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Leadership Influences on Turnover Intentions of Academic Staff in Tertiary Institutions in Zimbabwe

INTRODUCTION

Southern Africa has been witnessing an upsurge in the departure of technical expertise in virtually all sectors over the last five years (Stilwell, 2003). Experienced leaders inspire employees and lead them by vision, energy and integrity. From this it is evident that the quality of leadership determines how the talents, potential, and commitment of employees are optimized for the benefit of the workplace. According to Kusluvan (2003:546) leadership and turnover intention are inextricably linked.

With the high levels of unemployment and the current economic challenges facing the country it is expected that employees are less willing to terminate employment because of the fewer employment opportunities available to them. Those who do leave the organization are more dissatisfied with certain Human Resource Management (HRM) practices (Nel et al., 2006:551).

Organizations that experience employee turnover either benefit from it, or suffer costs as a result of turnover. These costs are a consequence of various factors that influence employee-turnover. Organizations that are able to identify these factors reduce the ramifications of turnover in terms of costs and disruptions in the workplace. If these factors are well maintained then the organization is able to retain its best performing employees, thus enhancing productivity and profitability of the organization. Therefore, organizations need to be aware of the factors that lead to turnover and deal better with the impact that it has on turnover.

This study focuses on leadership as a factor that influences turnover intent of academics in tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe.

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

With the ever-increasing levels of unemployment in Zimbabwe which is estimated at slightly above 80% (CSO, 2010). Universities have been considered as one of the desirable organizations to work for because of their relatively better salaries when compared to civil servants. However, management is becoming concerned that there are too many incidences of avoidable turnover. Some lecturers have resigned without alternative employment to go to, opting for unemployment rather than remaining in the particular department. In other instances many managers namely chairmen and deans are not able to discipline their staff and rely on heavy-handed tactics of warnings and dismissals to ‘force’ compliance and ‘scare’ academic staff into submission. The most worrying is the fact that in one department there has been a complete staff turnover from the most junior lecturer to the chairman, in another department...
the chairman and only and single devoted lecturer remain while the rest of the lecturers have left. These turnovers are due to voluntary resignation and disciplinary action.

Academics at most universities in Zimbabwe demands management attention because when high performing employees for example, senior lecturers and professors leave it, it puts pressure on the organisation. Kusluvan (2003) adds that the high impact of turnover requires management to monitor and measure its labour turnover and take remedial action. According to Ito et al. (2001:232) the strongest predictor of actual departure is when a staff member develops the intention to leave.

By not understanding this process the organisation’s managers are unable to identify intervention methods required to negotiate remedial strategies at their specific levels. Thus, they fail in preventing this intention from moving to the next level, which is actual turnover.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The purpose of this study was to investigate how leadership impacts on lecturer’s decision to leave the university in order to identify shortcomings so that recommendations could be made to management in the higher education sector on how to improve staff retention.

AIM OF THIS RESEARCH

The aim of this study was to investigate the reasons for high labour turnover of academic staff in the higher education sector in Zimbabwe by investigating the linkages between leadership and the lecturer’s decision to terminate his/her services.

THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study sought to achieve the following objective:

- To explore whether leadership influences turnover intention decisions in the higher education sector in Zimbabwe.

RESEARCH QUESTION FOR THIS STUDY

The research question for this study is:

- Does leadership influence the turnover intention levels in the higher education sector in Zimbabwe?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

- The study is of value to the senior management at tertiary institutions in that it will provide information from which management can set realistic retention strategies.

- The Human Resource (HR) departments will be able to identify potential future turnover intents of current lecturers, and make necessary amendments to current remuneration policies and basic conditions of employment, in order to maximize its retention efforts.

- The results of the study will provide awareness about the plight of the lecturers and improve job
The benefits to the higher education sector will be realized through improved service delivery, this in turn improve the quality of tertiary education in Zimbabwe.

- It identifies leadership skills gaps so that the Human Resource Departments can implement leadership and management training interventions to address these.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Leadership**

Leadership has many definitions but no real consensus; essentially it is a relationship through which one person influences the behavior or actions of other people. Leadership is a two-way relationship; the leader exerts leader influence on the followers, but the followers also exert influence over the leader (Nel et al., 2006:332; Mullins, 2002:253).

In every day speech, the terms leader and manager are often used interchangeably; on the one hand Nel et al. (2006:332), Kotter (1999:53) and Kreitner and Kinicki (1998:497) argue that there is a clear distinction between leadership and management. They claim that management and leadership have different functions, for example, Kreitner and Kinicki (1998:497) argue that management is about developing the organizational capacity through organizing and staffing, while leadership is about the aligning of these people to the expected outcomes of the vision. Kotter (1999:53) views management as coping with complexity by planning; and the setting of goals or targets for the future and the developing strategies for achieving these goals, and budgeting; by allocating the resources necessary to accomplish these plans. Leadership, according to Kotter (1999), is about ‘setting a direction’ or developing a vision of the future (usually long term) together with the necessary strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve this vision. The researcher adopts the stance, that in order to lead, one must be able to manage. In the context of business, leadership is about managing all facets of the organization from marketing, through manufacturing and operations to the final service delivery/end-product including customer service and after-sales service. Managing each of these facets requires management skills and leadership; management and leadership are thus inextricably linked. For the sake of this research the terms leadership and management will be synonymous.

**Leadership styles**

Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people (Nel et al., 2006:332; Mullins, 2002:253). According to Nel et al. (2006:340); Sadler (2003:65) and Robbins (1991:3361) leadership styles come from authors Tannerbaum and Schmidt (1958) who suggest that leadership behaviours varies along a continuum which has manager-centred behaviours, referred to as autocratic-leadership style on the one end, and, subordinate-centred behaviours, referred to as democratic-leadership style on the other end. Tannerbaum and Schmidt (1958) add that leadership styles can be located at points along such a continuum. Van Wagner (2009:1) cites Lewin (1939) as leading a group of researchers to identify different styles of leadership. Research has shown that leadership has direct influences on employee’s turnover intention (Bohn, 2002:66; Cronje et al., 2003:176). Therefore, it is important to take into account the different types of leadership styles. Lewin (1939) cited in (Wagner, 2009) leadership styles are basically grouped into three major types as follows:
Authoritarian or Autocratic Leadership style

In short, the autocratic leader dictates decisions down to the subordinate, where few opportunities are given to employees for making suggestions even if these are in the organization's best interest. According to Robbins (1991:353), autocratic leadership is where a leader exerts high levels of power over employees. Sadler (2003:65) claims that the autocratic leader takes the decision and then announces them, expecting subordinates to carry them out without question. By creating a structured set of rewards and punishment the leader produces the motivation environment.

Van Wagner (2009:1) and Sadler (2006:65) maintain that in certain circumstances this style is effective especially for some routine and unskilled jobs, where the advantages of control outweigh the disadvantages. For example, in situations where there is an emergency, an autocratic leader is advantageous because he is able to delegate, control and command with ease. Employees work well under his direction, even if they do it out of fear and dislike. The autocratic leadership style is appropriate and has proven to be successful in situations where the work carried out by academics is prescribed by legislative requirements, as such, any deviation from the prescribed operating procedures may prove disastrous for the organization in terms of university’s rating in terms of teaching and research. For example universities all over the world are ranked according to the volume and quality of research by its academic staff. Also the number of professors at a particular university is a good indication of success by the university particularly in the area of research. Under these conditions, the advantages of control well outweigh the disadvantages making the autocratic leadership style the best choice to manage his/her department or faculty.

Inappropriately, this style is used in other situations at institutions of higher learning, for example when managers at universities selectively allow other lecturers to go for contact leave while denying others under the guise of financial challenges. Often leaders have the misconception that their workers are lazy, averse to responsibility and need to be coerced into working, Sadler (2006). This inflexibility and high levels of control exerted by the leader builds resentment and demoralizes staff. Van Wagner (2009:1) supports this view stating that autocratic leadership often leads to high levels of absenteeism and staff turnover intent as employees become angry and demotivated.

Participative OR Democratic Leadership Style

Commonly referred to as participative leadership, the democratic leader is still responsible for any decisions and invites employees to contribute to the decision-making process. According to Sadler (2006:65) the democratic leader’s role is that of a conference leader or chairperson. By using the democratic leadership style employees become motivated and empowered and as a result contribute more than just for financial rewards. Judge and Ilies (2004:152) discovered that empowerment related to less anger and frustration on the job, which may contribute to intention to quit, and Spreitzer and Mishra (2002:714) found that empowerment was related to organizational attachment. Therefore, academics who feel empowered in their place of work are less likely to intend to quit their place of work.

This leadership style is most appropriate for teamwork, especially where quality is more important. It is often used in the workplace when the leader has some of the information needed and the employees have the other necessary parts of information, leader-employee input is equally important so that better
decisions are taken when everyone’s input is considered.

Many leaders and managers at institutions of higher learning feel threatened by this type of leadership style claiming that it is easier and more cost effective for the manager to make decisions. They cite responses like “it won’t work” or “it’s been before” or “the business can’t afford mistakes.” Alternatively they claim that there is not enough time to get every employee’s input. As a result, the leadership style that is expected to bring out the best of an experienced and professional team ends in conformity. Rousing resentment towards the leader and increasing staff dissatisfaction, are ultimately the beginning of turnover intentions.

DELEGATIVE OR FREE REIGN (LAISSEZ FAIRE) LEADERSHIP STYLE

According to Van Wagner (2009:1) Lewin first described the Laissez Faire Leadership Style in 1938 along with autocratic leadership and the democratic leadership styles. The laissez faire style is sometimes described as a “hands off” leadership style because the leader provides little or no direction to the follower giving him/her as much freedom as possible and then leaves his or her employees to get on with his/ her work. It is effective if the leader monitors what is being achieved and communicates this back to his or her team regularly. Very often, laissez-faire leadership works for teams in which the individuals are very experienced and skilled self-starters (Robbins, 1991:353). There is no continuous supervision or feedback from the leader to the group. Although this sounds risky, this leadership style can work if team members are highly experienced and require little supervision to achieve the expected outcome. It is also useful because a leader is not always able to do everything and often needs to delegate certain tasks. Therefore, this style of leadership works well if the leader is able to trust and have confidence in the abilities of the people below him or her.

Unfortunately at most institutions of higher learning, this leadership style is misunderstood and is referred to situations in which managers are considered as not exerting sufficient control or, as being “a softy”. As a consequence subordinate-employee’s ideas, qualifications and experience are not recognized. Often the affected academics verbalize their turnover intent with comments like “as soon as I get another job, I am out of here” or “I am just checking my options, if it works out, I am gone!” Inevitably and predictably the turnover intents become real turnover as these employees leave the company.

TURNOVER INTENT AND TURNOVER

Concerns about employee turnover have generated a number of studies that examine why employees leave or intend to leave their organizations (Nel et al., 2006: 551; Noe et al., 2006:434; Cascio, 1998: 622; Walker, 1992:622; Walker, 1992:168; Griffith and Hom, 2001:1).

The intent to leave refers to the degree of likelihood that an employee will terminate his or her membership in a work organization (Spreiter and Mishr, 2002: 17), while intent to stay refers to the extent to which an employee plans to continue membership with his or her employer (Griffith and Hom, 2001:23) view employee turnover as a process “that includes attitudinal, decisional and behavioural components”.

Employee turnover in the majority of cases is not a sudden or instant decision. Branham (2005:11) claims it is a process of disengagement that can take days, months or even years before a decision to
quit is reached and even then, resignation does not always occur. According to Tseane (2008:1) the traditional quitting process occurs when an employee is dissatisfied with his or her job, so he or she initiates a job search and then quits when a suitable replacement is found.

Workplace related factors such as working conditions including the nature of the job, pay, organizational benefits and job security, are shown to affect job satisfaction which in turn affects the employee’s turnover-decision. Evidence has shown that high turnover is related to high job dissatisfaction without a significant reason. Almost all negative leader-employee exchanges impact on employee self-esteem, trust and recognition. These have strong exchanges on employee self-esteem, trust and recognition. These have strong influences on employee decisions to leave an organization (Shultz and Shultz, 2002: 248).

THE IMPACT OF LEADERSHIP ON TURNOVER INTENT

A leader creates the environment that determines people’s moods at the office and their mood, in turn, affects their productivity and level of engagement. Employees working for such a leader rarely think about turnover intentions. This is supported by research that shows that the most significant determinant of continued job satisfaction is positive relationships with their immediate supervisors (Watson, 2009: 297). Bohn (2002:66) adds that leadership has a perceived influence on organizations and in most cases the quality of relationship has a perceived influence on organizations and in most cases the quality of relationship with an employee’s immediate manager is the most powerful determinant of job satisfaction.

Martinuzzi (2007:1) refers to a Harvard Business Review article called "Leadership That Gets Results" in it Goleman cites research which shows that up to 30% of a company's financial results (as measured by key business performance indicators such as revenue growth, return on sales, efficiency and profitability) are determined by the climate of the organization. According to Goleman in Martinuzzi (2007:1) the major factor that drives the climate of an organization is the leader. Goleman states that roughly 50 to 70 percent of how employees perceive their organization’s climate is attributable to the actions and behaviours of their leader.

Leadership styles have varying degrees of success in different situations. According to Van Wagner (2009:1) their effective use depends on the personality and personal skills of the “leader” involved, often the situation and environment will also dictate which style is more suitable. However, Van Wagner (2009) adds that although good leaders use different styles, with one of them normally dominant, bad leaders tend to stick with one style. Shultz and Shultz (2002:221) affirm that incompetent leadership results in poor employee performance, high stress, low job commitment, low job satisfaction and turnover intent.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Du Plooy (2006:83) asserts that a qualitative approach is appropriate when the researcher examines the properties, values, needs or characteristics that distinguish individuals, groups, communities, organizations, events, setting or messages. Du Plooy (2006) adds that the method of reasoning is inductive. Wegner (2007:4) points out that quantitative research yields information that allows a decision maker to justify a chosen course of action more easily and with greater confidence.
The researcher collected data from a relatively large population over a very short period of time and presented the data responses in a numerical format. The choice for this research design is quantitative in nature (Fox and Bayat, 2007:88; Kumar, 1996:110).

**TARGET POPULATION**

A population (or universe), according to Wegner (2008:6), represents every possible item that contains the data value or measurement of the random variable. Fox and Bayat (2007:52) see this as any group. For example, individuals events or objects that share common characteristics and represent the whole or sum total of cases involved in the study is called universum or population.

The target population for this study consisted of male and female lecturers at three State Universities in Zimbabwe. The sampling frame was constructed from lists of lecturers obtainable from the different departments at the institutions. The target population was approximately 300 lecturers.

**SAMPLING**

A simple random sample of 100 lecturers from different departments at three State Universities was considered to be appropriate for the sample. Simple random sampling is that method of drawing a portion or sample of a population so that each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected (Wolhuter et al., 2003:26). A total of 100 respondents were included in the survey. Small sample sizes can provide highly reliable findings depending on the sampling procedures adopted (Schiffman and Kanuk, 1997). Secondary data was collected from the Universities administration departments on the numbers of academic staff in each department. Departments included in the survey were education, commerce, agriculture and environmental science.

**RESEARCH INSTRUMENT**

**QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION**

The questionnaire items were based on the literature review and the construction was guided by other research instruments in similar studies. The researcher discussed the questionnaire with a statistician.

The questionnaire was formulated as close-ended and scaled. It was designed in such a way that the respondent was required to tick or cross the category that best describes the respondent’s feelings towards his/her work related needs, his/her feelings towards leadership, in other words his/her chairman or dean, in terms of his/her intentions to leave or stay with the company (Kumar, 1996:116; Fox and Bayat, 2007:93). Ito et al. (2001:232) claim that there is a strong relationship with leadership and retention. Management should recognize that an effective reduction in employee turnover has clear economic and organizational benefits that more than pays back any investment made in the human resource interventions.

When designing the questionnaire as proposed by Wolhuter et al. (2003:15) attention was given to:

- Easy to read and understand items.
- Concise and easy to complete items (as short as possible but long enough to get the essential data).
• Specifics of the employees’ work environment, leadership and their turnover intent (Objectively formulated).

To establish some degree of sensitivity and differentiation of responses, the Likert rating scale was adopted (Babbie, 1998:183), Fox and Bayat, 2007: 95). For each question, there were five response options strongly agree; agree; undecided/unsure; disagree; and strongly disagree. Respondents were required to read the questionnaire statements and select one of the categories for example, strongly agree or disagree. Numbers were then generated by the responses. Each response was assigned a score from 5 to 1. By adding up the scores as represented by the reaction of the respondent and assessed by the rater, lecturer attitudes towards a particular issue were determined.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Six questions relating to leadership items were sub-divided into three issues namely; chairm/dean-lecturer relationship, recognition of lecturer’s opinions and leadership style.

PILOT STUDY

A pilot test of 20 lecturers at Bindura University from commerce, agriculture, education, and science departments were requested to take part in the survey. Wolhuter et al. (2003:16) claim that this is done in order to ascertain the following:

• Whether the items and questions are clear and understandable to the respondents.
• Whether the employee feels that the questions asked are important to leadership style and retention.
• To encourage suggestions from lecturers for improvement to the survey instrument.
• To determine the level of lecturer willingness to participate in the survey
• To determine how to encourage lecturer participation.

After completion of the pilot study, two questions were reworded in order to improve the interpretation of the question as follows:

Question 1-The way my chairman/dean treats me makes me think of looking for another job, was changed to: My chairman/dean treats me poorly that it makes me think of leaving this job.

Question 2- I often think of leaving because my chairman/dean is constantly telling me how to do my work, was changed to: I think of leaving because my chairman/dean is constantly telling me how to do my work.

DATA COLLECTION

The support from all role-players within the organization allowed the researcher to visit each department and personally conduct the administration-collection process of the study. This resulted in the researcher being allowed the opportunity to explain the questionnaire and the purpose of the study to the potential respondents and more importantly, being able to receive all of the questionnaires that were handed out. It should be noted that no single respondent who was approached refused to
participate in the survey.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

After the data was collected it was organized and analyzed. The following forms the basis of the data analysis: the researcher involved a statistician during the analysis of the data and a computer programme called a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for the data analysis; data was analysed using descriptive statistics and frequency tables were drawn from these the mean, standard deviation and t-tests were extracted.

The aim of data analysis is to understand the various constitutive elements of the researcher’s data through an inspection of the relationships between concepts, constructs or variables. This is done to determine whether there are any patterns or trends that can be identified or isolated from the data (Mouton, 2004:108).

**RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY**

It is important to ensure that the factors that could affect the results of the research are effectively controlled. If not, it is impossible to come to a reliable and valid conclusion. In explaining the concept of reliability, Kumar (1996:140) cites the following “what does one mean when one says that a person is reliable? The inference is that the person is dependable, consistent, predictable, stable and honest. If the research instrument, in this case the questionnaire, is consistent and stable and hence, predictable and accurate, it is said to be reliable.”

**RELIABILITY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Instrument reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for the 6 leadership sub-scales. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of reliability scores were obtained separately as the questionnaire tested positive and negative results. Items that contributed negatively to the reliability scores were omitted.

The higher the value of Cronbach’ alpha the more reliable the test is. Generally, a value of (α=.70) and above is considered acceptable. It is a common misconception that if the alpha value is low, the reliability of the test may be questioned. However, if the construct is an untested one, as this survey was, that is, not tested on a major scale, then, the test may actually measure several attributes/dimensions rather than one and thus the Cronbach’s alpha is deflated. The alpha values for this research yielded Positive Statements with coefficient of (α=.680) and the negative statements with a coefficient of (α=.682).

Although these are slightly below that of (α=.70), Tredoux and Durrheim (2002:216) claim that the purpose of the scale is a deciding factor as to whether the level of reliability is adequate. Tredoux and Durrheim (2002) argue, that if the scale is to be used to compare groups of people then, a reliability of (α=.650) is sufficient.

**VALIDITY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

According to Kumar (1996:137), in terms of measurement procedures, validity is the ability of an instrument to measure what it is designed to measure. Melville and Goddard (1996:37) believe that
validity means that the measurements are correct. This means that an instrument measures what it is intended to measure, and does so correctly and accurately. Golafshani (2003:597) cites Joppe (2003:1) as providing the following explanation of what validity is in quantitative research. Validity determines whether the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are. In other words, does the research instrument allow one to hit “the bull’s eye” of one’s research object? Researchers generally determine validity by asking a series of questions, and will often look for the answers in the research of others.

Golafshani (2003) claim that testing the validity of a new instrument used for people is not easy. Three approaches are used:

- **Criterion-related validity**: this means whether an instrument accurately predicts (predictive validity—the degree to which scores or test predict later behavior) or diagnoses (concurrent validity—refers to the correlation between scores on a scale and scores on another scale or measure of established validity given at about the same time) some particular variable (the criterion). According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006:147), the only difference between concurrent validity and predictive validity is that in concurrent validity, the criterion with which the new scale is correlated is a measure given at about the same time, while in predictive validity, the validating measure is a behavior that occurs in the future. Concurrent and predictive validity are often referred together as criterion-related validity.

- **Construct validity**: this is done by comparing the results obtained by a new instrument with that of an existing instrument that measures something which is known to be closely related to the study intended to be measured.

- **Content validity**: if no related instruments exist, then expert opinion is required on each question in order to determine whether or not each question actually tests what it is supposed to. In addition, these experts must agree that the questions as a whole constitute a valid and representative test of the variable being measured. Fox and Bayat (2007:97) concur, claiming that the validity of a question should not be taken for granted and it should be scrutinized before the questionnaire is implemented.

The researcher used the construct validity approach to ensure the validity of this research, in that the questions used were compared to existing instruments used in similar studies that are presented by well-established theory. For example, the job descriptive index (JDI) already has established and recognized validity. With this in mind, the interpretation problems identified from the pilot study responses, resulting in rewording the following questions; 1 and 2. To further strengthen the validity of the survey instrument, the researcher used simple appropriate English, which is easily understood by the respondents to facilitate respondent comprehension of the reworded questions.

The researcher is of the opinion that in many instances, validity often requires that a second test is conducted using the same measuring instrument, under exactly (sic) the same circumstances and conditions and, that exactly (sic) the same results must be obtained.

However, outside carefully controlled laboratory situations this is virtually impossible. Validity is, therefore, subjective in that it is guided by the observers’ perceptions.

**COMPARISONS OF THE RESPONSES FOR POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ITEM PAIRS**
LEADERSHIP STATEMENTS

To analyse the data, the researcher used what Mouton (2004:28) refer to as the “Collapsing Response” method. This is done by adding the Strongly Disagree percentage responses with the disagree responses (SD + D), similarly, the ‘strongly agree’ with the ‘agree’ responses (SA + A). The method was extended to all response type tables.

Table 1: Responses for Item L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Behaviour</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to work at this university because my chairman/dean treats me well</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 reveals that 36% disagreed, 17% were neutral and 42% agreed to question L1. The mean is 3.05 while the standard deviation 1.197. The mean of 3.05 shows agreement and supports the 42% who agree. The standard deviation indicates that there is a variation in the respondents’ perceptions of this question.

Table 2: Responses for Item L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Behaviour</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My chairman/dean treats me poorly that it makes me think of leaving this job.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the responses in Table 2 show that 50% disagreed and 21% did not respond, with only 25% agreeing. The mean for the responses is 2.65 and the standard deviation 1.151. The mean tends towards 2.65 indicating that the response to this question is slightly positively skewed; this reveals a larger frequency of responses on the lower scale shown by the 50% who disagreed. The standard deviation indicates that the responses varied similarly to the first question. However, in this case the response was slightly more clustered around the mean, emphasizing this disagreement.

Table 3: Paired responses for Items L1 and L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Behaviour</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Paired Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 indicates that the paired sample mean tends towards disagreement 2.85. There is slight impression of neutrality. However, a closer examination of the results indicate biased responses, where some respondents answered at one extreme while others at the opposite, resulting in the neutral scores. This implies that some of the lecturers are satisfied with the manner in which their chairman/dean treats them, whilst others are not.

The reason for this may be due to the fact that the survey covered a number of departments within Universities. Each of these departments are managed and supervised by people having different areas of technical expertise hence the differing perceptions. Perhaps the negative responses are due to poor leadership skills because some chairmen/deans have been promoted to this position from within the organization. This supports Meyer’s (2002:175) theory, which indicates that in many cases employees are promoted into management or leadership role as a reward for excelling in the technical skills of a particular job. The new ‘chairmen/dean’ is, therefore, armed with superior technical knowledge and skills but is, usually lacking and even unaware of the complex knowledge of managing work and lecturers.

The results show that 17% did not express any opinion on item L1. This may be due to the fact that the respondents may be relatively new lecturers and have not yet formed an opinion, or it may be that they felt that their anonymity is not guaranteed and there may be repercussions and so refrained from making a comment.

A total of 21% chose not to express their views to item L2. The researcher is of the opinion that these respondents felt that by giving their age, race and job category, the respondents, became afraid of the possibility of being identified and so remained neutral. This clearly illustrates that leadership impacts negatively on an employee’s motivation.

These findings are supported by the studies of Watson (2009:297) who claims that the most significant determinant of continued job satisfaction and organizational commitment for employees is a positive relationship with their immediate supervisor. On the contrary almost all negative leader-employee exchanges impacts on employee self-esteem, trust and recognition; these have strong influences on employee decisions to leave an organization (Shultz and Shultz, 2002:248).

Table 4: Responses for Item L3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Respect for opinions</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to work for the university because my chairman/dean treats me well.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 reveals that 38% disagreed with the statement, 20% were neutral and 41% agreed. The mean is 2.94 and the standard deviation 1.227. This tighter cluster around the mean, which is close to 3, suggests neutrality. The high disagree, neutral and agree responses around the neutral score confirms that, which means that almost an equal amount of staff that are satisfied with this statement, as there are who are not.

Table 5: Responses for Item L4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Respect for opinions</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think of leaving here because my chairman/dean does not consider my opinions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table 5 reveal that 47% disagreed 19% did not have an opinion, with only 28% who agreed. The mean for the responses, is 2.72 and the standard deviation 1.130. The mean tends to lean towards the negative scores, with the standard deviation revealing bunched responses around the lower end of the scale indicating that, fewer respondents considered leaving than those who did not.

Table 6: Paired responses for items L3 and L4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Respect for opinions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Paired Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like to work for the university because my chairman/dean respects my opinions</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think of leaving here because my chairman/dean does not consider my opinions</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates that the paired sample mean of 2.83 tends towards disagreement. The results indicate biased responses, where some respondents answered at one extreme while others at the opposite.

However, more of the lecturers are satisfied with the manner in which their chairman/dean considers their opinions and ideas and thus have stay-intentions. Bohn (2002:66) corroborates this, asserting that the quality of the relationship with an employee’s immediate manager is the most powerful determinant of their intentions to stay with the organization.
Those respondents that reported negatively may feel that their chairmen or deans do not consider their opinions when making decisions, do not care about them as persons, and are autocratic in their leadership styles. Shultz and Shultz (2002:221) affirm this, claiming that incompetent leadership results in turnover intent, poor employee performance, high stress, low job commitment, and low job satisfaction. Tseane (2009:2) believes that employees need the flexibility and freedom to do their jobs productively.

The findings support the theory posited by Spreitzer and Mishra (2002:714) who argue that employees who are empowered in their place of work, are less likely to quit their place of work. Empowerment increases lecturer motivation and hence organizational commitment. In contrast however, Shultz and Shultz (2002:248) add that almost all negative leadership-employee exchanges impact on employee self-esteem, trust and recognition these have, strong influences on employee decisions to an organization. The neutral responses for L3 is 19% and for L4 is 19%, which may suggest that newer lecturers have not yet formed an opinion of their chairman or dean. However, it may also be that the older respondents have never been asked for their opinion and deem this to be the norm, thus they do not consider either leaving or staying as being affected by their opinions being considered or not.

Table 7: Responses for Item L5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Style</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working here because my chairman/dean allows me to work on my own.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reveals that 50% agreed with the statement, 36% disagreed and 14% did have an opinion as how to answer this question. A mean of 3.18 and standard deviation of 1.226 indicates that the results are negatively skewed, in that more scores are concentrated toward the higher (satisfied) end of the variable with smaller frequencies towards the lower (dissatisfied) end, supporting the assertion, that a relaxed leadership style, influences decisions to remain working at a university.

Table 8: Responses for Item L6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Style</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>St.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often think of leaving because my chairman/dean is constantly telling me how to do my work.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from table 8 revealed that 58% disagreed with the statement. A total of 16% agreed and
24% did not have an opinion. This is supported by a mean of 2.45 and a standard deviation of 1.066 showing a tighter group of responses about the mean, which is at the lower end of the scale, supporting the claim that leadership style influences turnover intentions.

Table 9: Paired responses for Items L5 and L6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership-Style</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Paired Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working here because my chairman/dean allows me to work on my own.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think of leaving because my chairman/dean is constantly telling me how to do my work.</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 verifies that the scores for the positive question have a direction, opposite to that of the negative question. The overall paired means has a value slightly less than the expected mean difference of 3. Since the questions are positive-negative combinations, a high negative score should correspond to a low positive score for the same concept, and vice versa. For example, a positive 5 should theoretically compare to a negative 1. The average for this pair of means should be 3, taking both into consideration. This is not so, therefore, implying that the respondents scored more favourably in a particular direction. In this case it would appear that more respondents are in favour of staying with the organization because they are satisfied with the leadership style of their chairman or dean.

The findings of the above questions support Sadler’s (2003:65) claims, that by using the democratic leadership style, employees become motivated and empowered and as a result contribute more to the organization than just for financial rewards. Nel et al. (2006:55) agree, asserting that leadership relationships are influenced by the amount of technical and social support extended by the manager or supervisor.

Those respondents who responded “don’t know” to any of the above questions might be newer lecturers and thus have not formed an opinion yet (this may be the case for all of the leadership questions to follow). This support by Branham (2005:3) views, that the manager is not always able to determine either reasons for employee de-motivation or how to change their behavior. On the other hand, it may be because they were asked to include their job title, which made them feel that their responses are not completely anonymous. Hence, they remained neutral for fear of repercussions.

This is an indication of their mistrust of management and is an area of concern. These, ‘neutral’ respondents, may easily become influenced by those lecturers who are already negative of the organization.

A summary of paired categories for the all of the above items indicates that there is a degree of satisfaction with the leadership at State Universities. This demonstrates a positive relationship between the manner in which these lecturers are treated by their chairmen or deans with regards to appreciation, recognizing employee inputs and opportunity to work independently, and with the
lecturers wanting to stay. In contrast, poor leadership relations have been indicated as intention to leave decisions.

FINDINGS FROM THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to examine leadership and job satisfaction influences on turnover intent of academic staff in tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe. The above aim was achieved through the following objectives:

- To explore and describe through literature review how leadership factors influence lecturer turnover in the higher education sector in Zimbabwe.
- To explore and describe through a questionnaire survey and data analysis how leadership factors influence lecturer turnover in the tertiary institutions in Zimbabwe.

The factors that influence lecturer turnover and a listing of the findings are presented as follows:

FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

- Leadership impact strongly on motivation.
- A significant determinant of continued job satisfaction and organizational commitment for lecturers is a possible relationship with their immediate supervisor.
- Poor leadership skills contribute to lecturer de-motivation, high levels of absenteeism and staff turnover intent.
- Leadership has direct influences on lecturer’s turnover intention.
- Lecturers who feel empowered in their place of work are less likely to intend to quit their place of work.
- If lecturers think it is likely they will find a job that will bring them more tangible and intangible benefits than their current one, they will begin to have a turnover intention.
- Lecturer turnover is costly and includes costs of hiring and retraining new lecturers, the loss of productivity, poor service quality and the demoralization of lecturers that remain within the organization.

FINDINGS FROM THE PRIMARY STUDY

- Lecturers who are satisfied with their chairman/dean have stay-intentions. Whilst, those who are not satisfied with their chairman/dean have turnover intent.
- The responses reveal a cordial relationship with peers and colleagues.

CONCLUSION FROM FINDINGS

On the whole the respondents indicated that they were fairly satisfied with most aspects of their work life. These aspects relate to leadership behaviours, benefits, work ethics and the job itself resulted in a positive effect on job satisfaction.
The findings of the current study support many of the literature findings, as discussed below:

- The quality of the leadership impacts on turnover decision, the findings revealed that some respondents indicated that they would leave the organization because they believed that the leadership style is stifling growth, that the leadership is not empowering them and that their chairmen/deans are not people-focused.

- Research opportunities for lecturers is crucial in minimizing lecturer turnover. The findings reflected that the majority of respondents considered research opportunities at State Universities as very limited and the chances of being funded to go for contact, sabbatical leave and conferences also very slim. Turnover decisions were relatively strong for this item. Management would need to continuously give support to their workers, and inspire them in their efforts to work effectively.

- Co-lecturer relationships are cordial. The findings reveal that almost as many respondents were satisfied with co-lecturer relationships, as there were those who were dissatisfied. On the one hand, good lecturer relationships bode well for the universities in terms of combined loyalty and ownership that result from cooperation and teamwork. On the other hand, poor relationships are indicators of mistrust, breeding contempt and negativity, which, eventually undermines motivation and loyalty. It is important for management to improve co-lecturer attitudes through team-building and teamwork exercises in order to reduce turnover intentions.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

In order to decrease the turnover levels in the higher education sector in Zimbabwe it is recommended that the following be done:

**CALCULATING LECTURER TURNOVER**

Management must capture and collate records and data in a structured manner. Currently in the higher education sector this is not done reliably or effectively. The data are then analysed to identify consistent patterns and trends and from this the Human Resources Management team needs to plan remedial actions.

The rate of turnover must be calculated per department so that the department losing the highest number of lecturers is also identified. Lecturer turnover is calculated and used to calculate accurate forecasting levels, past levels of turnover are accounted for, future staffing and recruitment needs are estimated reliably and retention strategies are decided on.

These turnover calculations can be expanded on at a later stage to include the measurement of turnover for other comparisons. Such as age groups, gender, and job-type, length of service, leadership and co-lecturer relationships respectively.

**MEASURING JOB SATISFACTION IN TERMS OF LEADERSHIP**

Management, in partnership with the Human Resources team must conduct surveys to measure job satisfaction amongst its lecturers in order to determine lecturer attitudes. Developing from scratch may not be as reliable as the job satisfaction measurement tools that are readily available.
There are a number of employee attitude survey tools available on the market. There are three popular survey tools that have been used reliably and effectively. Firstly, Noe et al. (2006:445) claims the most widely used measure of job satisfaction is the job descriptive index (JDI). It is a questionnaire, which assesses five facets: work, pay, promotion, supervision and co-workers. Secondly, Spector’s (1997:8) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) examines: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, rewards, working conditions, co-workers, nature of work and communication. Thirdly, Shultz and Shultz (2002:238) claim that a useful survey tool is the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) that is available in two forms: a 100-item version and a 20-item version. These measure an even broader spectrum of the various levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction and include advancement, independence, recognition, social status and working conditions.

Feedback from the surveys must be given timely and frequently. By systematically assessing lecturer satisfaction as well as the levels of importance of the various facets identified by each lecturer through their individual perceptions, the Human Resources team will be able to focus on the areas that matter the most to the lecturers.

**LEADERSHIP TRAINING**

According to Lee (1988:12) employees will tolerate tremendous adversity if they feel respected, have their ideas considered and, have a sense of ownership to their respective departments. Although the majority of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their leader, there were many who remained neutral (up to 25% on some items). This suggests that there are a large number of respondents who have not yet decided on their chairman/ dean characteristics but may well be swayed negatively. It is suggested that senior management in partnership with the Human Resource department, undertake the following:

- Conduct a skills audit of all chairmen and deans to determine their current skills, qualifications and past experiences, from their personal records.
- Match the required leadership profiles to the current leadership profiles to identify leader gaps.
- Train those leaders who do not have the required skills, by developing individual leadership training programmes using in-house resources, or outsource this training to external professional management training providers.
- To ensure all future chairmen and deans meet the required skills, the human resources department must use a more co-ordinated recruitment programme that will match and check the experience and qualifications of chairman and dean candidates to the experience and qualifications required for advertised position. It would be better to recruit a chairman/ dean who is widely published so that he/she can command respect from academics.
- Management must ensure leadership performance at six monthly intervals, by using a survey leadership questionnaire. The subordinates of each chairman or dean should complete this leadership questionnaire.
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