%), whilst 16.7% comprised
other African languages. Of the sample, 52 (23.6%) indicated that they had a Grade 12 certificate and education up to grade 11, and 155 (70.5%) reported a tertiary qualification. Regarding the organisational levels, 124 (54.6%) of respondents were on a managerial level and 54 (23.8%) reported that they were on a non-management level. Of the participants, 69 (30.3%) had less than one year’s working experience, while 159 (9.6%) had more than 5 years’ working experience. Furthermore, 69 (30.3%) indicated that they had been reporting less than one year to their current manager and 159 (69.7%) had been reporting between 1 to 5 years to the same manager. The sample indicated that 33 (14.5%) of the participants received a performance rating as a developer, 145 (63.6%) as full performers and 50 (21.9%) as exceptional performers. The sample is a good representation of the population.

The characteristics of the participants are displayed in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African languages</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Up to Grade 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment category</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-management</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in service</td>
<td>&gt;1 year</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to manager</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Managing Self</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme attended</td>
<td>Managing Others</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing Managers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance rating</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring Instruments

*Biographical information:* A biographical questionnaire was used to obtain the characteristics of the participants. Characteristics such as gender, age, language, education, employment category, years in service, reporting status, leadership programme attendance and performance ratings were collected by means of this questionnaire.

**The Manager as People Developer (MPD):** MPD was measured by selected items from the *Leadership Empowerment Behavior Questionnaire* (LEBQ; Konczak et al., 2000), and the *Empowering Leadership Questionnaire* (ELQ; Arnold et al., 2000). Both scales were scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). From the LEBQ, the skills development and coaching for innovative performance dimensions were used. Examples of items from the scale include: “My manager provides me with frequent opportunities to develop new skills”, and “My manager is willing to risk mistakes on my part if, over the long term, I will learn and develop as a result of the experience” (Konczak et al., 2000). Konczak et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.70 and 0.88. From the ELQ, the coaching dimension was used. An example of an item from the scale is: “Encourages work group members to express ideas/suggestions”. Arnold et al. (2000) reported reliability coefficients that ranged between 0.89 and 0.94.

**Work Engagement:** Work engagement was measured by means of the *Work Engagement Scale* (WES) (Rothmann, 2010). The WES consists of nine items that reflect the three components of Kahn’s (1990) conceptualisation of work engagement, namely cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement. All items were scored on a 7-point frequency scale ranging from 1 (*almost never or never*) to 7 (*always or almost always*). Cognitive engagement was measured by three items (e.g., “I am rarely distracted when performing my job”); emotional engagement by three items (e.g., “I am enthusiastic about my job”); and physical engagement by three items (e.g., “I am full of energy in my work”). The WES was reported to have the following reliability coefficients for the three scales respectively: 0.78, 0.82, and 0.80 (Rothmann, 2010).
**Turnover Intention:** The *Turnover Intention Scale* (TIS; Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000) was utilised to measure turnover intention. The TIS comprises three items and was scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Examples of items include: “I am actively looking for other jobs”, and “I feel I could leave this job”. The TIS was reported to have shown a reliability coefficient of 0.83 (Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000).

**Satisfaction with Life:** The *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985) is a measure of life satisfaction. The SWLS comprises five items and measures life satisfaction. All items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Examples of items include: “I am satisfied with my life”, and “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing”. Diener et al. (1985) reported a reliability coefficient of 0.87 and 2-month test-retest stability coefficients of 0.64 to 0.82.

**Affect Balance Scale:** The *Affect Balance Scale* (ABS; Bandburn, 1969) is widely used as a measure of social psychological well-being. The purpose of the ABS is to assess positive and negative affect as indicators of life satisfaction and/or well-being (Bradburn, 1969). The ABS comprises two components, namely a positive and negative affect component. Each component has five items and is scored by responding yes or no. Examples of positive items include: ‘Particularly excited or interested in something’ and ‘Proud because someone had complimented you on something you had done’; and examples of negative items include: ‘So restless you couldn’t sit long in a chair’ and ‘Very lonely or remote from other people’. Bradburn (1996) reported test-retest reliability of 0.83, 0.81 and 0.76. Internal consistency reliabilities for Positive Affect (PA) range between 0.55 and 0.73 and for Negative Affect (NA) scores range between 0.61 and 0.73. Validity shown by Bradburn indicated that PA correlated with single-item indicators of happiness from 0.34 to 0.38, with corresponding values for NA at -0.33 and -0.38.
**Research Procedure**

This research study followed the ethical guidelines as outlined by the North-West University (NWU). Prior to the commencement of the study, ethical clearance was obtained from the ethics committee of Optentia Research Focus Area of the NWU (Vaal Triangle Campus). Permission to conduct the research was also obtained from the Psychology Forum of the petrochemical organisation. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidentiality was maintained. The questionnaire was prefaced with a cover letter that explained the purpose and objectives of the study; participants were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. Written consent was obtained from all participants.

**Statistical Analysis**

The analyses were carried out with the SPSS 22.0 program (IBM Corporation, 2012) and Mplus 7.3 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). To analyse the distribution of the scores, descriptive statistics (e.g. means and standard deviations) were used. Raykov’s measure of composite reliability was used to assess the internal consistency of the measuring instruments (Raykov, 2004). To specify the relationships between the variables, Pearson correlations were calculated. The level of statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ and the practical significant cut-off point was set at $r \geq 0.03$, representing a medium effect and $r \geq 0.50$ representing a large effect (Raykov, 2004).

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to test measurement and structural models. The following fit indices were used in the study:

1. Absolute fit indices: Chi-square statistics (the test of absolute fit of the model), and Root-Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA);
2. Incremental fit indices: Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI); and
3. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (Hair, Black, Babin, & Andersen, 2010)
For a close fit between the model and the data, acceptable values for TLI and CFI should be higher than 0.95, with RMSEA values less than 0.08. The weighted-least-squared-adjusted-for-means-and-variances (WLSMV) estimator was used due to the categorical nature of the data; therefore no AIC or BIC values could be calculated, and chi-square values could not be compared directly.

RESULTS

Test for competing measurement models will be reported, followed by the results of test of alternative structural models.

Testing the Measurement Model

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine validity of factor structures. A five-factor measurement model and alternative models were tested to determine if each of the measurement items would load significantly onto the scales with which they were associated. Problematic items were removed from the models. To examine the validity of the proposed measurement model, three measurement models were compared.

Model 1: The hypothesised model of the MPD consisted of five variables, namely MPD as second order variable consisted of three first order variables, namely skills development (measured by three observed variables), coaching for innovative performance (measured by three observed variables), and coaching (measured by nine observed variables); work engagement as first order variable was measured by seven observed variables; turnover intention as first order variable was measured by three observed variables; subjective well-being as second order variable consisted of three first order variables, namely satisfaction with life (measured by five observed variables), positive affect (measured by five observed variables), and negative affect (measured by four observed variables); and performance as a single observed variable.

Model 2: The first competing model consisted of seven variables: Skills development (measured by three items), coaching for innovative performance (measured by three
items), and coaching (measured by nine items) as first order variables; work engagement as first order variable consisted of seven observed variables; turnover intention as first order variable was measured by three observed variables; subjective well-being as second order variable consisted of three first order variables, namely satisfaction with life (measured by five variables), positive affect (five items), and negative affect (measured by four observed variables); and performance as a single observed variable.

**Model 3:** The second competing model consisted of five variables, namely MPD as second order variable consisted of three first order variables, namely skills development (measured by three observed variables), coaching for innovative performance (measured by three observed variables), and coaching (measured by nine observed variables); work engagement as first order variable consisted of seven observed variables; turnover intention as first order variable was measured by three observed variables; subjective well-being as second order variable consisted of two first order variables, namely satisfaction with life (measured by three variables), and total affect (measured by nine observed variables); and performance as a single observed variable.

Model 1 was used as baseline model to determine if the other two models represented a statistically significant improvement. The fit statistics for testing the various models are presented in Table 2. (Due to a small variance in the data, up to three decimals are reported; therefore APA guidelines were not followed in Table 2 specifically.)

**Table 2**

*Fit Statistics of the Measurement Models (N = 228)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>1107.273</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>1141.265</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>1118.703</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df =$ degrees of freedom; TLI= Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI= Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA= Root-Mean Square Error of Approximation

As can be seen in Table 2, Model 1, which was subsequently used as a baseline model, had a $\chi^2$ value of 1107.27 ($df = 725$), TLI = 0.98, CFI = 0.98, and RMSEA = 0.05. The hypothesized model (Model 1) showed acceptable fit with the data. The results indicated
that each observed variable and its corresponding construct was statistically significant \((p < 0.01)\), establishing the relationship between indicators and constructs (Hair et al., 2010). The hypothesized model (Model 1) fitted the data best.

**Evaluating the Structural Model**

The descriptive statistics, reliabilities and correlations of scales are reported in Table 3. Reliabilities were not reported for MPD or subjective well-being, because of their second order nature; while the reliability for performance, a single measured item, cannot be calculated. Reliabilities ranged from 0.78 to 0.93. All scales showed adequate internal consistencies (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Only correlations between main constructs will be reported. As can be viewed in Table 3, MPD has a practically significant positive correlation (medium effect) with work engagement and subjective well-being, and a statistically significant positive relationship with performance. MPD has a practically significant negative correlation (medium effect) with turnover intention. Work engagement has a practically significant positive correlation (large effect) with subjective well-being and a statistically significant positive correlation with performance, whilst a negative (medium effect) relationship exists with turnover intention. Turnover intention has a practically significant negative correlation (medium effect) with subjective well-being.

Based on these results, support for Hypotheses 1 and 2 were found. Hypothesis 1 states that *positive significant relationships exist between employees’ experience of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being and performance*. Hypothesis 2, *negative significant relationships exist between employees’ experience of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention*, can be partly accepted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Skills development</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coaching for innovative performance</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.79**††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coaching</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.58**††</td>
<td>0.64**††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MPD</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.84**††</td>
<td>0.94**††</td>
<td>0.69**††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work engagement</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.35**††</td>
<td>0.39**††</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.41**††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Satisfaction with life</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.48**†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Turnover intention</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.40**†</td>
<td>-0.44**†</td>
<td>-0.32**†</td>
<td>-0.47**†</td>
<td>-0.43**†</td>
<td>-0.32**†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Positive Affect</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.50**†</td>
<td>0.48**†</td>
<td>-0.34**†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.52**††</td>
<td>-0.50**†</td>
<td>0.35**†</td>
<td>0.52**††</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Subjective well-being</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.34**††</td>
<td>0.38**††</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.40**††</td>
<td>0.71**††</td>
<td>0.68**††</td>
<td>-0.48**†</td>
<td>0.70**††</td>
<td>0.74**††</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Performance</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at p < 0.05  
**Correlation is significant at p < 0.01  
†Practically significant r > 0.30 (medium effect)  
†† Practically significant r > 0.50 (large effect)
The measurement model formed the basis for the structural model. The best fitting measurement model was used to develop the proposed structural model, which was then tested and compared to three competing structural models. Model 1 included paths from MPD to work engagement, turnover intention, subjective well-being, and performance; and from work engagement to turnover intention, subjective well-being, and performance. The results, as displayed in Table 4, indicated a good fit of the hypothesized model to the data ($\chi^2 = 1107.27$, $df = 725$, TLI = 0.98, CFI = 0.98, and RMSEA = 0.05).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>1107.27</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>1215.76</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>1596.93</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>1533.40</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$df$= degrees of freedom; TLI= Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI= Comparative Fit Index; RMSEA= Root-Mean Square Error of Approximation

Based on the hypothesised model, three competing structural models were developed and tested and the results are reported in Table 5. Changes in chi square between the different structural models were tested through difference testing, where different regression paths are constrained to zero: MPD to turnover intention in Model 2; MPD to work engagement in Model 3; and MPD to subjective well-being and subjective well-being to turnover intention in Model 4. Constrained paths were selected, based on theoretical considerations.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta df$</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>45.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 shows the structural model. The results show that MPD has a positive effect on work engagement and a negative effect on turnover intention, while work engagement has a positive effect on subjective well-being and performance, and a negative influence on turnover intention.
Figure 2. The structural model

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$. 
The obtained statistical results of the best fitting structural model (Model 1) are discussed with reference to the hypotheses of this study.

**Hypothesis 3:** Employees’ experience of MPD predicts work engagement, subjective well-being, performance, and turnover intention

For the portion of the model predicting the relationships between MPD and work engagement ($\beta = 0.41, p = 0.00$), and between MPD and turnover intention ($\beta = -0.36, p = 0.00$), the path coefficients were significant in the expected direction. The path coefficients between MPD and subjective well-being ($\beta = 0.13, p = 0.14$), and MPD and performance ($\beta = 0.17, p = 0.06$) were not significant. Hypothesis 3 was therefore partially accepted.

**Hypothesis 4:** Work engagement predicts subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention

For the portion of the model predicting relationships between work engagement and subjective well-being ($\beta = 0.66, p = 0.00$), work engagement and performance ($\beta = 0.17, p = 0.02$), and work engagement and turnover intention ($\beta = -0.28, p = 0.00$), the path coefficients were significant and had the expected direction. Work engagement was found to be a strong antecedent to subjective well-being, performance, and turnover intention. Hypothesis 4 was therefore accepted.

**Hypothesis 5:** Work engagement has an indirect effect on the relationship between MPD, and subjective well-being, performance, and turnover intention respectively

Table 6 shows that a bootstrap-estimated indirect effect of MPD on subjective well-being and turnover intention (via work engagement) was found ($p \leq 0.01$), and confidence intervals did not include zeros (Hayes, 2009). An indirect effect from MPD on performance via work engagement was not found. Hypothesis 5 is therefore partially accepted: MPD impacts subjective well-being and turnover intention via work engagement.
Table 6

*Indirect Effects of Work Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.19, -0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective well-being</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[0.16, 0.38]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[-0.01, 0.14]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SE= standard error, CI= confidence interval

** p < 0.01.

**DISCUSSION**

The aim of this study was to investigate whether employees’ experience of their managers as people developers will have an effect on work engagement, and whether work engagement will have an effect on subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The study also considered the possible mediating effect of work engagement.

The results of the study indicated that there were practically significant relationships between MPD and work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. There are limited studies on MPD; however, *skills development*, and *coaching* have been identified as important dimensions of MPD. In this study they were positively related to work engagement, subjective well-being and performance, and negatively to turnover intention. The results also showed that MPD accounted for a large proportion of variance in work engagement. Work engagement positively related to subjective well-being and performance and negatively to turnover intention. Turnover intention had a negative relationship with subjective well-being.

The analysis therefore showed that employees’ level of work engagement is related to their experience of their managers as people developers. A higher level of MPD was related to higher work engagement. When managers focus on the development and coaching of their employees, they ensure higher levels of work engagement. This is supported by De Klerk and Stander (2014) who found that a significant positive relationship existed between leadership empowerment behaviour (with a strong development component) and work engagement. These results are supported by studies that found that where managers utilise coaching
techniques, they will increase work engagement and allow employees to reach their full potential and deliver longer-term value (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Sparrow, 2013). Higher levels of MPD also relate to higher levels of subjective well-being; therefore, employees whose managers spend time to coach and develop their subordinates will experience higher levels of well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Where managers coach and develop employees, it could potentially lead to lower levels of turnover intention (Stander & Stander, 2010). Higher levels of MPD correlated with performance, indicating that when managers focus on the coaching and development of their employees, their performance will increase (Ellinger, Ellinger, & Keller, 2003). Coaching supports employees to improve their work performance (Jorgensen, 2012) and this could have a direct effect on the organisational climate and productivity (Goleman et al., 2002).

High levels of work engagement correlated with high levels of subjective well-being and performance. When employees experience work engagement, they will concurrently experience higher levels of subjective well-being. Harter, Schmidt, and Keys (2003) stated that work engagement will result in increased subjective well-being. Several researchers have found that work engagement has positive relationships with job satisfaction and employee well-being (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Takawira, Coetzee, & Schreuder, 2014). This is also applicable to performance, indicating that when employees feel engaged in their work, they will display higher levels of performance. This is supported in the findings of Ladyshewsky (2009) who stated that where managers adopt coaching practices, it will lead to work engagement - resulting in increased performance.

MPD had a negative correlation with turnover intention. Employees who experience their managers as people developers will be less likely to think about leaving their organisation. Work engagement also had a negative correlation with turnover intention. When employees experience high levels of work engagement, they will be less likely to have intentions of leaving. Furthermore, turnover intention had a negative correlation with subjective well-being. Employees who experience positive emotions about their work environment are less likely to have cognitions of leaving.

MPD, according to the multiple regression analysis, predicted turnover intention (it explained 29% of the variance). Employees will show a greater commitment toward the organisation
and lower intentions to leave when they perceive their managers as people developers. Managers who coach and develop employees contribute to their intentions to stay. Stander and Rothmann (2008) found that managers who take responsibility for the development of their employees will contribute to lower employee turnover. Rothmann et al., (2013) found that a poor relationship with managers indirectly affected the intentions of employees to leave. The results of the multiple regression analysis also showed that MPD predicted work engagement (it explained 17% of the variance). The manager who spends time on the skills development of his or her staff and who coaches for performance will enhance the work engagement of employees and their interest in their work (May et al., 2004).

The multiple regression analysis showed that work engagement predicted turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance. This is supported by studies that found that work engagement played a predicting role in employees’ willingness to stay with the company. Where people are devoted and passionate about their work, they will experience more positive feelings and will be less likely to think of leaving (Mendes & Stander, 2011). In this study work engagement was also predictive of performance and this is supported by other research (Bakker, Demerouti, & Brummelhuis, 2012; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010). Bakker and colleagues (2012) found that when employees were highly engaged in their work, and supervisor-ratings of performance were high, employees were more dedicated and displayed satisfactory task performance (Bakker et al., 2012). Bakker and Demerouti (2008) found that work engagement contributes to the improvement of work-life and promotes the well-being of employees. Engaged employees will be happier at work and will be less likely to think of leaving. The results are in line with previous research and confirm that work engagement has predictive value in terms of subjective well-being (Maslach & Leiter, 2008).

Lastly, the regression analysis also showed that the relation between MPD and work engagement created a stronger prediction of turnover intention (it explained 29% of the variance) and subjective well-being (explaining 52% of the variance). Therefore, when employees experience their managers as people developers, they will be less likely to leave the organisation and will display higher levels of well-being.

Regarding employees’ perceived experience of their managers as people developers, the results showed that MPD had an indirect effect on subjective well-being and turnover
intention (via work engagement). Specific experiences of supervisory coaching and development at work promote work engagement, and work engagement again affects subjective well-being and turnover intention. An indirect effect from MPD on performance via work engagement was not found. However, MPD did affect work engagement significantly. The results are related to the JD-R model (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) identified job resources related to development (social support from colleagues, supervisory coaching and performance feedback) as the main predictors of work engagement. Supporting studies also found that job resources were the most important predictors of work engagement (Halbesleben, 2010). In the study, MPD can be viewed as a job resource in that where managers coach and develop employees, it will positively influence work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Job resources are therefore one of the key drivers of work engagement leading to outcomes of well-being and happiness (Bakker et al., 2014). Organisations need to utilise job resources to ensure a happier and more engaged workforce (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). Employees who utilise job resources effectively will show higher levels of work engagement (Bakker, 2014). Engaged employees will experience good health and positive work affect (Rothbard, 2011). The results also confirm that where MPD as job resource is lacking, employees’ intention to leave will be higher. Intention to leave could be the most important antecedent of employee turnover (San Park & Hyun Kim, 2009). Turnover relates to employee dissatisfaction and when employees are dissatisfied with their jobs, they will leave (Cohen & Golan, 2007). Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found that work engagement had a mediating effect on the relationship between job resources and turnover intentions.

The key contribution of this study is towards the MPD construct, investigating and confirming the effect of MPD on work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. When employees perceive their managers as people developers, they will show higher levels of work engagement, and work engagement will result in higher levels of subjective well-being, performance and lower turnover intention.

A cross-sectional survey design was followed which limits the ability of this study to determine cause-and-effect relationships. Self-reported questionnaires could have influenced
the results due to potential bias. The study focused only on one company, limiting the results. Furthermore, limited research was found on the construct of MPD.

It is recommended that more research should be conducted on MPD, as this construct has not been fully conceptualised in literature. Going forward, a longitudinal research design is recommended to ensure that the causal effects among all the variables are identified. It is also recommended that the constructs used in this study be investigated in other organisations.
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CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present conclusions, recommendations and limitations, according to the general and specific objectives of the study. Firstly, conclusions were drawn from the research objectives. Secondly, attention was given to the limitations of the study. Finally, recommendations were made to the organisation for consideration as well as for future research.

3.1 CONCLUSIONS FROM LITERATURE AND EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The general objective of this study was to explore the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

*The first objective was to conceptualise the constructs and the relationships between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.*

MPD is a fairly new construct and currently not extensively conceptualised in literature. However, in this study - for the conceptualisation of MPD - the focus was on skills development, coaching for innovative performance and coaching in general. MPD could partly be linked to leadership empowerment behaviour. Konczak, Stelly, and Trusty (2000) identified skills development and coaching for innovative performance as dimensions of empowering behaviour, whilst Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000) identified coaching as contributing to developing people. Researchers emphasise the importance of coaching for successful managers and employees (Chen, Ai, & You 2014; Jorgensen, 2012). Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) stated that coaching enables employees to improve their work performance and could have a direct impact on the organisational climate and productivity. Ladyshewsky (2009) defined coaching as: “A short-term developmental interaction focused on performance, goal-setting, providing practical application, feedback and teaching as components” (p. 293).
According to Knobel (2008), a manager’s most important job is to be experienced as genuine by showing interest in employees’ development. Goleman et al. (2002) identified a core quality of a successful manager as the ability to develop others. Stander and Rothmann (2008) support this by stating that to be able to be a good developer of people, managers must be developed to delegate authority, make employees accountable for outcomes, lead by example, allow participative decision making, share information, coach, mentor and develop people. This is supported by Huang and Hsieh (2015) who postulated that where managers form conditions for employees to develop, they will improve their job performance and add value to the bottom line.

Researchers emphasise that coaching is a key skill for managers and organisations need to ensure that learning interventions incorporate coaching skills development (Jorgensen, 2012; Ladyshewsky, 2009). Goleman et al. (2002) stated that coaching could help subordinates improve their work performance and this could have a direct effect on the organisational climate and productivity. Where managers utilise their coaching skills, employees will flourish in their work and high quality relationships will be formed, leading to an engaged and high performance culture (May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). It is therefore important to emphasise the imperative role that managers play as people developers, as they will contribute to employees feeling engaged and this will positively impact their work engagement (Whittington & Galpin, 2010).

*Work engagement* is defined as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). Kahn emphasised that employees will become physically involved in work activities, displaying their values and beliefs, creativity and feelings (Kahn, 1990). Kahn (1990) laid the foundation for work engagement as a psychological state. He stated that engagement captures an employee’s psychological presence, or “being there” (Kahn, 1992). Psychological presence relates to the extent that an employee is alert, engaged, and focused on the task at hand. This is supported by Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) who stated that engaged employees will put more effort into their work as they identify with it. They express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performance (Kahn, 1990; Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010). Work engagement plays a key role towards employee and organisational success. Managers
constantly have contact with employees and when they engage employees, work engagement will be positively impacted (Whittington & Galpin, 2010).

*Subjective well-being* is defined by Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith (1999) as “a broad category of phenomena that includes people’s emotional responses, domain satisfactions, and global judgments of life satisfaction” (p. 277). Life satisfaction will indicate the degree to which a person evaluates the overall worth of his life (Veenhoven, 1991). Graves, Ohlott, and Ruderman (2007) defined life satisfaction as a measure of one’s appraisal of life in general, and Ye, Yu, and Li (2012) defined life satisfaction as an individual’s evaluation about his or her quality of life. Subjective well-being therefore relates to a person’s cognitive and affective evaluation of his or her life. The affective part relates to feelings and emotions, the presence of positive affect (PA) and the absence of negative affect (NA). The cognitive part relates to an information-based appraisal of one’s life (Diener, 1994). Bosman (2005) found that employees who experience higher levels of NA and lower levels of PA will experience a decrease in work engagement and higher levels of exhaustion and disengagement.

*Performance* is defined as the accomplishment of tasks assigned to individuals that are in line with organisational expectations and evaluated according to a standard performance appraisal process (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). The performance appraisal process is where individual performance is evaluated, managed and improved (Ahmad, Lemba, and Wan Ismail (2010). When performance expectations are mutually agreed upon, it provides the basis for the development of a high quality relationship between the manager and his followers (Whittington & Galpin, 2010). Organisations that invest in the training of their managers as coaches ensure that employees receive the necessary support to grow, develop and enhance their work performance (Jorgensen, 2012).

*Turnover intention* is defined as employees’ intentions to stay or leave their employer and is a key predictor of voluntary turnover (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Rothmann, Diedericks, & Swart, 2013). In addition, turnover is defined as the voluntary separation of an individual from an organisation (Cohen & Golan, 2007). According to San Park and Hyun Kim (2009), the intention to leave relates to the cognitive stage in the decision-making process in that quitting and searching for alternative employment occur actively. Cohen and Golan (2007) defined turnover as the voluntary separation of an individual from an
organisation. Turnover relates to employee dissatisfaction and when employees are dissatisfied with their jobs, they will find alternative employment (Cohen & Golan, 2007).

Coaching has been linked to outcomes of high motivational levels, improved employee performance, and, job satisfaction (Watkins & Leigh, 2009). Previous research found statistically significant relationships between work engagement and subjective well-being (Maslach & Leiter, 2008), work engagement and performance (Bakker & Bal, 2010; Bakker, Demerouti, & Lieke, 2012; Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2010), and work engagement and turnover intention (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira, Coetzee, & Schreuder, 2014).

*The second objective was to investigate the relationship between MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.*

Statistical analyses were performed to determine the relationships between MPD, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The results of the study indicated that MPD had a practically positively significant relationship (medium effect) with work engagement and subjective well-being, and a statistically positive relationship with performance. Work engagement had a practically positive significant relationship (large effect) with subjective well-being and a statistically positive relationship with performance. MPD and work engagement had a statistically significant negative correlation (medium effect) with turnover intention, and turnover intention had a statistically significant negative correlation (medium effect) with subjective well-being.

*The third objective was to determine if MPD is an antecedent for work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.*

MPD was found to be an antecedent of work engagement. Where managers provide their subordinates with opportunities to develop and they spend time on coaching them, the employees will respond with higher levels of work engagement. The results also showed that MPD was an antecedent for turnover intention. Managers who coach and develop employees contribute to their intention to stay.
Furthermore, work engagement was found to be an antecedent for turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance. This is supported by studies that found that work engagement played a predicting role in employees’ willingness to stay with the company (Mendes & Stander, 2011). Work engagement also displayed predictive value in terms of subjective well-being (Maslach & Leiter, 2008) and performance (Bakker, Demerouti, & Brummelhuis, 2012). Engaged employees will be happier at work and more dedicated, displaying higher levels of performance (Bakker et al., 2012).

The fourth objective was to determine if work engagement will indirectly affect the relationship between MPD, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention.

An indirect effect was found from MPD (via work engagement) on subjective well-being and turnover intention, but an indirect effect from MPD on performance (via work engagement) was not found. Work engagement had a direct effect on performance. Work engagement was found to be a strong antecedent to subjective well-being and turnover intention. The results imply that if employees experience their managers as people developers, they will be more engaged and this feeling of work engagement can contribute to increased levels of subjective well-being and lower turnover intention. Therefore, MPD has an indirect effect on subjective well-being and turnover intention via work engagement.

3.2 LIMITATIONS

Certain limitations need to be reported. The first limitation of the study is that a cross-sectional survey design was followed. This could potentially influence the credibility of the causal relationships as it does not allow for the measurement of variables that change over time. A second limitation could be the utilisation of self-reported questionnaires to obtain data. Participants could have been biased and this could have potentially influenced the results. Thirdly, the study was conducted in one company, limiting the results.

Limited research was found with regard to the relationships between MPD and the constructs of work engagement, turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance.
3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

The research provided the opportunity to evaluate relationships between different constructs of MPD, work engagement, subjective well-being, performance and turnover intention. The recommendations are based on the findings of the research and are made specifically to the organisation and scholars for future research.

3.3.1 Recommendations for Organisations

Organisations that invest in developing their managers as coaches ensure that employees receive the necessary support to grow, develop and improve their work performance (Jorgensen, 2012). This is supported by Huang and Hsieh (2015) who indicated that where managers create conducive environments for employees to learn, grow, develop and perform, they will enhance individual and organisational outcomes. Goleman et al. (2002) stated that coaching could help subordinates to improve their work performance and this could have a direct effect on the organisational climate and productivity.

The petrochemical organisation where the research was conducted was highly successful in the past, both from a financial and business perspective. However, the global financial crises, drop in prices and demand for many of their products emphasised the need for change. Improvement was required in respect of engaging employees and enabling high performance. An integrated employee survey was conducted in 2013 and the results supported managers to enter into meaningful dialogue with their teams to inspire the necessary actions towards creating an engaging work environment. The results drawn from the survey indicated low employee engagement and low employee performance. Employees indicated that they were not motivated to contribute to organisational success. They strongly felt that managers were not leading employees effectively; they had limited trust in management as goal clarity and alignment were missing. Growth and development opportunities were also limited and, in general, employees did not take responsibility for their work and decisions.

However, the results indicated that where managers coach and develop their employees, it could lead to higher levels of work engagement and lower turnover intention. Knobel (2008) stated that managers need to invest time and effort in developing those around them. This can
only happen if managers improve their own coaching and feedback skills (Ladyshewsky, 2009). It is therefore proposed that all employees continue to attend leadership development programmes identified for the company. The programmes will support employees to understand their roles and responsibilities and practically show how coaching can support personal and organisational growth and development. Stander and Rothmann (2008) are of the opinion that only where managers are empowered to be people developers, will they be able to empower their staff. They further stated that to be able to be a good developer of people, managers must be coached and developed to delegate authority, make employees accountable for outcomes, lead by example, encourage subordinates, show concern for others’ feelings, allow participative decision making, share information, coach, mentor and develop people.

In the context of the study, the MPD need to empower and engage their subordinates by focusing on the following behaviours:

**Skills development:** Managers need to provide employees with frequent opportunities to develop new skills, such as encouraging systematic problem solving. They need to prioritise continuous learning and skills development for their department.

**Coaching:** Managers need to be prepared to risk mistakes on the part of the employees. They need to allow employees to learn and develop from their experience. They need to encourage individuals to try out new ideas and follow corrective actions, rather than blame and shame. Organisations need to invest in coaching training to enable managers to support their teams. Coaching skills will allow managers to make suggestions around work performance, help subordinates to solve problems, focus on goals and help the team to be self-reliant.

Considering a normal day in the life of a manager, organisations should ensure that coaching forms part of their daily tasks. As a “manager as people developer”, line managers will manage, teach, mentor, coach and counsel employees to achieve individual and organisational results. Both the line manager and the employee have a responsibility to navigate the coaching process within the organisation, including any intervention focused on performance improvement. This will provide the necessary support to:
• Focus on the strong points and capabilities of employees to maximum performance;

• Provide “on-the-job” and “just-in-time” workplace “fit-for-purpose” training;

• Allow behavioural shifts; and

• Enable projects and people to show maximum return on investment.

Managers are accountable for the coaching and development of employees. Coaching is fundamental in the development of employees and will realise growth ambitions and support organisational priorities. Coaching also underpins the success of learning in the workplace. It is important to identify development gaps before learning can take place. Coaching is a continuous process towards unlocking and developing potential, enhancing performance and building individual skills sets as this will allow alignment with organisational goals.

### 3.3.2 Recommendations for Future Research

A cross-sectional survey design was followed, potentially limiting the study to determine the cause-and-effect relationships. A longitudinal research design is recommended for future research to ensure that the causal effects among all the variables are identified. Self-report questionnaires could have led to bias from participants; therefore, it is recommended that a more objective approach be considered. A longitudinal design including different organisations should be followed.

More research should be conducted on MPD as this construct has not been fully conceptualised in literature. It could be worthwhile to use a mixed method process to qualitatively conceptualise the concept, compile a measuring instrument and validate it quantitatively. This will also apply to the different relationships between MPD, work engagement, turnover intention, subjective well-being and performance.
3.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The study investigated employees’ experience of their managers as people developers in the South African context. It was found that managers are the major source of contact with employees and when they coach and develop their subordinates, it leads to work engagement and lower turnover intention. Work engagement will again lead to higher levels of subjective well-being, performance and lower turnover intention. It will therefore be beneficial for organisations to invest in the development of their managers, with specific focus on coaching skills, as this will result in an engaged workforce and support a high performance culture.
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