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SUMMARY

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAREER ANCHORS, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION

by

MICHELLE CLINTON-BAKER

SUPERVISOR : Prof A.M.G. Schreuder
DEPARTMENT : Industrial and Organisational Psychology
DEGREE : MCom (Industrial and Organisational Psychology)

The primary objectives of the study were as follows: (1) to explore the relationship between career anchors (as measured by the Career Orientations Inventory), organisational commitment (as measured by the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire) and turnover intention (as measured by a three-item questionnaire, developed by Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth, 1978); and (2) to determine whether employees from different gender, race, employment positions and age groups differ significantly in their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

A quantitative survey was conducted on a non-probability sample of 343 employed adults at managerial and general staff levels in the South African retail sector. The results of this study suggest that there was a significant but weak relationship between employees’ career anchors and their organisational commitment. Career anchors were also found to be significantly related to organisational commitment and turnover intention; with entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors being the best predictors of these two variables. The relationship between organisational commitment and turnover intention was significant and negative, with affectively and normatively committed participants being more likely to remain with the organisation (i.e. having lower turnover intentions). In addition, the findings indicate that although gender has no relationship with turnover intention, race, employment position and age do. African, general staff and 30 years and younger participants indicated higher intentions to leave the organisation.
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Affective commitment, career anchors, continuance commitment, normative commitment, turnover intention
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CHAPTER 1

SCIENTIFIC OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH

This study explores the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention among individuals employed in the South African retail sector. In this chapter, the background and rationale for the study are outlined. In addition, the problem statement and research questions are formulated and the general and specific theoretical and empirical aims stated. The paradigm perspectives, which demarcate the boundaries of the study, the research design and methodology are also discussed. The final section indicates the chapter layout, and the chapter concludes with a chapter summary.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE RESEARCH

The context of this study is career decision making (what values attract individuals to a particular organisation) and what keeps them committed to the organisation and therefore less inclined to leave it. The research focuses specifically on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, particularly in the South African multicultural organisational context.

An organisation cannot perform successfully in today’s highly competitive world without employees who are committed to its objective and strategic goals (Lesabe & Nkosi, 2007). This is particularly vital when skilled and competent employees are scarce and there is an acknowledged ‘global war for talent’ (Beechler & Woodward, 2009). In the South African context, with its multicultural society, diversity (which includes attributes such as gender, race and age) is an even more important factor for organisations to consider when strategising on how to attract and retain committed employees (Rothmann & Cilliers, 2007).

Effectively attracting, developing, managing, motivating and retaining committed employees has become a critical success factor for sustained organisational performance (Beechler & Woodward, 2009; Chang, 2010; Döckel, 2003; Luthans, Luthans & Luthan,
As the world of work changes, it influences how employees view their careers (Cascio, 2001, Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). The old psychological contract of stability, loyalty, predictability, permanence, job security, linear career growths and one-time learning has changed to a new psychological contract which favours change, uncertainty, temporariness, flexible work, the valuing of performance and skills, self-reliance, employability, multiple careers and life-long learning (Cascio, 2001). Employees are placing far more emphasis on satisfying their own individual demands and being more responsible for their own futures and careers (Coetzee, Bergh & Schreuder, 2010; Furnham, 2000; Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane & Ferreira, 2011). Since the responsibility for career management in a ‘contemporary career’ falls on the individual, self-insight is required when it comes to making the right choice (Schein, 1990).

The concept of career anchor is especially applicable in today’s turbulent employment context (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Schein, 1996), with organisations facing challenges and opportunities because of the constantly changing world of work (Manetjie & Martins, 2009). In the South African career context, employees face high unemployment rates, large-scale retrenchments, employment equity targets, fewer employment opportunities in the formal sectors, education and skill shortage, and financial and emotional stressors (Van Vuuren & Fourie, 2000).

Owing to these challenges, one of the characteristics of today’s workforce is their high level of mobility (Lumley et al., 2011; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004), with voluntary turnover posing a significant challenge in the management of talent and human capital (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). Organisations need to pay more attention to questions about why individuals stay in their organisations even when other (and better) opportunities are available elsewhere (Feldman & Ng, 2007). This is vitally important because the cost of labour turnover of high-performance employees is exorbitant, both in direct (financial) and indirect (nonfinancial) costs both to the employee and the organisation (Bigliardi, Petroni & Dormio, 2005; Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Chang, 1999; Davidson, Timo & Wag, 2010; Mallol, Holtom & Lee, 2007; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004) The key to organisational success is a committed and loyal workforce (Lesabe & Nkosi, 2007).
Research indicates that an individual’s career motives and values (his/her career anchors) have an impact on career decision making and psychological attachment or commitment to an occupation or organisation (Coetzee, Schreuder & Tladinyane, 2007; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Lumley, 2009; Schein, 1996). According to Schein (1996), a career anchor is an individual’s occupational self-concept, comprising self-perceived talents and abilities, basic values and motives, and needs. These talents, values and motives, in turn, influence an individual’s career decisions. If organisations understand the relationship between career anchors (what drives employees’ career decisions), organisational commitment, which for the purposes of this study, is defined as “a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p.14), and why employees intend leaving an organisation (turnover intention), they will be able to proactively introduce strategies to increase organisational commitment levels and reduce turnover intention.

Allen and Meyer (1990) found a linkage between organisational commitment and employee turnover, whereby employees who were strongly committed to the organisation were less likely to leave. From an organisation’s perspective, research on career anchors can be used to guide current selection, placement, development and reward practices. In addition, an organisation might be able to improve employees’ retention (or reduce turnover) by matching career opportunities and job requirements to employees’ career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; João & Coetzee, 2011; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003). Commitment strategies may be used to forge psychological bonds between the organisation’s and employee’s goals (Döckel, 2003; Döckel, Basson & Coetzee, 2006).

Industrial and organisational psychologists are fundamentally concerned with understanding individuals and how they function and behave in the work context. Organisations are also concerned with how employees behave in the work place. Exploring career decision making, commitment and turnover intention are therefore vital in order to motivate and retain competent and skilled employees. The main rationale for the research study was to contribute to the broader research community by generating new knowledge and enhancing existing knowledge concerning career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention (and the relationship between these three variables) in
the field of industrial and organisational psychology, especially from a South African perspective.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Against the aforementioned background, it is evident that knowledge of employees' career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention (and the relationship between these variables), could increase understanding of employees' career decisions and their commitment or intention to remain in an organisation.

While research has focused on each of the concepts of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention separately or in relation to other variables, there is a need for further research to explore the relationship between all three variables. A review of the current literature on career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention indicates the following research challenges:

- Theoretical models do not clarify the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.
- Industrial and organisational psychologists lack knowledge of the theoretical and empirical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.
- The relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention and the implications of the relationship for organisational commitment strategies are not fully known, particularly in the multicultural South African context – hence the need for exploration.

The aim of this research was therefore to benefit both industrial and organisational psychologists and employers in further understanding why employees make certain career decisions, why they stay committed to a particular organisation and, in turn, what drives their decision to either stay or leave an organisation. In the multi-cultural South African context, it is also important to explore whether biographic variables such as gender, race, position and age play a role in career decision making and continued employment.
On the basis of the above, the following research questions were formulated in terms of the literature review and empirical study.

1.2.1 Research questions relating to the literature review

Research question 1: How are the concepts of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention conceptualised in the literature and what are the theoretical linkages between these variables?

Research question 2: According to the literature, do gender, race, employment position and age play a role in career anchors, type of organisational commitment and turnover intention?

Research question 3: What are the theoretical implications of these findings for career decision making and commitment strategies?

1.2.2 Research questions relating to the empirical study

Research question 1: What is the nature of the empirical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention as manifested in a sample of respondents employed in the South African organisational context?

Research question 2: How do individuals from different gender, race, employment position and age groups differ with regard to their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention?

Research question 3: Based on the findings of this research, what recommendations can be made for the practice of industrial and organisational psychology, for organisations in relation to career decision making and commitment strategies, and for further research?
1.3 AIMS

The research aims consist of one general aim and several specific aims. Based on the research questions posed above, several aims were formulated. These aims are explained in detail in the sections below.

1.3.1 General aim

The general aim of this research was to explore the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention and to determine whether individuals from different gender, race, employment position and age groups differ with regard to these three variables.

1.3.2 Specific aims

The following specific aims were formulated for the literature review and the empirical study:

1.3.2.1 Literature review

The specific aims of the literature review were as follows:

Research aim 1: To conceptualise career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and to explain the theoretical linkages between these variables

Research aim 2: To determine theoretically (based on a review of the literature) the role of gender, race, position and age in career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

Research aim 3: To conceptualise the implications of the theoretical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover
intention for career decision making and commitment strategies in the South African organisational context

1.3.2.2 Empirical study

The research aims of the empirical study were as follows:

Research aim 1: To investigate the relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention as manifested in a sample of respondents employed in the South African organisational context

Research aim 2: To determine the differences between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups as manifested in the sample of respondents

Research aim 3: To formulate recommendations for the discipline of industrial and organisational psychology, with particular focus on career decision making, commitment strategies and possible future research

1.4 THE PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE

“A paradigm provides a conceptual framework for seeing and making sense of the social world” (Williams, 1998, p. 1). Morgan (2007, p. 49) describes paradigms as “systems of beliefs and practices that influence how researchers select both the questions they study and the methods they use to study them.”

According to Morgan (1980), a meta-theoretical paradigm may include different schools of thought, with different ways of approaching or studying a shared reality or world view. The importance of paradigms is that they influence the way researchers perceive the world around them, which in turn reflects in the way their research is designed, how they collect and analyse data, and how they present the results of their research (Williams, 1998).
In the context of the present study, the concept of a paradigm is used in its metatheoretical or philosophical sense to denote an implicit or explicit view of reality (Morgan, 1980).

1.4.1 The relevant paradigms

In this research, the literature review covers theories relating to the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, which will be presented from a humanistic paradigm. The empirical research will be presented from the positivist paradigm.

1.4.1.1 The humanistic paradigm

The constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention can be understood from the humanistic paradigm. The humanistic paradigm emphasises the freedom, dignity and potential of individuals (Brockett, 1997). According to Watkins (2001), individuals constantly strive towards self-actualisation.

According to Meyer, Moore, and Viljoen (1994), the basic assumptions of the humanistic paradigm are as follows:

- The individual is an integrated whole and should be studied as a whole.
- The individual is a dignified human being and has qualities that distinguish him/her from other objects such as stones and trees.
- Human nature is positive.
- The conscious processes of the individual dictate individual decision making.
- Individuals are active participants in life, make choices and are responsible for the course their life takes.

In the context of this research, individuals have free will and consciously make career decisions based on their self-concept (or career anchors), and they actively decide whether or not to remain with an organisation on the basis of their relationship with it (organisational commitment).
1.4.1.2 The positivist paradigm

In the empirical study, the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention are presented from the positivist paradigm. In the positivist paradigm, the object of research is independent of the researcher and emphasises an objectivist approach to studying social phenomena (Dash, 2005; Krauss, 2005); knowledge is explored and verified quantitatively through direct observation or measurement (empiricism); and facts are established by taking a phenomenon apart to examine its component parts (Krauss, 2005; Williams, 1998).

The positivist paradigm focuses on looking for regularities and causal relationships to understand and predict the social world (Williams, 1998).

1.4.2 The market of intellectual resources

The collection of beliefs that has a direct bearing on the epistemic states of scientific statements is referred to as the market of intellectual resources (Babbie & Mouton, 2009). According to Mouton and Marais (1996), the two major types of beliefs are the theoretical beliefs about the nature and structure of phenomena, and methodological beliefs about the nature and structure of the research process.

For the purposes of this study, the meta-theoretical statements, theoretical models, conceptual descriptions about career anchors, organisational commitment, turnover intention and central hypothesis are described below.

1.4.2.1 Meta-theoretical statements

The meta-theoretical statements represent an important category of assumptions underlying the theories, models and paradigms of this research (Mouton & Marias, 1996). From a disciplinary perspective this study focuses on industrial and organisational psychology as a field of application. More specifically, the focus in the literature review is on career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. In terms of the
empirical study, the focus is on psychometrics and statistical analysis. The meta-theoretical statements are presented in the sections below.

a. *Industrial and organisational psychology*

This research was conducted in the context of industrial and organisational psychology. Industrial and organisational psychology is defined by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2013) as “a general practice specialty of professional psychology with a focus on scientifically-based solutions to human problems in work and other organizational settings.”

Industrial and organisational psychology is viewed as dualistic in nature and follows a scientist-practitioner model. One part is viewed as an applied science, in the sense that industrial and organisational psychologists accumulate order and disseminate knowledge through research. The other part is application, which involves using the knowledge acquired to identify and solve problems in the workplace (Van Vuuren, 2010).

This study explores individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention in the context of industrial and organisational psychology. This research also focuses on the differences between gender, race, position and age groups in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

The sub-fields of industrial and organisational psychology included in this research were career psychology, organisational psychology, personnel psychology and psychometrics.

i. *Career psychology*

Career psychology is the study of career development and career behaviour as integral parts of human development (Greenhaus, Callanan & Godshalk, 2010). The focus of research and application interventions in career psychology include the meaning of work in individuals’ lives, the quality of work life balance, organisational commitment and employee turnover (Van Vuuren, 2010). It emphasises the importance of the psychological contract between the organisation and the employee, and is concerned with optimising the
respective expectations of both parties in the employment relationship (Van Vuuren, 2010).

The current study has relevance in the field of career psychology because it focuses on individuals’ underlying values (career anchors) and the individual differences between different groups’ underlying values.

ii. Organisational psychology

Organisational psychology focuses on the influence of the organisational context on employees’ behaviours and attitudes, and is concerned with social and group influences (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2010).

This study focuses on individuals’ organisational commitment in terms of exploring what binds the individual to an organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991), and the individual differences between different groups’ organisational commitment.

iii. Personnel psychology

According to Cascio and Aguinis (2011), personnel psychology focuses on measuring and predicting individual differences in behaviour and job performance. It focuses on the attraction, selection, retention, development and utilisation of human resources in the organisation in order to achieve both individual and organisational goals (Van Vuuren, 2010). Personnel psychology is concerned with all aspects of psychology applied to understanding the differences between individuals (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2010).

This study focuses on an individual’s turnover intention and the individual differences between different groups’ underlying turnover intention.
iv. Psychometrics

Psychometrics relates to the principles and practices of psychological measurement and refers to the entire process of compiling information about an individual and using it to make inferences about characteristics and to predict behaviour (Gregory, 2011). Psychometrics includes activities such as the development and standardisation of psychological tests and related statistical procedures. In the current study, questionnaires were used to measure individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

1.4.2.2 Theoretical models

“Theories provide meaning. They allow us to understand and interpret data” (Klein & Zedeck, 2004, p. 931). According to Klein and Zedeck (2004), effective theory offers novel insights (it teaches us something new), it is interesting, focused and cohesive, it is grounded in relevant literature, it clearly defines constructs, it is testable, it has practical implications and it is well written. Several different theoretical models were used in this research.

The literature review on career anchors was presented from the career psychology perspective and focused specifically on Schein’s (1978) career anchor theory. The literature review on organisational commitment was presented from an organisational psychology perspective, with particular emphasis on Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model. Lastly, the literature survey on turnover intention is presented from the personnel psychology perspective, with various models and theories including the organisational equilibrium theory (March & Simon, 1958), the met expectations model (Porter & Steers, 1973), the linkage model (Mobley, 1977) and the unfolding model of voluntary turnover (Lee & Mitchell 1994) being presented.

1.4.2.3 Conceptual descriptions

The following conceptual descriptions serve as points of departure for discussions in this research.
a. Career anchors

According to Schein (1978), an individual’s career self-concept comprises self-perceived talents, motives and values that evolve and stabilise over time through self-insight gained from work experience and feedback. Schein (1978, p. 6) defines the career anchor as “that one element in a person’s self-concept that he or she will not give up, even in the face of difficult choices.”

The career anchor can be used as a useful tool in assisting individuals’ in making career decisions, and matching individuals’ needs with those of the organisation (Schein, 1978).

b. Organisational commitment

Organisational commitment is generally defined as a psychological state that binds an individual to an organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The concept of organisational commitment has attracted considerable interest in an attempt to understand and clarify the intensity and stability of an employee’s relationship with an organisation (Mester, Visser, Roodt & Kellerman 2003); and has been related to major work outcomes such as turnover intention and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Ferreira, 2012; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Somers, 2010).

Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of organisational commitment was therefore of relevance to this research because it identifies individuals’ relationships with the organisation and their decision to continue membership with it (turnover intention).

c. Turnover intention

Turnover intention refers to as an individual’s behavioural intention to leave the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand & Meglino, 1979). It has implications for both the individual and the organisation in terms of costs (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Davidson et al., 2010; Mitchell, Holtom & Lee, 2001a). Numerous research studies support the notion that the most important and immediate
antecedent and predictor to actual turnover is turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1978; Wilson, 2006; Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009).

1.4.2.4 Central hypothesis

The central hypothesis for this study was formulated as follows:

A statistically significant relationship exists between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Furthermore, individuals of varying genders, races, positions and ages differ significantly in their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

1.5 RESEARCH DESIGN

Terre Blanche, Durheim, and Painter (2006) describe a research design as a strategic framework which serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution of the research. It is the outline, plan or strategy used to investigate the research problem (Christensen, 2006). In the context of this study, the research design refers to all the decisions the researcher made in planning the study, including the research approach, the methods used to ensure validity and reliability, the unit of analysis and the research variables.

1.5.1 Research approach

A quantitative research approach was adopted for this study. Descriptive research is used in the literature review to describe the conceptual characteristics of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and the relationship between these three variables. The research then investigated the empirical relationship between these three variables by means of descriptive, correlational and inferential statistical analyses.

The study applied a cross-sectional survey design in order to tie in with the descriptive approach and adopt a simple and cost-effective approach (Mouton & Marais, 1996). Primary data were analysed using descriptive statistics such as the Cronbach alpha,
correlations such as Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficients, and inferential statistics such as multiple regressions, ANOVAs and t-tests.

1.5.2 Methods used to ensure reliability and validity

The measures taken to ensure reliability and validity are discussed in this section. Reliability refers to the attribute of consistency in measurement, and validity refers to the extent to which a construct or test measures what it intended to measure (Feist & Feist, 2009; Gregory, 2011).

1.5.2.1 Reliability

Reliability in the literature review was addressed by using existing literature sources, theories and models. The reliability of the empirical study was ensured through the reliability of the measuring instruments, standardised assessment conditions and standard scoring instructions (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2009).

1.5.2.2 Validity

When deciding on a research design, both internal and external validity are deemed important (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). In the current study, potential threats to the internal and external validity of the empirical study were therefore considered to ensure that accurate conclusions could be drawn about the relationship between the variables.

In this research study, validity was ensured by selecting models and theories that were relevant to the research topic, the problem statement and the aims, choosing measuring instruments in a responsible and representative way and presenting them in a standardised format.

The validity is ensured by determining how appropriate, meaningful and useful the instrument is, and where validity coefficients are calculated, they usually range between a low score of zero and a high score of one (Gregory, 2011).
1.5.2.3 Ethical considerations

The Employment Equity Act (55 of 1998) requires that psychological and other assessments should be valid, reliable, fair and unbiased against any employee or group of employees. In order to comply with this legislation, care was taken in the choice and administration of the assessments (the COI, the OCQ and the three-item turnover intention questionnaire), the validity of assessment items and the process followed in data collection and data analysis.

Ethical guidelines and standards formed the basis of this research. Ethical considerations were therefore a vital part of every step of the research process, to ensure that they guided the researcher and the study. Ethical rights include the right to informed consent, privacy, confidentiality, protection from deception, and debriefing (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). At all times, the researcher should strive to remain objective and conduct the research with integrity.

Accordingly, the participants in the current study were informed of the purpose of the study and gave their written consent to participate in it. The participants could elect not to participate in the study and withdraw at any point for any reason whatsoever. The privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants were honoured.

Ethical clearance and permission to conduct the research was obtained from both the university overseeing the research and the organisation in which the study was conducted. Moreover, the researcher emphasised that the results of the research would be made available to the participants and the relevant organisation.

1.5.3 Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis refers to the object, phenomenon, entity, process or event an individual is interested in investigating (Babbie & Mouton, 2009). In terms of individual measurement, in this study the unit of analysis was the individual. The researcher focused on the individual’s career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention with the intention of ascertaining whether there is a relationship between these variables. When
investigating the differences between the biographical groups, the unit of analysis was the subgroups.

1.5.4 Research variables

According to Christensen (2006), the independent variable is one of the antecedent conditions that the research manipulates, while the dependent variable measures the influence of the independent variable.

The dependent variable in this study was turnover intention and the independent variables were career anchors and organisational commitment. The current research focused on determining whether there is a significant empirical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

1.6 RESEARCH METHOD

In the current study, the research method was divided into three phases, each comprising of several steps. Figure 1.1 below provides an overview of the different phases.
1.6.1 Phase 1: literature review

The literature review focuses on exploring the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The general aim of the literature study is to establish the theoretical link in the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and to identify differences between biographical groups. These relationships were explored in order to determine the implications of the theoretical relationship for influencing career decision making and commitment strategies.
1.6.2 Phase 2: empirical study

The empirical study is presented in the form of a research article in chapter 3 of this dissertation. The research article outlines the core focus of the study, the background to the study, relevant trends from the research literature, potential value added by the research, the research design (research approach and research method), the results of the empirical study, a discussion of the results, conclusions, limitations and recommendations for practice and future research. Figure 1.1 outlines the various steps that were followed in this study to ensure the systematic and rigorous execution of the empirical study.

The empirical study comprised seven steps:

Step 1: determination and description of the population and sample

The empirical study was conducted among a population comprising employees working in a retail organisation based in South Africa. The population consisted of 837 employees. A sample of 343 participants (41%) was used to allow generalisation of the results to the total population. The sample was non-random and based on convenience.

Table 1.1 indicates population and sample size. Race was categorised in terms of white, black, Indian, and coloured participants; and position by management and staff. Age was categorised into three groups, 25 to 29 years, 30 to 45 years, and 46 to 65 years. The youngest age was 25 years in order to accommodate Schein’s (1996) premise that individuals’ career choices are affected as they mature and develop as a result of work experience and feedback. This age group was also linked to Super’s (1980) establishment phase (or early adulthood, 25 to 45 years).
Table 1.1

Biographic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>254 (30%)</td>
<td>96 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>583 (70%)</td>
<td>247 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>40 (5%)</td>
<td>19 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>513 (61%)</td>
<td>158 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>202 (24%)</td>
<td>124 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>82 (10%)</td>
<td>42 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>162 (19%)</td>
<td>91 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>675 (81%)</td>
<td>252 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>364 (44%)</td>
<td>136 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 years</td>
<td>339 (40%)</td>
<td>138 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 years</td>
<td>134 (16%)</td>
<td>69 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: choosing and justifying the measuring instruments

A biographical questionnaire containing data on gender, race, position and age was used to gather demographic data. In addition, three quantitative instruments were used to measure the variables: the Career Orientations Inventory (Schein, 1990) the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Meyer & Allen, 1997), and three-item turnover intention questionnaire (developed by Mobley et al., 1978). Measuring instruments were selected on the basis of their high degree of reliability and validity, affordability and ease of administration.
a. Career Orientations Inventory (COI)

Schein’s (1990) COI was used to measure each participant’s dominant career anchor. Schein (1990) emphasises that the questionnaire provides a career orientation as opposed to the more accurate reflection of the individual’s career anchor. He believes that in order to determine an individual’s career anchor, a structured interview is necessary. For the purposes of this study, however, the career orientation is referred to as a career anchor. This approach was taken as it would have been too time consuming and costly to conduct a lengthy interview with each of the 343 participants in the study. From other research conducted on career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Van Vuuren & Fourie, 2000) it was felt that the COI would serve as an adequate measurement of career anchors for the purposes of this study. For example, Coetzee and Schreuder (2011) reported internal consistency of reliability estimates for the technical/functional as 0.77, general management as 0.79, autonomy as 0.80, security as 0.81, entrepreneurial creativity as 0.78, service/dedication to a cause as 0.78, pure challenge as 0.77 and lifestyle as 0.78.

The COI is a self-report questionnaire containing 40 items, all of which are considered to be of equal value, and the participant has to rate how true the item is for him/her in general. The COI measures eight career preferences (technical/functional competence, managerial competence, entrepreneurial creativity, security/stability, autonomy/independence, lifestyle, dedication to a cause and pure challenge).

A six-point Likert-type scale was used for subject responses on each of the 40 items (1 = statement is never true to the respondent and 6 = statement is always true to the respondent). High scores on the COI represent a person’s dominant preference towards a career orientation. Separate scores for each eight subscale can range between 1 and 8.4. Total scores obtained for each of the eight categories of career anchors were summed up and averaged to yield an individual score for each career anchor. The category that yielded the highest score was regarded as the individual’s dominant career anchor. The COI (Schein, 1990) can be administered to individuals or groups and requires 10 to 20 minutes to complete.
b. Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

The three forms of organisational commitment (affective, continuance and normative) were assessed using an 18-item scale (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The three scales of Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-component model of organisational commitment are defined as follows:

- affective commitment – employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organisation because they want to
- continuance commitment – employees whose primary link to the organisation is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to
- normative commitment – employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organisation

Six items were used to measure each of the three types of organisational commitment. The responses were on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree) and were averaged to yield composite commitment scores for each respondent.

The instrument was a self-completion questionnaire and took 10 to 15 minutes to answer, although there was no time limit. It was administered in groups. For administration, items from the three scales were mixed to form an 18-scale series. Some items were reverse scored to counteract response styles. The maximum score that could be obtained was 42 for each scale.

Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) reported internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach alphas) for affective commitment (0.82), continuance commitment (0.74) and normative commitment (0.83). These meet the required 0.70 Cronbach alpha reliability standard to ascertain internal reliability. They also confirmed test-retest reliability. Allan and Meyer (1996) also attest to the questionnaire having convergent and discriminative validity.
c. Turnover intention

Turnover intention is measured using three items: desire to quit (*I think a lot about leaving this organisation*), seriously thinking about quitting (*I am actively searching for an acceptable alternative to this organisation*), and intention to quit (*When I can, I will leave the organisation*). These questions are based on research conducted by Chang (1999) and Mobley et al. (1978).

The answers to each item were recorded on a seven-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). For each participant, the responses were averaged for the three items; higher scores represented higher intentions to leave the organisation.

Morrison (2004) found that the internal reliability of the three items was good (Cronbach alpha of 0.82). In their study, Hsu, Jiang, Klein, and Tang (2003) determined a Cronbach alpha of 0.86. In additional research studies, Joo and Park (2010) and Yin-Fah, Foon, Chee-Long, and Osman (2010) found that the alpha coefficients for the three items was 0.82 and 0.90 respectively.

**Step 3: data collection**

Approval was obtained from the CEO of the organisation for this study. The four questionnaires were bound together. A covering letter explaining the reason for the study and how to complete the questionnaires was compiled.

The data were collected in pre-arranged group administration sessions. The participants were required to complete a biographical questionnaire and a paper-and-pencil version of the three measuring instruments.

The participants were invited to voluntarily participate in a session that lasted approximately 30 minutes. At the start of the session, all the participants signed informed consent forms, and the aim of the study and ethical considerations were explained. The researcher ensured that the physical environment was conducive to answering the questionnaires.
Step 4: research hypothesis and proposition formulation

The research hypothesis was formulated in order to achieve the objectives of the study.

Step 5: data analysis

The responses of participants to each of the items of the four questionnaires were captured on an electronic spreadsheet format. All the data were analysed by means of statistical analysis, using a statistical package (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2010).

Step 6: reporting and interpretation of results

The results were presented in tables and/or diagrams and the findings outlined in a systematic framework, ensuring that the interpretation of the findings would be conveyed in a clear and articulate manner.

Step 7: integration of research

The results of the empirical research were integrated into the findings of the literature review.

1.6.3 Phase 3: conclusions, limitations and recommendations

Chapter 4 integrates the research study and discusses the conclusions, limitations and recommendations in more detail.

1.7 CHAPTER LAYOUT

The chapter layout of the study is as follows:
Chapter 2: Literature review of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

The aim of this chapter is to conceptualise the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The conceptual foundations of each construct are explored and the development of the constructs and the prominent theories relating to the constructs analysed, evaluated and critically discussed. The chapter then focuses on existing literature on the impact of differences in gender, race, position and age on the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention constructs. The impact of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention on career decision making and commitment strategies is discussed. The chapter concludes with the integration of the career anchor, organisational commitment and turnover intention variables.

Chapter 3: Research article

This chapter, which is in the form of a research article, focuses on the empirical study of the research methodology used in this study. The research article comprises the following sections:

- an abstract outlining the scope of the work and the principal findings
- an introduction contextualising the study according to the key focus, the background and the objective
- a discussion of the research design outlining and describing the research approach, method, participants, instruments and statistical analysis
- the results, which provide an overview of the descriptive statistics and explain the reliability of the statistics
- a discussion of the results as per the stated research objectives
- a discussion of the study and recommendations for the field of industrial and organisational psychology and further research
- a conclusion, summarising the main findings of the study
- limitations and recommendations
Chapter 4: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations

In the final chapter, the results are integrated and conclusions drawn. The limitations of the study are explained and recommendations made for the field of industrial and organisational psychology. The chapter also includes recommendations for further research. The chapter ends with concluding remarks designed to integrate the research.

1.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The background to and rationale for the study, the problem statement, the objectives, the paradigm perspectives, the research design and research methodology for this study were discussed in this chapter. The rationale for the study was based on the fact that by exploring the relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, organisations may be able to develop more effective strategies to increase organisational commitment and reduce turnover intention.

Chapter 2 comprises an in-depth literature review of the constructs, career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW ON CAREER ANCHORS, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION

This chapter defines and conceptualises the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The chapter includes an integration of existing literature, and the presentation of models and approaches, to explain the practical implications of the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The chapter also reviews the influence of biographical variables (gender, race, position and age) on the three constructs, and the practical implications of the three constructs for career decision making and commitment strategies.

2.1 CAREER ANCHORS

Career anchor theory was conceptualised by Edgar Schein at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in the 1960s (Yarnall, 1998). The concept of career anchor evolved out of the longitudinal study of Sloan School alumni ten to 12 years after their graduation (Schein, 1978). Schein re-interviewed 44 MBA graduates using in-depth interviews to examine their histories and the reasons behind their career decisions (Erdoğmus, 2004). When Schein (1978) examined the reasons for career decisions, he found that there was a clear pattern of responses and that these reasons became more clear and stable as the individuals accumulated job experience.

While Schein's (1978), research was originally developed by studying managers, career anchor theory is now applied to all levels of employees, and has been studied widely in various occupations and in different contexts, countries and organisations (Erdoğmus 2004).

Career anchor theory is particularly significant in the South African context because of an environment characterised by high unemployment, large-scale retrenchments, no-fault terminations, employment equity targets, fewer employment opportunities, education and skill shortages and financial and emotional stressors (Van Vuuren & Fourie, 2000). In the
multicultural South African work environment, the importance of investigating the career anchors of difference races also becomes vital in order to take into account their diverse needs and values (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Rothman & Cilliers, 2007). Recent research on career anchors in the South African context has included predominantly black samples, with the Career Orientations Inventory indicating acceptable psychometric validity and reliability in a multicultural South African context (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007; Lumley et al., 2011; Martin & Roodt, 2008).

In the context of this study, the emphasis is on the construct of career orientation as a central part of the concept of career anchors and for which measurement can be operationalised by means of Schein's (1990) Career Orientations Inventory. This is also in line with other research on career anchors conducted, for example, by Coetzee and Schreuder (2008, 2009a), Coetzee et al. (2007) and Ramakrishna and Potosky (2003).

2.1.1 Conceptualisation

According to Schein (1978), the early career is a time of mutual discovery between the new employee and the organisation. Schein (1971) defines career as the description and analysis of an individual's movement through an organisation. Through successive trials and job challenges, the new employee gradually gains self-insight into “what one wants out of one’s career, one’s talents and limitations, one’s values and how they will fit in with the organizational values” (Schein, 1978, pp. 252-253). An individual's career self-concept or career anchor is built on feedback and self-insight, which matures with experience (Schein, 1978).

The self-concept has the following three components, which together constitute what Schein (1978, p. 125) refers to as the individual's career anchor:

- **self-perceived talents and abilities** (based on actual successes in a variety of work settings)
- **self-perceived motives and needs** (based on opportunities for self-tests and self-diagnosis in real situations and on feedback from others)
• self-perceived *attitudes and values* (based on actual encounters between self and norms and values of the employing organisation and work setting)

Schein (1978, 1996) proposed that career anchors evolve as one gains occupational and life experiences, but once the self-concept has been formed, it functions as a stabilising force or “anchor.” Schein (1978, p. 128) defined a career anchor as “that concern or value which the person will not give up, if a choice has to be made.” It is through being forced to make choices that individuals become aware of what is important to them in terms of self-development, family or career (Schein, 1996).

It is not possible to predict career anchors from psychological tests because the concept evolves and develops through actual work experience (Schein, 1978). Talents and abilities do not become an active part of the self-concept until they are tested in real situations in which the outcomes matter (Schein, 1978). According to Schein (1978), career anchors are the result of the early interaction between the individual and the work environment. They are “inside” the person, functioning as a set of driving and constraining forces on career decisions and choices. If one moves into a setting in which one is likely to fail or which fails to meet one’s needs or which compromises one’s values, one will be “pulled back” into something more congruent – hence the metaphor of “anchor” (Schein, 1978, p. 125).

An individual’s career self-concept influences career choices, affects decisions to move, shapes career aspirations, determines an individual’s view of the future, sways employee reactions to work experiences and influences perceptions of career success and satisfaction (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012). Career anchors influence how individuals interpret and negotiate their career experiences and cope with and adapt to career transitions (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013).

According to Hsu et al. (2003), the concept of career anchors can further be categorised as internal and external. Internal career anchors refer to an individual’s self-concept and are realised in terms of non-monetary incentives such as job security and autonomy in the workplace. External career anchors refer to the same set of career anchors, but are based
more on the extent to which individuals perceive that their organisation currently satisfies their internal career anchors through benefits and incentives.

According to Schein (1978), several important points and preconditions should be noted about the concept of career anchor:

- It is broader in its definition than other concepts such as job value or motivation to work.
- The concept emphasises the interaction between the three components (abilities, motives and values), that is, “we come to want and value that which we are good at, and we improve our abilities in those things that we want or value” (Schein, 1978, p. 126).
- Career anchors can only be discovered after a number of years of work experience as one needs a variety of real-life situations to know what one’s talents, motives and values are. One of Schein’s (1978) basic theoretical premises is that individuals’ career values, motivations and attitudes are consistent, mutually interactive and inseparable throughout their careers after an initial adjustment following the first three years or so of workplace experience (Marshall & Bonner, 2003). According to Schein (2006), the evolvement of a career anchor may take up to ten years, but may be shorter or longer, depending on how varied one’s work experience (number of jobs) has been and the quality or meaningfulness of the feedback one has received from each experience.
- The concept is intended to identify a growing area of stability in the individual. However, this does not imply that the individual does not change or grow. Instead, the concept is designed to explain that part of an individual’s life which grows more stable as he/she develops more self-insight on the basis of more life experience (Schein, 1978).

Schein (2006, p. 1) distinguishes between internal and external careers. Internal is anchored by the person’s self-image of his/her competencies, motives and values, while external involves “the actual steps that are required by an occupation or an organization to progress through that occupation.”
Career anchors are described as patterns of self-perceived talents and abilities, basic values, motives and needs that pertain to careers, thus influencing individuals’ career-related decisions (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009a; Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Greenhaus et al., 2010). For the purposes of this study, a career anchor is defined as “that one element in a person’s self-concept that he or she will not give up, even in the face of difficult choices” (Schein, 2006, p. 6).

2.1.2 Other career models

Similarities can be drawn between Schein’s (1978) career anchor theory and other models of career development, namely those of Driver (1982) and Derr (1986) (Kanye & Crous, 2007).

2.1.2.1 Driver (1982)

Driver (1982), in line with Schein’s work, constructed the idea of career self-concept. He indicated that habit of thought, motives and decision making styles guide the individual’s long-term career choices and determine his/her definition of career success. Like Schein, he emphasised the importance of self-insight and informed choice when faced with career decisions (Kanye & Crous, 2007).

Driver’s (1982) four career concepts of linear, transitory, steady state and spiral careers show similarities to Schein’s general managerial competence, autonomy/independence, technical/functional competence and pure challenge anchor respectively (Yarnall, 1998). The results of Driver’s (1982) study indicate that some individuals define career success as continued growth and self-renewing experiences (spiral), some individuals want long-term stability and relatively unchanging work identity (steady-state), others view a successful career as having a variety of different experiences (transitory), and others again view success as upward mobility to the top of the organisation or profession (linear) (Kanye & Crous, 2007).
2.1.2.2 Derr (1986)

Derr (1986) modified the construct of career orientations and suggested that career success is determined by an individual’s motives, values and talents with due regard for any perceived constraints (Kanye & Crous, 2007). His model consists of five career orientations which appear to map easily on to Schein’s anchors, that is, Derr’s (1986) orientations of getting ahead (i.e. seeking advancement); getting secure; getting free (i.e. seeking independence); getting high (i.e. valuing excitement); and getting balanced, show similarities with Schein’s career anchors of general managerial competence; security/stability; autonomy/independence; pure challenge and technical/functional competence; and lifestyle. The main difference between the two researchers is that Schein (1978) argues that career anchors are stable, while Derr (1986) contends that career orientations can change with age and as a result of external influences (Yarnall, 1998).

In this study, Schein’s (1978) career anchor theory was chosen over Driver’s (1982) and Derr’s (1986) models because the main advantage of Schein’s model is that it recognises a need for a balance between the individual and organisation, as opposed to being a purely individual focus (Yarnall, 1998).

2.1.3 Types of career anchor

According to his original conceptualisation of career anchor theory, Schein (1978) postulated that an individual’s self-concepts could be generalised into the following five categories: technical/functional competence (achievement of expert status among their peers); general managerial competence (willingness to solve complex, whole-of-organisation problems and undertake subsequent decision making); autonomy/independence (personal freedom in job content and settings); security/stability (long-term employment for health benefits and retirement options); and entrepreneurial creativity (opportunity for creativity and identification of new businesses, products or services).

Follow-up studies by Derr and DeLong in the 1980s revealed the following three additional anchor categories: service/dedication to a cause (working for the greater good of
organisations or communities); pure challenge (testing personal endurance through risky projects or physically challenging work); and lifestyle (obtaining balance between personal and the family’s welfare with work commitments) (Chang, 2010; Kanye & Crous, 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Schein, 1996).

Research by both Marshall and Bonner’s (2003) and Danziger, Rachman-Moore, and Valency (2008) proposed that while they generally support Schein’s (1978) career anchor theory, there should in fact be nine career anchors. They make a distinction between entrepreneurship and creativity. Baruch (2004) proposes extending the number of career anchors even further by including employability, work versus family balance and spiritual purpose. Based on their research findings, Hsu et al. (2003) and Chang (2010) propose the need to explore a new category of anchor, namely “learning motivation.”

Table 2.1 provides an overview of the eight career anchors and the typical rewards that motivate individuals with each relevant anchor (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011).

Table 2.1
**Characteristics of the eight career anchors** (Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career anchor</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Technical/functional competence      | Identity built around content of work – the technical/functional skill in which the individual excels  
                                       | Challenging work that allows application of expertise  
                                       | Rewards  
                                       | Want to be paid according to skills level  
                                       | Opportunities for self-development in particular field                                                                                      |
| General managerial competence        | High levels of responsibility  
                                       | Challenging, varied, and integrative work  
                                       | Leadership opportunities that allow contribution to organisation  
                                       | Measure self by pay level – desire to be highly paid  
                                       | Rewards  
                                       | Bonuses for achieving organisational targets  
                                       | Promotion based on merit, measured performance, or results  
                                       | Promotion to a position of higher responsibility – rank, title, salary, number of subordinates, size of budget |
| Autonomy/independence | Clearly delineated, time-bounded kinds of work within area of expertise  
| | Clearly defined goals which allow means of accomplishment to the individual  
| | Do not desire close supervision  
| Rewards | Pay for performance, bonuses  
| | Autonomy-oriented promotion systems  
| Security/stability | Stable, predictable work  
| | Concerned about the context of the work and the nature of the work itself  
| | Prefer to be paid in steady, predictable increments based on length of service  
| | Benefit packages which emphasise insurance and retirement programs  
| Rewards | Seniority based promotion systems with published ranks spelling out how long a person must serve in any given grade before promotion is preferred  
| | Recognition for loyalty and steady performance  
| | Assurance of further stability and steady employment  
| Entrepreneurial creativity | Enjoy creating new products or services, building new organisations through financial manipulation, or by taking over an existing business and reshaping it in one’s image  
| | Obsessed with the need to create, requiring constant new challenge  
| Rewards | Wealth  
| | Ownership  
| | Freedom and power  
| Service/dedication to a cause | Work towards some important values of improving the world in some manner  
| | Prefer helping professions (e.g. nursing, teaching, ministry)  
| Rewards | Fair pay  
| | Recognition for one’s contributions  
| | Opportunities to move into positions with more influence and freedom  
| Pure challenge | Pursue challenge for its own sake  
| | Jobs where one faces tougher challenges or more difficult problems irrespective of the kind of problem involved  
| | Highly motivated  
| Rewards | Adequate opportunities for self-tests |
Feldman and Bolino (1996) reconceptualised Schein’s eight career anchors into three distinct groupings or higher-order categories along with the inherent motivations underlying the various career anchors. These motivations are described as being talent-based (which encompasses technical/functional competence, general managerial competence, and entrepreneurial creativity anchors), motive and need-based (including security/stability autonomy/independence, and lifestyle anchors), and value-based (i.e. dedication to a cause and pure challenge anchors) (Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

The three career anchors grounded in an individual’s work talents, focus on the type of work individuals do on a daily basis. The three anchors grounded in an individual’s motives and needs focus on how individuals wish to structure their work roles consistent with their personal lives. The two career anchors grounded in a person’s attitudes and values focus on individuals’ identification with their occupations and the cultures of their organisations (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Wils, Wils & Tremblay, 2010).

According to Feldman and Bolino (1996), for individuals whose career anchor is talent-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work effectiveness and job stability. For individuals whose career anchor is need-based, the impact on congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work role adjustment and outside role conflict. Finally, for individuals whose career anchor is value-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on job satisfaction and psychological well-being. Figure 2.1 depicts the integrated framework of career anchors based on this alternative classification of career anchors.
Figure 2.1: Integrated theoretical model of the construct career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, p. 48)
Feldman and Bolino (1996) maintain that other significant dimensions which determine the impact of career anchors on career decisions and outcomes include how self-aware individuals are of their career anchors and how important anchors are in guiding their career decisions (i.e. the salience of career anchors). They hypothesise that an employee’s age, length of service (tenure) and the number of organisations he/she has worked for will be positively associated with the durability of career anchors.

Schein (1996) predicted that change in the career environment would affect individuals differently, depending on their career anchor. Schein (1996) holds that individuals anchored in security/stability experience the most severe problems because of organisations no longer offering employment security. Their base of security and stability has to shift from dependence on an organisation to dependence on themselves (i.e. employability). Schein (1996) believes that individuals anchored in autonomy/independence find the occupational world an easier place to navigate - in other words, they respond positively to the move to employability. Individuals with a technical/functional competence need to adjust to reality that they have to update and relearn using their own money and time because organisations are no longer willing to bear these costs. According to Schein (1996) increasingly more people are indicating service/dedication to a cause, that is, the need for their work to be meaningful in a larger context.

Schein’s (1996) predictions of the increasing dominance of the service/dedication to a cause career anchor is supported by more recent research (e.g. Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007; Coetzee, Schreuder & Tladinyane, 2013). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) the increasing emphasis on social responsibility and global and moral citizenship may explain the dominance of the service/dedication to a cause career anchor in recent research studies. Research also indicates a shift towards the lifestyle career anchor as being the primary career anchor in today’s world of work (e.g. Coetzee et al, 2013; Du Toit & Coetzee, 2012; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012). Meister and Willyerd (2010) predict that as the world of work becomes increasingly more global and driven by virtual employment and mobile technology; individuals will become increasingly more concerned with balancing and managing their personal and work lives better.
2.1.4 Multiple career anchors

Schein (1978) argued that, by definition, an individual can maintain only one dominant career anchor. According to him, if no anchor emerges clearly for an individual it is possibly because he/she has not had enough life experience to develop priorities that determine how to make those choices. Schein (1978) allowed for the possibility that a person may be in transition between career anchors, but would, in time, settle according to one dominant anchor.

However, Schein’s own empirical evidence suggests that individuals can have more than one strong career anchor (Coetzee, Bergh & Schreuder, 2010; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009a, 2009b; Coetzee et al., 2007; Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Wils et al., 2010). For example, in Schein’s (1978) study of 44 MBA graduates, ten respondents (23%) indicated that they held two career anchors equally strongly, while four respondents (9%) reported that they held three career anchors equally strongly. Research by Ramakrishna and Potosky (2003) indicates that it is possible and even common for information system professionals to have more than one dominant career anchor. Ramakrishna and Potosky (2003) examined the career anchors of 163 information system professionals and found that their results provide evidence of multiple dominant anchors for many individuals, and that individuals with dominant anchors do not report significantly different career-related outcomes compared with those with single dominant anchors. A study of 540 managers found that only about 50% of the sample had a single dominant anchor - the rest had two or more dominant anchors (Kniveton, 2004).

Feldman and Bolino (1996) further proposed that it is possible for individuals to have both primary and secondary career anchors. This may be because of multiple career and life goals or simply high levels of personal ambivalence towards career choices (Feldman & Bolino, 1996). For those individuals with multiple career anchors, another significant factor to consider is whether those career anchors are complementary or mutually inconsistent, because this will influence the impact of career anchors on career-relevant outcomes (Wils et al., 2010).
Wils et al. (2010) proposed significant associations between Schein’s (1978) career anchors and the work values system of Schwartz (1992). According to Wils et al. (2010), career anchors can be structured within the four value quadrants of Schwartz’ (1992) model. Each of the four values relate to specific interdependent motivational domains that can either be compatible or conflictual (mutually inconsistent). Schwartz (1992) identified four work values: openness to change (which relates to the motivational domains of self-direction, stimulation and hedonism); conservation (which relates to the motivational domains of tradition, conformity and security); self-transcendence (which relates to the motivational domains of universalism and benevolence); and self-enhancement (which relates to the motivational domains of achievement and power). Wils et al. (2010) cluster the pure challenge, entrepreneurial creativity and autonomy/independence career anchors under openness to change; security/stability and lifestyle under conservation; technical competence and service/dedication to a cause under self-transcendence; and managerial competence under self-enhancement. A study by Wils et al. (2010), using the analysis of data collected from a sample of engineers, supported the notion that several anchors are complementary (e.g. entrepreneurial creativity and pure challenge), while others are conflictual (e.g. pure challenge and security/stability).

According to Feldman and Bolino (1996), individuals may have multiple career anchors for at least two reasons. In other words, individuals may have high levels of personal ambivalence towards certain career choices or objectives, and career anchors can be talent-based, need-based or value-based (with an individual holding, say, one career anchor that is primarily talent-based and one that is primarily need-based or value-based).

The existence of multiple career anchors suggest that individuals can develop more than one strong career anchor in turn suggesting an overlap of values and motives among the eight career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Schein, 1996; Wils et al., 2010).

Quesenberry and Trauth (2012), posit that although individuals quantitatively tend to identify with multiple career anchors, they qualitatively identify strongly with at least one career anchor and less strongly with a second and third career anchor.
2.1.5 Practical implications of career anchors

Career anchors generally explain why people stay engaged in a certain job or are committed to an organisation, with organisational commitment being regarded as an outcome of the career choices that are determined by an individual’s career anchors (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). According to Schein (1978), it is important for people to gain self-awareness of their career anchors in order to make more informed career choices at critical points in their lives; as well as for organisations to become more aware of the career anchors of their employees so that appropriate career moves can be made.

Empirical evidence suggests that the main attribute of career anchor theory is congruence (Feldman & Bolino, 1996). It is when individuals achieve congruence between their career anchor and their work environment they are more likely to achieve positive career outcomes (Feldman & Bolino, 1996) such as increased job and career satisfaction, organisational commitment and intention to stay (Coetzee et al., 2007; Igbaria, Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1991; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012).

Research also indicates that individuals’ need congruence between their work and personal interests (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008), and that they make career choices and decisions based on personal preferences and current circumstances (Coetzee et al., 2007; Kanye & Crous, 2007). Career anchors influence every major decision about career issues, including decisions to move, subjective experiences of career success, employees’ reactions to work experiences and their choice of career and workplace (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003).

The career anchor concept advocated by Schein (1978) is important to both the individual and the organisation. According to Schein (1978), people can make the difference between organisational success and failure. For example, if an organisation has the wrong person in the job or people work below their potential, it is less likely to affectively achieve its goals (Schein, 1978). One can also expect that certain occupations tend to attract individuals with specific career anchors more than others (Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003).
From an organisation’s perspective, research on career anchors can be used to guide current selection, placement, development and reward practices. In addition, an organisation might be able to reduce turnover of employees by matching career opportunities to employees’ career anchors (Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003). Yarnall (1998) summarises the literature on the organisational benefits in understanding career orientations as follows: having the ability to tailor career interventions appropriately to individual employee needs; offering job opportunities congruent with an individual’s orientation; designing appropriate reward, promotion and recognition systems; increasing managers’ understanding of what drives employees’ internal career satisfaction; increasing understanding of the overriding career culture in the organisation; and finding a way to structure career discussions and exit interviews.

2.1.5.1 Practical implications: organisational perspective

An understanding of career anchors is essential for organisations because individuals with different career anchors “want quite different things out of their careers, measure themselves quite differently, and therefore have to be managed quite differently” (Schein, 1978, p. 128).

Marshall and Bonner (2003) contend that organisations need people with divergent career anchors, since this provides organisations with a flexible and diverse workforce. In order to develop psychological contracts with individuals with different views on careers and diverse needs (Schein, 1978), Erdoğan (2004) suggests that organisations adopt a more pluralistic approach to career management.

Career anchors provide organisations with a vital framework to help them offer employees opportunities and conditions that are congruent with their career orientations, career values and motives (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009a). Research on career anchors can be used to guide current human resource practices in order to improve retention (or reduce turnover) by matching career paths, rewards, recognition and opportunities to employees’ career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003).
The consequences of staying in a job that is incongruent with an individual’s career anchor has implications for the organisation, because the individual will then look for outside work interests to fulfil his/her needs or will withdraw his/her commitment to the organisation (Yarnall, 1998). Zangaro (2001) proposes that if managers find that prospective employee’s goals are not congruent with the organisation’s goals, they should not consider even employing him/her.

According to Schein (1990), when individuals achieve congruence between their career anchor and their work, they are more likely to attain positive career outcomes, such as job effectiveness, satisfaction and stability. Schein (1990) does, however, acknowledge that because people cannot always find jobs which match their career anchors, the relationships between career anchors and career outcomes are not perfect. The availability of reasonable alternative jobs and external personal life constraints moderate the relationship between career anchor congruence and career outcomes (Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) stress the importance of person-environment fit especially in today’s turbulent employment context as it results in enhanced levels of career well-being and career and life satisfaction.

2.1.5.2 Practical implications: individual perspective

Career anchors influence career choices, affect turnover decisions, shape career aspirations, determine an employee’s view of the future and influence employees’ reactions to work experiences (Bigliardi et al., 2005). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) career anchors guide employees’ career decisions, and preferences for work and work environments.

A individual’s career motivation is tied to his/her work and organisational commitment, and is influenced by his/her career interests, values, motives, personality preferences and self-perceived competencies (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). Different career anchors fulfil specific career needs of the individual (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).
Becoming aware of and identifying one’s career anchor/s strengthens the individual’s ability to make more informed career choices and has a major impact on an individual’s career decision making, personal life and psychological attachment to an occupation (Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Schein, 1996; Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). According to Coetzee and Roythorne-Jacobs (2012), career anchors are a key determinant of an individual’s choice of a career or workplace.

This awareness also assists organisations to determine the most appropriate career interventions for rewarding and retaining talented staff - that is, it helps organisations to design appropriate reward, recognition and promotion systems (Erdoğanus, 2004). The goal is to match the needs of the organisation with those of the individual (Schein, 1978).

By implementing organisational conditions and career development support practices that result in individuals experiencing higher levels of career satisfaction and success, other key outcomes such as organisational commitment, talent retention, employee engagement and job performance can be achieved by the organisation (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b).

2.1.6 Career anchor research

In general, research indicates that an individual’s career motives and values (his/her career anchors) have an impact on career decision making and psychological attachment or commitment to an occupation or organisation (Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Schein, 1996). There is also a significant relationship between employee wellness variables (e.g. burnout, sources of job stress and work engagement) and career anchor variables (De Villiers, 2009).

A study of information system professionals found that internal career anchors (desires/expectations) were positively related to career satisfaction and motivation (Jiang, Klein & Balloun, 2001). Coetzee and Schreuder (2011) studied the relationship between career anchors, emotional intelligence and employability satisfaction using a random sample of adults employed in the service industry. They concluded that organisations should realise that the fit between employees’ internal values, their emotional intelligence and the work environment is the key to their employability satisfaction.
Feldman and Bolino's (2000) research suggests that individuals vary greatly in their motivations to pursue self-employment and that career anchors do influence individuals' satisfaction with self-employment, their overall life satisfaction, their psychological well-being, their skill utilisation and their intentions to remain self-employed.

A study by Hardin (1995) using a sample of certified public accountants demonstrated that matching the needs of the individual and the organisation tends to achieve greater organisational commitment, stronger job satisfaction and lower turnover intention among employees.

In a study focusing on the MIS professionals and managers, Igbaria et al. (1991) found that employees whose career orientations matched their job settings were more satisfied with their jobs and careers, more committed to the organisation and ultimately less inclined to leave the organisation than employees who lacked such a match.

Research by Danziger and Valency (2006) supports the premise that individuals whose career anchors are congruent with their job report a significantly higher mean level of job satisfaction than those who lack such congruence. However, it should be noted that individuals will not be able to act in a manner congruent with their preferences when external situational (e.g. no reasonable alternative jobs available) and/or personal life (e.g. family commitments) constraints prevent them from doing so (Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

According to Marshall and Bonner (2003), certain career anchors appear to be playing a more prominent role in today's fast-paced world of work. Data gathered from 423 graduate students enrolled in management courses in Western Australia, the USA, Malaysia, South Africa and the UK found that the lifestyle career anchor (work-life balance) dominated the results of the study. This finding suggests that the possible increasing number of employees who value lifestyle will impact significantly on the relationship between organisations and individuals in meeting their respective work and career values (Marshall & Bonner, 2003). The shift toward the lifestyle career anchor as being the dominant anchor in today's work of work is also highlighted in research by Coetzee et al. (2013), Danziger and Valency (2006), Du Toit and Coetzee (2012) and Quesenberry and Trauth (2012).
There has been conflicting research in terms of whether biographic variables have a significant effect on career anchor preference.

The results of a study by Yarnall (1998) on the career anchors of employees in the UK, showed that gender, age and length of service have no significant effect on the distribution of career anchors (Yarnall, 1998). De Villiers' (2009) research investigating the relationship between employee wellness and career anchors also indicates that age and race have no significant effect on preference for a specific career anchor. However, other researchers (e.g. Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Coetzee et al., 2007) have found significant differences.

2.1.6.1 Gender

Research has revealed significant differences between the career anchors of males and females, with males and females focusing on different career anchors (Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). Coetzee and Roythorne-Jacobs (2012) posit that women perceive their careers differently from men because of historical experiences as a minority group in a male-dominated work environment and differences in their values.

According to Coetzee et al. (2007), differences of statistical significance were found between males and females for all the career anchors, with the exception of the security/stability, service and lifestyle career anchors (the effect size was small to modest). In Coetzee and Schreuder's (2008) research, males showed higher preferences for general management competence, autonomy/independence, pure challenge and entrepreneurial creativity career anchors, while females showed a high preference for the security/stability career anchor.

Marshall and Bonner (2003) found that females place more emphasis on factors such as working conditions, facilities for child rearing, career certainty and working hours, while males are more likely to run their own businesses than females. They noted that gender was a significant predictor of general managerial competence, entrepreneurial creativity and pure challenge career anchors.
Research by Coetzee et al. (2007) indicates that females tend to be more committed to organisations that respect personal and family concerns, whereas males tend to be more committed to organisations that provide them with the autonomy that enables them to work independently.

A study conducted by Knivetont (2004) found that males and females were similar in their views of what was important to them, gender differences were limited to the talent-based anchors, with males scoring higher for technical and entrepreneurial anchors. Findings reported by Ellison and Schreuder (2000) also scored male participants higher on the entrepreneurial creativity anchor. Hardin (1995) found that a higher percentage of females than males were lifestyle oriented, while males were more than twice as likely as females to possess the general managerial or entrepreneurial creativity career anchors.

Research by Igbaria et al. (1991) confirms the premise that career orientation is significantly related to gender. Their study of information system employees reported that a higher percentage of men than women were technically oriented, whereas a higher percentage of women than men were lifestyle oriented.

Danziger and Valency’s (2006) research indicates significant differences between men and women in all but two career anchors: technical/functional competence and security/stability. They noted that the proportion of women was significantly higher than that of the men in the lifestyle anchor. Danziger and Valency (2006) postulated that the dominance of the lifestyle anchor may reflect a growing desire of working adults to balance the different facets of their lives, that is, work, family and leisure.

These results contradict the research conducted by Coetzee and Schreuder (2008), Knivetont (2004) and Marshall and Bonner (2003) whose findings indicated no significant differences between males and females as far as the lifestyle anchor was concerned.

The results of a study by De Villiers (2009) support the notion that male and female groups differ significantly in their career anchors. However, they found that the male participants obtained significantly higher total mean scores than the females on the lifestyle,
service/dedication to a cause, entrepreneurial creativity and general management career anchors, with females scoring higher on security/stability.

In a study by Ngokha (2009) investigating the relationship between career anchors and personality preference, the female participants’ dominant career anchor was service/dedication to a cause, followed by lifestyle.

2.1.6.2 Race

The findings of a South African study conducted by Coetzee et al. (2007) suggest that the black and white respondents differ in their career anchors. The black respondents in the sample scored the highest on service/dedication to a cause, pure challenge and technical/functional competence, while the whites scored the highest on lifestyle, technical/functional competence and pure challenge. Both the black and white respondents scored the lowest on the security/stability, entrepreneurial creativity and general managerial competence scales (Coetzee et al., 2007).

When Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) investigated the use of the Career Orientations Inventory as a measure to determine the career anchors of a random sample of predominantly managerial and supervisory participants in the service industry, they found that with the exception of the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor, the black and white respondents indicated similar career anchor preferences. Marshall and Bonner’s (2003) research indicates that culture impacts significantly on the entrepreneurial creativity and technical/functional competence career anchors.

2.1.6.3 Position

In research by Ellison and Schreuder (2000) it was found that mid-career employees (managers and non-managers) with a fit between their career anchor and occupational type are likely to experience a higher level of general and intrinsic job satisfaction than mid-career employees with no such fit.
Yarnall’s (1998) research findings indicate that career anchors do differ to a limited extent according to the individual’s position in the organisational hierarchy. More senior employees showed a greater likelihood of having a general managerial anchor and the lowest grade showed a higher proportion of employees anchored in security/stability (Yarnall, 1998). Danzinger and Valency (2006) found a significant difference in the career anchors of salaried and self-employed individuals.

Permanent and contract staff appear to differ significantly on the following career anchors: permanent staff members seem to prefer higher levels of autonomy in their work than their contractor counterparts, and also appear to have a greater preference for the lifestyle career anchor (De Villiers, 2009).

2.1.6.4 Age

Marshall and Bonner’s (2003) research revealed age to be a significant predictor of the importance placed on the security/stability, autonomy/independence and service/dedication to a cause career anchors. They found that a specific relationship emerged relating to age, downsizing and careers, with the younger participants having more favourable and positive views on their downsizing experiences. Research also indicates that values change as individual’s age and go through life and career stages (Rodrigues & Guest, 2010; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

Research by Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) found that with the exception of the lifestyle and entrepreneurial creativity career anchors, all other career anchors indicated significant differences between the age groups. They found, for example, that participants 25 years and younger showed a higher preference for autonomy/independence than the other age groups, and a lower preference than the other age groups for service/dedication to a cause.

Hardin (1995) reported a significant relationship between career anchors and age. In his research, respondents with a dominant lifestyle anchor were significantly younger than respondents with a dominant general managerial anchor.
In contrast to these other studies, Yarnall (1998) found no significant differences between the career anchors of different ages.

2.1.7 Evaluating the career anchor model

Schein’s (1978) work has made a major contribution to how career scholars conceptualise the development of a stable career identity and distinguish that process from initial career choice (Feldman & Bolino, 1996). Despite numerous researchers’ attempting to refute the theory, “the basic typology has held firm” (Marshall & Bonner, 2003, p. 282) and has remained “consistent and socially-grounded in its premises” (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013). As shown by numerous research studies, this model can be regarded as a valid and reliable diagnostic tool for understanding career decision making in the South African environment (Coetzee et al., 2007, 2013; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

However, Schein’s (1978) career anchor theory does have several key limitations.

Firstly, empirical investigations have highlighted inconsistencies in the results (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009a; De Villiers, 2009; Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Yarnall, 1998). For example, in their international study of 423 graduate students enrolled in various MBA and other management courses, Marshall and Bonner (2003) found the proportion of individuals inclined to certain anchors differed from that reported by Schein (1996).

Secondly, the idea that individuals only have one stable dominant career anchor has been questioned by researchers (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Wils et al., 2010). Research by Kniveton (2004) which endeavoured to compare the career perceptions of younger managers and older managers, found that the participants in the study did not adopt a single career anchor, as Schein (1978) claimed, but were inclined towards a career profile. In their research, only about 50% of the sample had a single dominant anchor, while the rest had two or more anchors.

Thirdly, research suggests that individuals can develop more than one strong anchor, with studies providing evidence of individuals’ having multiple career anchor profiles comprising
of a primary, secondary and even tertiary career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2013; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; Wils et al., 2010). Feldman and Bolino (1996), suggest that for those individuals with multiple career anchors, a key factor to consider is whether these career anchors are complementary or mutually inconsistent, that is, whether it is possible to find a job which fulfils both or all preferences.

Fourthly, although Schein’s questionnaire is much quicker, easier to understand and has been used far more widely in organisations, it still has disadvantages. It appears to be geared towards men because Schein’s research was conducted on a relatively small sample of highly educated men in their late twenties/early thirties. It is also easy to skew the results of the questionnaire if the respondent is so inclined (Yarnall, 1998) because it is a subjective concept based on an individual’s view of his/her career (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

Coetzee and Schreuder (2009a) investigated the use of the COI as a measure to determine the career orientations of working adults in a multicultural South African environment using both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. Their research findings (based on a randomly selected sample of participants in the service industry at predominantly supervisory and managerial level) suggest that assessing the inner career orientations of employees provides valuable information on the motives and values driving individual’s career decision making. However, there is a need for the further refinement of the items relating to each subscale of the COI, particularly for the South African organisational context.

Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) suggest that longitudinal research on the stability of and shift in individuals’ career anchors over time is needed in order to validate the usefulness of the construct in today’s knowledge- and digital-driven work environment.

Marshall and Bonner (2003) propose that the entrepreneurial and creativity anchors should be separated, suggesting a nine-factor solution to the COI. Danziger et al. (2008) support this suggestion because their research findings indicate that the nine-construct model of the COI is a more valid and reliable model. Coetzee and Roythorne-Jacobs (2012) added the employability anchor with Schein’s talent-based anchors, the work-family anchor to need-based anchors and the spiritual purpose anchors to value-based anchors.
2.2 ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Over the past few decades, organisational commitment has been studied extensively and has become a topic of increasing importance in the area of industrial and organisational psychology (Adzeh, 2013; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Chen, Wang & Sun, 2012; Joo & Park, 2010; Manetjie & Martins, 2009; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Somers, 2009; Tladinyane, 2012). The ongoing interest in this topic has mostly been due to the theorised relationships between organisational commitment and employee behaviour such as productivity/performance (Jaros, 1997; Suliman & Iles, 2000), turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Farris, 2012; Lew, 2009; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000), well-being (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) and job satisfaction (Farris, 2012; Lumley et al., 2011; Singh, Bhagat & Mohanty, 2011).

Organisational commitment which is generally defined as a psychological link between the employee and his/her organisation, has been found to be related to major work outcomes, namely turnover intention and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Ferreira, 2012; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Somers, 2010). Employees who are strongly committed to their organisations are less likely to leave their organisation than uncommitted employees (Delobbe & Vandenberghe, 2000; Ding & Lin, 2006; Ferreira, 2012; Somers, 2010).

Research has indicated that employee commitment is a crucial factor in achieving organisational success/goals (Khalili & Asmawi, 2012; Roodt, 2004), with high employee commitment being “a prominent feature of world-class companies” (Roodt, 2004, p. 82). In a highly volatile world of work characterised by change, it has been shown that committed employees adapt and accept change and changing conditions more readily than less committed employees (Suliman & Iles, 2000).

2.2.1 Conceptualisation

Organisational commitment has been defined in a variety of ways, but common to all the definitions is the notion that commitment binds an employee to an organisation (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982; SamGnanakkan,
Martin and Roodt (2008, p. 24) state the following in this regard: “Despite the lack of consensus on the various definitions, conceptualisations and measurements, a common theme is shared across all these deviations, namely that organisational commitment is considered to be a bond or linkage of the individual to the organisation.”

All definitions generally point to commitment (1) being a stabilising and obliging force; and (2) providing direction to behaviour (e.g. restricting freedom and binding the person to a course of action) (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), the differences in the definitions involve the detail on the nature or origin of the stabilising force that gives direction to behaviour. Allen and Meyer (1990) believe that the difference between the various conceptualisations of commitment involve the psychological state, the antecedent conditions leading to its development and the behaviours that are expected to result from commitment.

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) provide a set of definitions taken from the work commitment literature, as set out in table 2.2. These are examples of definitions taken from authors with totally different approaches and perspectives. These approaches and perspectives range from viewing organisational commitment as unidimensional (e.g. Becker, 1960; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Wiener, 1982) to multidimensional models (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1990; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986), to distinguishing commitment from other constructs (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).
Table 2.2

Definitions of organisational commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001, p. 302)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment in general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“…engagement which restricts freedom of action” (Oxford English Dictionary, 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity” (Becker, 1960, p. 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by his actions and through these actions to beliefs that sustain the activities of his own involvement” (Salancik, 1977, p. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…a stabilizing force that acts to maintain behavioural direction when expectancy/equity conditions are not met and do not function” (Scholl, 1981, p. 593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…a force that stabilises individual behaviour under circumstances where the individual would otherwise be tempted to change that behaviour” (Brickman, 1987, p. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…one’s inclination to act in a given way toward a particular commitment target” (Oliver, 1990, p. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…an obliging force which requires that the person honor the commitment, even in the face of fluctuating attitudes and whims” (Brown, 1996, p. 241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“… the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organisation” (Mowday, Steers &amp; Porter, 1979, p. 226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… the totality of normative pressures to act in a way which meets organisational goals and interests” (Weiner, 1982, p. 421)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organisation; it will reflect the degree to which the individual internalises or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organisation” (O’Reilly &amp; Chatman, 1986, p. 493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… a psychological state that binds the individual to the organisation (i.e., makes turnover less likely)” (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1990, p. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“… a bond or linking of the individual to the organisation” (Mathieu &amp; Zajac, 1990, p. 171)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“refers to the likelihood that an individual will stick with a job, and feel psychologically attached to it, whether it is satisfying or not” (Rusbult &amp; Farrell, 1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Regardless of the definition, “committed” employees are more likely to remain in the organisation than “uncommitted” employees” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), commitment can assume different forms (i.e. the relationship between an employee and the organisation may vary); and committed individuals may be committed to different entities.
For the purposes of this study, the following definition of organisational commitment as formulated by Allen and Meyer (1996, p. 252) was adopted: “Organizational commitment can be defined generally as a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization.”

2.2.1.1 Approaches to organisational commitment

Researchers have distinguished between the following four main approaches to study organisational commitment: the attitudinal, behavioural, motivational and multidimensional approaches (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Mester, Visser, Roodt & Kellerman, 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997). These four approaches describe the different ways in which organisational commitment is developed and the implications of employee behaviour (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

The differences identified in the theoretical approaches are briefly explained below and depicted in table 2.3.

a. Attitudinal approach

The most prominent unidimensional approach to organisational commitment is the attitudinal approach of Mowday et al. (1979), which views commitment largely as an attitude or a set of behavioural intentions.

According to Mowday et al. (1979), attitudinal commitment represents a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organisation and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals. This approach typically encompasses an exchange relationship in which individuals attach themselves to the organisation in return for certain rewards or payments from the organisation (Mowday et al., 1979).

According to the attitudinal approach, commitment develops as a result of some combination of work experiences, perceptions of the organisation and personal
characteristics, which lead to positive feelings about an organisation and which, in turn, result in organisational commitment (Mowday et al., 1982).

b. Behavioural approach

The behavioural perspective of commitment is also a unidimensional approach and developed from the work of Becker (1960). Becker (1960) proposed that employees make choices or side bets on whether to remain part of an organisation. He defined side bets as individuals’ investment (time, pension, etc.) in an organisation. According to Becker (1960, p. 32), “commitments come into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity.”

In terms of a behavioural approach, organisational commitment is regarded as behaviour in terms of which individuals are committed to a particular course of action rather than an entity (Allen & Meyer, 1990). These committing behaviours, or side bets, may make it difficult for an employee to leave an organisation, as the perceived costs of leaving may be too great (Becker, 1960; Brown, 1996).

According to the side bet theory, individuals are committed to the organisation as far as they hold their positions, irrespective of the stressful conditions they experience. However, should they be offered a better alternative, they would be willing to leave the organisation (Becker, 1960).

c. Motivational approach

The motivational approach is a third school of thought that emerged in an attempt to integrate the diverse perspectives and also to overcome the primary limitations of the previous two approaches (Roodt, 2004). The motivational approach focuses on the state of commitment known as cognitive predisposition (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

This approach can be characterised by the employee having a strong belief in the organisation’s goals, being motivated to exert high levels of effort to achieve these goals and wanting to remain with the organisation (Mowday et al., 1979).
Commitment as part of a motivated mindset requires goal regulation which focuses on the reasons for and purpose of a course of action (Meyer, Becker & Vandenberge, 2004). Motivated behaviour may be accompanied by different psychological states or mindsets found in different forms of commitment - hence the need to consider behaviours that are not required of an individual (Meyer et al., 2004).

d. Multidimensional approach

Organisational commitment has been researched in terms of both a unidimensional and multidimensional perspective (Suliman & Ilse, 2000). Brown (1996, p. 230) argues that “commitment is best conceptualised as a single, fundamental construct that may vary according to differences in focus, terms, and time-specific evaluation.”

However, the growing consensus among commitment theorists and researchers is that commitment is a multidimensional construct (McKenna, 2005; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Nazari & Emami, 2012; Somers, 2010). This approach views commitment as developing as a result of an interplay between emotional attachment (affective commitment), perceived costs (continuance commitment) and moral obligation (normative commitment) (Döckel et al., 2006; Suliman & Iles, 2000). Somers’ (2009) research supports the multidimensional approach to organisational commitment by highlighting that the influence of commitment on organisational outcomes is greater when multiple forms of commitment are combined compared to a single form.

Johnson, Groff, and Taing (2009) examined the possibility that different forms of organisational commitment might interact. They developed the organisational synergistic model, which posits that organisational commitment theory and prediction are compromised when independent effects are considered at the exclusion of interacting effects. Their research shows that organisations should emphasis increasing multiple forms of organisational commitment instead of focusing on the affective or attitudinal aspect of commitment.
Table 2.3
A set of definitions of organisational commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Core aspect of each approach towards organisational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal approach</td>
<td>Commitment is largely viewed as an employees’ attitude or a set of behavioural intentions which focuses on how the individual identifies with the organisation and its goals and chooses to remain committed to the organisation to be a part of achieving its goals (Mowday et al., 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural approach</td>
<td>Focuses on the behaviour where individuals are committed to a particular course of action rather than an entity (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational approach</td>
<td>Focuses on the state of commitment, known as cognitive predisposition which includes the realisation of salient values and the achievement of salient goals (Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional approach</td>
<td>Organisational commitment develops through the interplay of emotional attachment, perceived costs and moral obligation (Suliman &amp; Iles, 2000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the most prominent multidimensional commitment models, namely those of O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) and Meyer and Allen (1991), will be discussed in more detail below.

2.2.1.2 Organisational commitment models

The models that have generated the most research and best explain commitment in terms of organisational behaviour for the purposes of this research are those of O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) and Meyer and Allen (1991). Table 2.4 represents Meyer and Herscovitch’s (2001) reference to the different binding forces of organisational commitment by describing the O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) model and Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model.
Table 2.4

Dimensions of two forms of commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O'Reilly and Chatman (1986)</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Instrumental involvement for specific extrinsic rewards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Attachment based on a desire for affiliation with the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internalisation</td>
<td>Involvement predicted on congruence between individuals and organisational values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer and Allen's three-component model (1991)</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>The employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>An awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>A feeling of obligation to continue employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are clear differences and similarities between all of the commitment models. A major factor that distinguishes the different forms of commitment from one another in the various models is the mindsets that accompany the commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

a. O'Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) model

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) developed their multidimensional framework on the basis of Kelman’s (1958) work on attitude and behaviour change. Kelman (1958) distinguished between three different processes influencing attitude change, namely: compliance, identification and internalisation. O'Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) model is based on the assumption that commitment represents an attitude towards the organisation, and that there are various mechanisms through which attitudes can develop.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986, p. 493) defined commitment as “the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organisation”, and maintained that commitment will reflect the degree to which the individual internalises or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organisation. According to the above authors (1986), this psychological attachment to the organisation can reflect varying combinations of three distinct forms:

- *compliance*, which occurs when attitudes and corresponding behaviours are adopted in order to gain specific, extrinsic rewards
• *identification*, which occurs when an individual accepts influence to establish or maintain a satisfying relationship, that is, a desire for affiliation

• *internalisation*, which occurs when influence is accepted because the attitudes and behaviours one is being encouraged to adopt are congruent with existing organisational values

Research by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) provided evidence that identification and internalisation are negatively related to turnover intention and actual turnover, and positively related to prosocial behaviour. Compliance indicated the reverse and contributed uniquely to the predication of turnover intention.

The impact of O'Reilly and Chatman's model (1986), however, has been weakened because of the difficulty of distinguishing identification and internalisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Owing to the limitation of this model, Meyer and Allen's (1991) model was deemed more suitable for use in this study.

*b. Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model*

Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organisational commitment can be regarded as the dominant model in organisational commitment research (Farris, 2012; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Nazari & Emami, 2012; Solinger, Van Olffen & Roe, 2008; WeiBo, Kaur & Jun, 2010) and has undergone the most extensive empirical evaluation to date (Johnson et al., 2009; Krishnaveni & Ramkumar, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2004).

The model was developed on the basis of the observation that there were similarities and differences in the existing unidimensional concepts of organisational commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2004). The commonalities existing between all the unidimensional concepts resulted in the belief that commitment binds an individual to an organisation and reduces his/her intentions to leave (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 2004).
The key differences were in the mindsets presumed to characterise the commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argue that it is necessary to distinguish between the different mindsets that accompany the development of commitment because these mindsets bind an individual to a course of action.

Meyer and Allen (1991) integrated attitudinal and behavioural approaches to commitment in order to create three distinct dimensions. The different dimensions or mindsets are described in the three-component model of commitment as affective, continuance and normative, and differ in terms of the link between the employee and the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The affective and normative components reflect employees’ attitudinal dispositions, whereas the continuance component indicates their behavioural orientation (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that the three components reflect either (1) a desire (affective commitment), (2) a need (continuance commitment), or (3) an obligation (normative commitment) to maintain employment in an organisation.

Meyer and Allen (1997) noted that the various definitions of organisational commitment reflect three broad themes as indicated by the category labels in table 2.5. In other words, commitment was viewed as reflecting an affective orientation towards the organisation, recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organisation and a moral obligation to remain with it (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen (1991) view affective, continuance, and normative commitment as components as opposed to types of commitment. They believe that an employee can experience all three forms to varying degrees, and that all three components can exert independent (and possibly interactive) effects on a particular behaviour.
Table 2.5  
Definitions of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p.12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Orientation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The attachment of an individual’s fund of affectivity and emotion to the group (Kanter, 1968, p. 507)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization (Sheldon, 1971, p. 143)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent (Hall, Schneider &amp; Nygren, 1970, pp. 176-177)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A partisan, affective attachment to goals and values of the organization, to one’s role in the relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth (Buchanan, 1974, p. 533)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday, Porter &amp; Steers, 1982, p. 27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost-Based</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profit associated with continued participation and “cost” associated with leaving (Kanter, 1968, p. 504)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity (Becker, 1960, p. 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organizational transactions and alterations in side bets or investments over time (Hrebiniak &amp; Alutto, 1972, p. 556)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligation or Moral Responsibility</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment behaviours are socially acceptable behaviors that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment (Wiener &amp; Gechman, 1977, p. 48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests (Wiener, 1982, p. 421)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives him or her over the years (Marsh &amp; Mannari, 1977, p. 59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Meyer and Allen (1991), one of the main reasons for distinguishing between the different forms of organisational commitment was that they have different implications for behaviour. Although all three forms tend to bind employees to the organisation, and
therefore relate negatively to turnover, their relations with other types of work behaviour may be quite different. Research shows that affective commitment has the strongest positive correlation with job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and attendance, followed by normative commitment. Continuance commitment tends to be unrelated or negatively related to these behaviours (Meyer et al., 2004).

Meyer and Allen (1984) posit that organisational commitment is a psychological state linking employees to the organisation, which is multifaceted in both form (affective, continuance, normative) and focus (organisational, work team, top management, team leader).

Because of the conceptual distinctions between the three components of commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) also suggested that affective, normative and continuance commitment will probably develop as the result of different causes or experiences, and have different implications for on-the-job behaviour and turnover, as illustrated in figure 2.2 below.
Figure 2.2: A three-component conceptualisation of organisational commitment (adapted from Meyer & Allen, 1991)

i. Affective commitment

Meyer and Allen (1997, p. 11) define affective commitment as “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization.” The development of affective commitment is based on the exchange principle – individuals commit themselves to the organisation in return for the rewards received or the punishments avoided (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Affective or emotional attachment to the organisation is the most prevalent component describing organisational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).
According to Meyer and Allen (1997), affective commitment is probably the most desirable form of commitment and the one that organisations are most likely to want to instil in their employees because it involves employees having an emotional attachment to the organisation. Affectively committed individuals continue their employment with an organisation because they want to (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Manetjie and Martins (2009) conclude that respondents who are affectively committed to the organisation are more willing to maintain their relationship with the organisation than those who are normatively and continuance committed.

However, other researchers (e.g. Farris, 2012; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002; Somers, 2010) emphasise the need to foster multiple organisational commitment forms as opposed to only focussing on affective commitment. Farris (2012) posits that the best model for predicting job satisfaction results from utilising all three forms of commitment. Based on their research findings Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, and Wright (2005) argue that profiles or combinations of affective and continuance commitment may lead to better performance than just considering commitment forms independently.

It has been suggested (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997) that the antecedents of affective attachment to the organisation fall into the following three categories: personal characteristics (which include demographic variables as well as dispositional variables such as personality and values), work experiences and organisational structural characteristics.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), the strongest evidence has been provided for work experience antecedents, particularly those experiences that fulfil employees’ psychological needs to feel comfortable in the organisation and competent in the work role. Job characteristics (such as job challenge, job role and degree of autonomy) also have strong correlations with affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Relations between demographic variables and affective commitment are neither strong nor consistent (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Studies report that gender and affective commitment are unrelated, while evidence suggests that age and affective commitment are weakly related (Meyer & Allen, 1997).
In terms of organisational structural characteristics, positive correlations have been found between perceptions of fairness of policies introduced in organisations and affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Guerrero and Herrbach (2009) found a significant correlation between perceived organisational support and affective commitment.

The consequences of affective commitment are important to organisations because Meyer and Allen (1997) found that employees with strong affective commitment feel emotionally attached to the organisation, and will have a greater motivation or desire to contribute meaningfully to the organisation than an employee with weak affective commitment would. Janet, Cadwallader, and Busch (2008) concluded that a significant correlation exists between motivation and affective commitment.

Affective commitment is also positively correlated to effort and job performance (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1991), satisfaction with the job or training (Meyer et al., 1993); prosocial and citizenship behaviours (Allen & Meyer, 1996); lower levels of absenteeism (Allen & Meyer, 1996), and person-job fit (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Valentine, Godkin & Lucero, 2002). Flu, Bolander, and Jones (2009) found that affective commitment has a positive and direct influence on sales effort. Janet et al. (2008) found a significant relationship between employee affective commitment, performance improvement and the success of change implementation. Labatmediene, Endriulaitiene, and Gustainiene’s (2007) research indicates that affective commitment is the primary predictor of intention to leave.

Meyer and Allen (1997) emphasise the significance of person-job fit. They postulate that when an individual’s needs, values and personalities are congruent with his/her job, it will influence his/her affective commitment. McDonald and Makin (2000), emphasise the role of individuals’ met expectations in terms of the organisation, that is, the psychological contract.

Affective commitment is relevant to this study because it may help to determine employees’ feelings of attachment to the organisation.
Continuance commitment originated from Becker’s (1960) side bets theory. It can be described as the perceived cost an individual associates with leaving an organisation (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Individuals who experience continuance commitment remain with an organisation because they feel they need to or have to (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Continuance commitment can develop as a result of any action or event that increases the costs of leaving the organisation, provided the employee recognises that these costs have been incurred (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). In their three-component model of organisational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) summarised these actions and events in terms of two sets of antecedent variables: investments and alternatives.

Investments specifically tie in with Becker’s (1960) side bets theory. According to Becker (1960, p. 32), “commitments come into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity.” A side bet involves the investment of something valuable (say, time, effort and money) that an employee would lose if he/she were to leave the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to Becker (1960), the likelihood that employees will stay with the organisation will be positively related to the magnitude and number of side bets they recognise; and the number of feasible alternatives. Like investments, the lack of employment alternatives also increases the perceived costs associated with leaving the organisation (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Employees who believe they have several alternatives will have weaker continuance commitment than those who perceive they have fewer alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Continuance commitment is related to higher levels of investment to the job and is reflected, say, in tenure (Meyer et al., 1993). Continuance commitment increases as organisational and positional tenure increase (Allen & Meyer, 1993). Perceptions of alternatives can also be influenced by previous job search attempts, whether other organisations have tried to recruit the employee, and the extent to which family factors limit the employee’s ability to relocate (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Previous studies have associated continuance commitment with adverse organisational outcomes, such as employee
intention to leave the organisation (Labatmediene et al., 2007; O'Donnell, Jayawardana & Jayakody, 2012). Meyer et al. (2002) have demonstrated in their research that continuance commitment is negatively correlated with turnover intention. They suggest that organisations attempting to decrease turnover intention should potentially increase continuance commitment.

Continuance commitment is relevant to this study because it may help to determine employees’ intention to continue working at their current organisation.

**iii. Normative commitment**

Normative commitment refers to an employee’s feelings of obligation or duty to remain with an organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Employees internalise organisational goals and values, such that they become committed to the organisation because they believe it to be the moral or right thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

According to Wiener (1982), normative commitment to the organisation develops on the basis of a collection of pressures that individuals feel during their early socialisation (from family and culture) and during their socialisation as newcomers to the organisation.

A potential antecedent for normative commitment is the psychological contract between the individual and the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The psychological contract creates either a transactional or relational employee obligation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). A transactional psychological contract is based on economic exchange (e.g. a willingness to work overtime in exchange for extra pay), while a relational psychological contract is based on social exchange (e.g. loyalty to the employer in exchange for job security) (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Normative commitment to the organisation has been positively related to such work behaviours as job performance, work attendance and organisational citizenship (Döckel 2003; Döckel et al., 2006). It is reflected in more positive work experiences and to a
general sense of obligation to others (Meyer et al., 1993), as well as more prosocial and citizenship behaviours (Allen & Meyer, 1996).

Normative commitment is relevant to this study because it may help to determine employees’ sense of duty and responsibility towards the organisation.

2.2.2 Practical implications of organisational commitment

Commitment is generally measured in the organisational behaviour literature using three different conceptualisations, namely the psychological state reflected in commitment, the antecedent conditions leading to its development and the behaviours that are expected to result from commitment (Carbery, Garavan, O’Brien & McDonnell, 2003).

Meyer and Allen (1997) proposed a specific model for the antecedents and consequences of organisational commitment. The model establishes the following two main blocks of variables that influence the development of organisational commitment in the individual:

- **Distal variables.** These include variables associated with the characteristics of the organisation (e.g. size, structure and climate); personal characteristics (e.g. demographics, values and expectations); socialisation experiences (e.g. cultural, familial and organisational); management practices (e.g. selection, training and compensation); and environment conditions (e.g. unemployment rate, family responsibility and union status).

- **Proximal variables.** These include work experiences (e.g. job scope, relationships, participation, support and justice); role states (e.g. ambiguity, conflict and work overload); and psychological contracts (e.g. economic and social exchange).

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), affective commitment is developed through work experiences like job challenge, degree of autonomy, the variety of skills used by the employee, knowing the role that the employee plays in his/her organisation and the relationship between the employee and his/her co-workers and supervisor. Continuance
commitment is developed by assessing the perceived transferability of the employee’s skills and education to other organisations, and the individual’s perception of his/her job opportunities outside the current organisation. The development of normative commitment is based mainly on the process of socialisation and acculturation of values such as loyalty.

The consequences or organisational commitment are retention (which includes turnover intention and turnover), productive behaviour (e.g. attention, performance and citizenship), and employee well-being (which includes psychological health and career progress) (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

2.2.2.1 Organisational perspective

Organisational commitment is a variable that indicates the way in which individuals perceive their relationship with their organisation, what binds them to the organisation and what makes them want to stay with that particular organisation (Mowday et al., 1982). By understanding this relationship better, organisations are better equipped to develop and introduce strategies to strength the person-organisation fit (Mowday et al., 1982).

Valentine et al.’s (2002) research results indicate that corporate ethical values in organisations are positively related to organisational commitment and that organisational commitment is also positively related to person-organisation fit.

Rashid, Murali, and Johari (2003) examined the influence of corporate culture and organisational commitment on financial performance in Malaysian companies. Their results revealed a significant correlation between corporate culture and organisational commitment, with both of these having an influence on the financial performance of these companies. Lok and Crawford’s (2004) study, using Australian and Hong Kong samples, also confirmed that organisational culture and leadership styles are significant organisational antecedents of organisational commitment. Farahani, Taghadosi, and Behboudi (2011) conducted a study in which they found that transformational leadership correlated positively and strongly with organisational commitment.
Organisational commitment is a crucial factor in achieving organisational success (Allen & Meyer, 1996) because it helps to promote employee retention and productive behaviour (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

a. Retention: turnover intention and turnover

Several reviews report consistent negative correlations between organisational commitment and both employee intention to leave the organisation and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; O’Donnell et al., 2012; Tett & Meyer, 1993). In fact, Allen and Meyer (1996, p. 252) maintain that organisational commitment can generally be defined “as a psychological link between the employee and his or her organisation that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organisation.” A South African study by Vallabh and Donald (2001) found the correlation between organisational commitment and intention to leave to be significant and negative for both white and black managers. However, the correlation was stronger for black managers.

Organisational commitment has even been found to be significantly related to intention to emigrate (Miller, Haskell & Thatcher, 2002).

A study by Labatmediene et al. (2007) using a sample of employees in various organisations in Lithuania, found a significant negative relationship between organisational commitment and intention to leave the organisation; with organisational commitment explaining 31% of variance in intention to leave the organisation. According to Labatmediene et al. (2007), the conclusion that can be drawn from their research is that more committed employees are less likely to have intentions to leave the organisation. They propose that organisations can benefit from understanding the predictors of organisational commitment because this will enable them to initiate interventions when problems with turnover intention occur.

Turnover is the most widely studied behavioural correlate of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). A longitudinal field study conducted by Neininger, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Kauffeld, and Henschel (2010) indicates that organisational commitment increases job satisfaction
and reduces turnover intention (and moreover, that these effects increase over time). According to Lok and Crawford (2004), when employees are dissatisfied at work, they are less committed and will look for other opportunities to quit.

Suliman and Al-Junaibi (2010) conducted research within the oil industry to explore the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and organisational commitment. SamGnanakkan (2010) examined communication and information technology professionals in India to assess the relationship between employees’ organisational commitment and turnover intention. Both studies concluded that a negative relationship exists between an individual’s organisational commitment and turnover intention.

Several studies support the notion that affective commitment is the main component of organisational commitment in predicting turnover intention (Jaros, 1997; Law, 2005). In a study investigating all three components of commitment, Somers (1995) found only affective commitment, to be a consistent predictor of turnover. He did, however, find that continuance commitment interacted with affective commitment in predicting job withdrawal intentions.

A study by Lazar (2005) found that affective and normative levels of commitment are the best predictors in examining an employee’s intent to leave an organisation. These findings imply that employees stay in an organisation, not as a result of the costs they may incur in leaving it, but because of their feelings of obligation and emotional attachment to the organisation.

As reported in Allen and Meyer (1996), various studies have measured the correlations between turnover intention and commitment. Turnover intention is consistently and significantly related to affective commitment (with correlations between 0.29 and 0.61) and normative commitment (correlations range from 0.20 to 0.38). Correlations between continuance commitment and turnover intentions are less consistent across studies, ranging from 0.00 and 0.42.

Quantitative summaries of findings have demonstrated that the relationships between organisational commitment and turnover have produced few large correlations. One
explanation for the low commitment-turnover correlations is that other variables probably moderate this relationship (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

b. **Productive behaviour**

Several studies have examined the relationships between organisational commitment and attendance (or its inverse, absenteeism) and have found a positive relationship between commitment and attendance (Ferreira, Basson & Coetzee, 2010; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

A number of studies have discussed the relationship between organisational commitment and job performance (e.g. Camilleri & van der Heijden, 2007; Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Sinclair et al., 2005). Sinclair et al. (2005) examined the effects of performance resulting from different combinations of affective and continuance commitment. They concluded that organisational commitment combinations that include weak affective commitment are associated with weaker performance measurements. Sinclair et al. (2005) suggest that increasing affective commitment should result in an increase in performance.

Hunter and Thatcher (2007) also found that affective commitment to an organisation is positively related to higher employee performance. Kelidbari, Dizgah, and Yusefi (2011) found that all three dimensions of organisational commitment correlated with job performance, with normative commitment having the strongest influence on performance. In research conducted by Mehmud, Ali, Baloch, and Khan (2010) affective, continuance and normative commitment accounted for almost 39% of the variance in performance.

In a study of employees from 91 high-tech organisations in Taiwan, Kuo (2013) found that organisational commitment has a positive direct effect on organisational performance. He suggests that the findings indicate that employees who are willing to commit to the organisation, guarantee organisational performance. The findings also show normative commitment followed by affective commitment as being the principal components of organisational performance. Camilleri and van der Heijden (2007) were also able to
observe a positive relationship between performance and organisational commitment in their research.

2.2.2.2 Individual perspective

Organisational commitment is important to individuals because it has been linked to well-being (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Viljoen and Rothman (2009) investigated the relationship between perceived organisational stressors and the levels of commitment and ill-health of staff at a university of technology. They noted that stressors such as job insecurity and lack of autonomy can lead to lower levels of organisational commitment and to higher levels of physical and psychological ill-health. Low individual commitment to the organisation was predicted by five stressors, namely work-life balance, overload, control, job factors and pay.

A South African study conducted by Field and Buitendach (2011), indicates that affective organisational commitment has a positive relationship with life, well-being and work engagement. Research has also linked high levels of organisational commitment with positive personal attitudes such as feelings of belonging, security, efficacy, purpose in life, and a positive self-image (Mowday et al., 1982).

Individual characteristics such as an employee’s work values (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001) and emotional and practical intelligence abilities (Humphreys, Weyant & Sprague, 2003) are positively related to his/her level of commitment to the organisation. The results of a study by Spagnoli and Caetano (2012) demonstrate how personality variables may directly and indirectly affect organisational commitment. Humphreys et al.’s (2003) research indicates that those employees who describe themselves as highly committed tend to view their leaders as more effective and inspirational (transformational).

Furthermore, the nature of the employee’s relationship with an organisation also impacts on organisational commitment. The results of a survey by Briscoe and Finkelstein (2009) suggest that a protean or boundaryless relationship between employer and organisation does not automatically result in less organisational commitment.
Lumley et al. (2011) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment using a South African sample. Their findings suggest significant relationships between job satisfaction and affective and normative commitment. Farris (2012) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and affective, continuance and normative commitment. They found that the interactional effects of the three forms of commitment predicted job satisfaction with 47% accuracy.

### 2.2.3 Organisational commitment research

Research has shown that the concept of organisational commitment is distinguishable from other constructs such as job satisfaction (Hardin, 1995), work engagement and job involvement (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006), motivation (Meyer et al., 2004), occupational commitment, turnover intentions, work group attachment and the Protestant work ethic (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Organisational commitment has been analysed from several perspectives (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001). It has been studied as both a dependent variable for antecedents such as age, tenure and education and as a predictor of various outcomes such as turnover, intention to leave, absenteeism and performance (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001). Its impact and influence on work outcomes such as turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Farris, 2012; Lew, 2009; Suliman & Iles, 2000), job satisfaction (Farris, 2012, Lumley et al., 2011; Meyer et al., 1993; Sing et al., 2011), job performance and business success (Jaros, 1997; Kelidbari et al., 2011; Mehmud et al., 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000), are well documented. Research by Martin (2008) indicates that affective commitment has a positive influence on normative commitment, and continuance commitment is determined by normative commitment and affective commitment.

A large amount of research has also been undertaken to investigate how commitment can be built (McKenna, 2005). Bedeian, Kemery, and Pizzolatto’s (1991) data indicate that it is the absence of career growth opportunities that prompt individuals with high career commitment to consider leaving an organisation. By contrast, a reverse relation appears to exist for individuals with low career commitment.
Guerrero and Herrbach (2009) conducted research to assess the factors which influence organisational commitment. Their goal was to consider those influencing factors associated with organisational characteristics and organisational work characteristics. In regards to organisational characteristics, they found that perceived external prestige influences affective and normative commitment. In regards to organisational work characteristics, they concluded that perceived organisational support influences affective commitment.

Several studies have found a positive correlation between human resource management practices and organisational commitment; and that these practices influence an employee’s decision to stay or leave an organisation (Chew & Chan, 2008; Hashim, 2010; Zaitouni, Sawalha & El Sharif, 2011).

Results of a study conducted by Abdulkadir, Isiaka, and Adedoyin (2012), indicate that human resource practices such as performance appraisals, career planning and employee participation significantly correlate with organisational commitment and explain 63% of the variation in the outcome.

According to McKenna (2005), evidence linking personal characteristics to commitment has shown mixed results, but there appears to be no relationship between demographic variables (such as age and gender) and commitment. Kipkebut’s (2010) organisational research in a non-Western environment shows that the three forms of commitment are influenced by demographics.

Research by Martin and Roodt (2008) indicates that organisational commitment has a significant relationship with the age of the respondent (i.e. organisational commitment increases as age increases), race of the respondent (black respondents were more positive than white respondents about their commitment to the organisation), and academic qualification (organisational commitment decreased as level of education increased).
Allen and Meyer’s (1993) study indicates that affective and normative commitment increases across age, while continuance commitment increases as organisational and positional tenure increases.

### 2.2.3.1 Gender

There are also contradictory findings in the relevant literature on the relationship between gender and organisational commitment (Martin & Roodt, 2008). Some studies indicate that gender is not significantly related to commitment (Al-Ajmi, 2006; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003), while others have found gender to be a significant predictor of commitment (Elizur, & Koslowsky, 2001; Khalili & Asmawi, 2012; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Pretorius & Roodt, 2004).

Research by Labatmediene et al. (2007) suggests that males and females have the same general organisational, continuance and normative commitment, but there are differences between men and women in the case of affective commitment. Their findings suggest that men have a higher level of affective or emotional attachment to their organisation than women. Other research indicates that women are more committed than men, although the magnitude of this effect is small (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Khalili and Asmawi (2012) conducted a quantitative study using a random sample survey design to collect data from employees. Their results show that affective and continuance commitment is similar for men and women. However, normative commitment appears to be different between men and women.

### 2.2.3.2 Race

There are also contradictory findings in the relevant literature concerning the relationship between race and organisational commitment. Researchers such as Coetzee et al. (2007), Ferreira and Coetzee (2010), and Lumley (2009) did not find significant differences between the organisational commitment levels of the various race groups. However, research by Martin and Roodt (2008) investigating the perceptions of organisational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a post-merger South African
tertiary institution, found that organisational commitment had a significant relationship with the race of the respondent. In their research, the black respondents were more positive than the white respondents about their commitment to the organisation. In contrast, Vallabh and Donald's (2001) research reported the white respondents having higher levels of commitment than their black counterparts.

2.2.3.3 Position

There is limited research available on the relationship between position in organisation and commitment levels (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Lumley (2009) found that supervisors showed a significantly higher score for affective commitment than staff. The results of a study by Ferreira and Coetzee (2010) suggest that employees in managerial positions have higher levels of normative commitment than employees employed at the staff level. DeConnick and Bachmann (1994) found that marketing managers’ intention to leave their jobs was highly influenced by their degree of organisational commitment.

A study of 280 hotel managers in Ireland indicated that a manager’s age, education attainment, reported job satisfaction and organisational commitment (affective) as well as the star rating of the hotel are important in predicting turnover intentions. The results of this study suggest that managers' perceived commitment to the organisation, their perceptions of psychological contract violation, their career anchors and perceptions of managerial competencies, are significant in explaining the turnover cognitions of hotel managers. Organisational commitment appeared to be the most significant variable in explaining the intention to quit measure of variables in the study (Carbery et al., 2003).

According to McDonald and Makin (2000), there are obvious links between the nature of the psychological contract and the individual’s commitment to the organisation. They postulated that employees with contracts that are predominantly transactional in nature are unlikely to have high levels of commitment to the organisation; while those with relational contracts may show much higher levels of commitment. Their research, however, found that the levels of relational and transactional contracts of permanent and temporary staff did not differ significantly.
2.2.3.4 Age

Research by Martin and Roodt (2008) indicated that organisational commitment increases as age increases. Other research also supports this positive relationship between organisational commitment and the age of the respondent (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Brimeyer, Perrucci & Wadsworth, 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Popoola, 2009; Suliman & Illes, 2000). However, in a Taiwanese study by Chen et al. (2012), no significant relationship was evident between age and organisational commitment.

Allen and Meyer (1993) demonstrated in their research that affective and normative commitment is strongly related to employee age. Ferreira et al. (2010), found older employees to be affectively and normatively more committed to their organisations than their younger counterparts. According to Cohen (1993), for younger employees, the shorter the time separating the measurement of organisational commitment and the occurrence of departure, the stronger the correlations will be.

Finegold, Mohrman, and Spreitzer (2002) investigated whether the elements of the employment relationship that predict commitment and willingness to change organisations varied significantly with age. Using a sample of over 3 000 technical professionals from six large organisations, they found that in comparison with those employees under the age of 30, satisfaction with job security was more strongly related to the commitment of more senior workers (aged 31 and over) and to their desire to remain with their organisations. In contrast, satisfaction with work-life balance is more strongly related to commitment of those under age 30 than those over 30. Also, for those under 30, satisfaction with opportunities to develop technical skills and pay linked to individual performance has a stronger negative relationship with willingness to change companies than those over 45. It should be noted, however, that the size of the effects is relatively small.

Research by Lub, Bijvank, Bal, Blomme, and Schalk (2012) suggests that opportunities for development and challenge, variation and responsibility are more important for younger generations of hospitality employees. Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980) placed higher value on work-life balance, autonomy and security. Significantly lower commitment
and higher turnover intention were evident for Generation Y (born after 1980). Baby Boomers (born between 1945 and 1964) and Generation X both had stronger affective and continuance commitment to their organisations than Generation Y.

2.2.4 Evaluating organisational commitment

Suliman and Iles (2000) examined the validity and reliability of affective, continuance and normative commitment in a sample of 1 000 employees. They found that even in a world of work characterised by increased re-engineering, corporate restructuring and downsizing, the results support the multidimensionality of organisational commitment.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), commitment will always have relevance even as the world of work changes. They postulated that as organisations become leaner, for example, it would become even more important for them to have a core of committed people who are the organisation. Kuo (2013) maintains that regardless of how the industrial environment changes in terms of complexity and diversity, organisational commitment will remain crucial because it is only through the long-term retention of human capital that organisational performance can be sustained and enhanced.

From the employee perspective, the focus of commitment may be less on the organisations and more on other areas in their lives, for example, commitment to their profession (Döckel, 2003). Individuals also tend to have multiple commitments as opposed to only the traditional organisational commitment (Baruch, 2004). For example, individuals tend to have work-related commitments (organisation, leader, team, colleagues, union, and profession), family-related commitments (spouse, children and parents), commitments in other life domains (country, friends and pets) and commitment to self (time for self and hobbies/leisure activities) (Baruch, 2004).

However, according to Cohen (2007) the three-component model has three major limitations. He argues that the model had limited predictive validity; criticizes the overlap between affective and normative commitment; and argues that continuance commitment is unclear. Cohen (2007) defines organisational commitment as both instrumental attachment and psychological attachment. He proposes that the concept has two
dimensions: the base of commitment and the time of entry into the organisation. Cohen (2007) redefines normative commitment as commitment propensity that occurs before and after the employee enters the organisation; and conceptualises continuance commitment as the benefits employees perceive with staying in the organisation as opposed to the associated cost of leaving it.

Somers (2009) defines organisational commitment as a combined influence of several commitment profiles which affects the general psychological state of the employee and determines how he/she experiences organisational commitment. Somers (2009) suggests that a new approach to commitment theory would involve combining multiple forms of commitment rather than a single form. Cohen’s (2007) and Somers’ (2009) models of organisational commitment, however, lack empirical validation and instruments to test their theories.

2.3 TURNOVER INTENTION

Employee turnover intention and turnover have long been a topic of interest to researchers and practitioners mainly because of the negative consequences of actual turnover (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000; Hom, Mitchell, Lee & Griffeth, 2012; Jiang, Liu, McKay, Lee & Mitchell, 2012; Siong, Mellor, Moore & Firth, 2006; Tian-Foreman, 2009). “Firms that attract, develop, and retain top talent will thrive, those that do not will face significant struggles” (Brooks, Holtom, Mitchell, Lee & Inderrieden, 2005, p. 337). As the global economy becomes increasingly knowledge based, the attraction and retention of high quality employees becomes a competitive advantage (Felps et al., 2009; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee & Eberly, 2008).

In the era of globalisation, turnover is a persistent problem in organisations (Yin-Fah et al., 2010), with many organisations experiencing an increase in turnover immediately after a major organisational change such as a merger or a reorganisation (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001). Changing jobs is no longer viewed as an impediment to an employee’s career - in fact staying with one employer is now regarded as the exception (Brooks et al., 2005).
Turnover has a negative impact on organisational effectiveness (Pienaar, Sieberhagen & Mostert, 2007), and the personal and organisational costs of voluntary employee turnover are high (Jones, Massey Kantak, Futrell & Johnston, 1996; Mallol et al., 2007; Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablynski & Erez, 2001b). The costs of turnover to organisations are one of the reasons why so much effort has been put into understanding the antecedents of turnover (Holtom et al., 2008).

Personal costs include the stress of starting a new job, uncertainty and ambiguity surrounding the new job and numerous possible adjustments such as a new house and schooling if relocation is necessary (Brooks et al., 2005; Mitchell et al., 2001a).

At organisational level, turnover can have a direct effect on an organisation’s bottom line by affecting costs, sales and profits (Holtom et al., 2008; Jones et al., 1996). Standard estimates of turnover costs range from a one-time annual salary to a seven-time salary (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001). According to Allen, Bryant, and Vardaman (2010), the costs of recruiting and training replacement employees range from 90 to 200% of annual pay.

High costs for an organisation due to turnover, start prior to separation, through lower productivity of the employee intending to leave, and continuing difficulties after actual separation (Hsu et al., 2003). The costs of turnover may include both direct costs such as the costs required for reselection and retraining; and indirect costs, including the loss of valuable knowledge, skills and experience, and decreased levels of morale of the remaining employees (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Chang, 1999; Davidson et al., 2010; Holtom et al., 2008; Mitchell et al., 2001a). The organisation may even experience the loss of competitive position as their competitors gain insight by hiring these employees (Hsu et al., 2003). The costs resulting from turnover become even more serious when the organisation loses talented and highly committed employees (Chang, 1999).

By identifying factors that may be related to turnover intention, organisations and researchers may proactively identify the key determinants of turnover, and develop and manage strategies to decrease voluntary turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001a; Pienaar et al., 2007). Identifying the key determinants of turnover may help organisations to decrease
replacement costs, and prevent them from spending time and money on factors that do not really resolve the problem (Cooper, 2010).

Depending on what the organisation’s real costs and causes of turnover are, the remedies may be significantly different (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001). According to Bigliardi et al. (2005), anything that can be done to reduce turnover intention (and thus turnover) will lead to significant benefits for an organisation. Reducing turnover is beneficial to organisations because the retention of key employees creates a sustainable competitive advantage (Lub et al., 2012).

2.3.1 Conceptualisation

Turnover intention literature uses many terms interchangeably to describe this construct. Some of the terms used are propensity to leave, staying or leaving intentions, intent to leave and intention to quit (Wilson, 2006). Intention to leave refers to an individual’s reduced level of commitment, which results in an increased desire to leave the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982).

A distinction needs to be made between turnover intentions and actual turnover. While turnover intention measures an individual’s thoughts about leaving an organisation (SamGnanakkan, 2010) and is conceived to be “a conscious and deliberate wilfulness to leave the organisation”, turnover is understood to be the actual termination of an employee’s employment with an organisation (Tett & Meyer, 1993, p. 262). Turnover is defined as voluntary or involuntary departure from an organisation (Jones et al., 1996).

Voluntary turnover research has traditionally followed two main paths, namely the study of turnover from an attitudinal perspective (i.e. looking at its link to organisational commitment and job satisfaction) and the influence of the labour market on turnover in terms of the perceived availability of alternative positions (Mallol et al., 2007).

The causal relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover is well established in research literature with the underlying premise that turnover intention is the most important antecedent and predictor of turnover decision (Hsu et al., 2003; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wells & Peachey, 2011). One way to
reduce actual turnover is therefore to lower the rate of employees’ turnover intention (Hsu et al. 2003). The average correlation between turnover intention and actual turnover has been estimated to be between 0.38 (Griffeth et al., 2000) and 0.65 (Tett & Meyer, 1993) (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011).

It should be noted that turnover intention does not always result in actual turnover behaviour. Possible explanations for this include the following: (1) it does not account for impulsive behaviour, (2) it does not adequately capture perception and evaluation of alternatives, and (3) it does not take personal circumstances into account. Organisational and external conditions may result in a change in decision (Mobley et al., 1979).

Not all turnover is bad, and research has distinguished between functional and dysfunctional turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Brooks et al., 2005; Holtom et al., 2008). What employees do while they are with the organisation is as important (if not more important) as how long they remain with an organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1996). However, even if some forms of turnover are desirable (e.g. losing poorly performing employees); most researchers use this term to refer to the loss of valued employees (Bigliardi et al., 2005). Because it is impossible to sustain zero turnover, organisations need to make sure they know who they are most and least willing to lose (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001).

In this study, turnover intention was defined as an individual’s behavioural intention to leave the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Mobley et al., 1979). The focus was on voluntary turnover, which is a function of perceived ease of movement and perceived desirability of movement (Carbery et al., 2003).

Turnover intention, as opposed to actual turnover, was used for this study because not only have researchers found intention to be an accurate predictor of turnover (McKay et al., 2007; Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009), but it is also a more appropriate variable because it gives organisations the ability to intervene and influence the individual’s decision to leave the organisation (Lazar, 2005). By understanding the predictors of turnover intention, organisations can introduce strategies to prevent turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008).
2.3.2 Models

Many theories have been advanced to explain why employees voluntarily leave their organisations (Joseph, Ng, Koh & Ang, 2007; Holtom et al., 2008). Voluntariness of leaving is relevant to consider in evaluating turnover models because these models generally apply to voluntary termination of employment (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Models include the theory of organisational equilibrium (March & Simon, 1958); the met expectations model (Porter & Steers, 1973); the linkage model (Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1978); the unfolding model of turnover (Lee & Mitchell 1994; Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel & Hill, 1999); and the job embeddedness theory of turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001b).

2.3.2.1 Organisational equilibrium theory

March and Simon’s (1958) organisational equilibrium theory focuses on the psychological constructs of perceived ease of movement and the desirability of leaving one’s job (Crossley, Bennett, Jex & Burnfield, 2007; Joseph et al., 2007; Holtom et al., 2008). The theory postulates that turnover occurs when individuals’ perception of what they are contributing to the organisation exceeds the inducements or rewards they are receiving from an organisation (Joseph et al., 2007). According to this theory, the inducement-contribution relationship is influenced by two factors: an individual’s desire to leave an organisation (which is generally determined by levels of job satisfaction) and the ease with which an individual is able to move to another organisation (which is influenced by both macro and individual factors) (Joseph et al., 2007). Both factors were proposed to operate independently to influence an employee’s motivation to leave an organisation (Holtom et al., 2008).

2.3.2.2 Met expectations theory

Porter and Steers’ (1973) met expectations theory builds on the organisation equilibrium theory and proposes that met expectations are a key determinant in turnover decisions. They argue that dissatisfaction arises when an organisation fails to meet the employee’s expectations, resulting in dissatisfaction and ultimately turnover.
Porter and Steers (1973) investigated the various factors that potentially relate to turnover intention. These factors include organisation-wide factors (e.g. pay and promotional policies, and organisational size), job content factors (e.g. job autonomy and responsibility, and role clarity) and personal factors (e.g., age, tenure and personality characteristics).

2.3.2.3 **Linkage model**

Mobley’s (1977) linkage model proposes a series of linkages between job satisfaction and turnover. According to Mobley (1977), one of the consequences of dissatisfaction is thoughts of quitting. He then suggests that the next step in the withdrawal decision is an evaluation of the expected utility of search (which includes an estimate of the chances of finding an alternate job) and the cost of quitting. He identified a more comprehensive withdrawal process and highlighted the sequence of steps employees go through before deciding to leave an organisation (Holtom et al., 2008). According to this model, job dissatisfaction triggers a linear series of withdrawal cognitions in which employees examine the costs and benefits associated with leaving their jobs. These cognitive evaluations start with initial thoughts of leaving the job followed by the comparison between the current job and possible job alternatives. When a more attractive job is found, the employee develops an intention to quit and consequently leaves the organisation (Bluedorn, 1982; Jawahar & Hemmasi, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Mobley et al., 1978; Wheeler, Gallagher, Brouer & Sablonski, 2007).

Mobley (1977) recognised the fact that for some individuals, the decision to leave an organisation was an impulsive act and did not follow his proposed steps.

Several studies conducted to test Mobley’s (1977) model found that many of the model’s linkages were not significant, had small effects or had signs that opposed the predicted relationship (Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009).

2.3.2.4 **Steers and Mowday’s (1981) model**

Steers and Mowday (1981) extended March and Simon’s (1958) approach, and suggested a complex 13-stage model of the process of voluntary employee turnover (Rusbult &
Farrell, 1983). They proposed that that the immediate antecedents of an employee leaving an organisation are the interaction of turnover intention and alternate job opportunities, organisational characteristics and the employee’s affective experiences in the workplace (Lee & Mowday, 1987).

Their model includes as antecedents of turnover, variables such as individual expectations, job experiences, affective responses to jobs, nonwork-related influences, intentions to stay, search for alternatives and availability of alternatives (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983).

Lee and Mowday (1987) tested propositions derived from Steers and Mowday’s (1981) model, using a group of employees in a financial institution. The results of the study indicated that met expectations, job values, job attitudes, intention to leave the organisation and actual leaving were related to many, although not all theorised antecedent variables (Lee & Mowday, 1987).

2.3.2.5 Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model of voluntary turnover

The unfolding model of voluntary turnover proposed by Lee and Mitchell (1994) examines different psychological paths individuals take when leaving organisations. They argue that turnover cannot be explained by linear decision making because turnover is a more complex process with both market-pull and psychological-push approaches contributing to the decision and behaviours of people who voluntarily leave an organisation. Lee and Mitchell (1994) based their theory on Beach’s (1993) image theory which describes the process of how individuals evaluate information during decision making. According to Beach (1993), individuals use the following three different schematic knowledge structures to organise their decisions: the value image (the individual’s principles which guide his/her decisions), the trajectory image (previously adopted goals) and the strategic image (the individual’s various plans for achieving his/her goals).

Lee and Mitchell (1994) reasoned that expected or unexpected shocks to individuals’ status quo would lead them to assess their fit with their current job or organisation, causing
them to take various decision paths. The major components of the unfolding model include shocks, scripts, image violations, job satisfaction and job search (Lee & Mitchell, 1994).

The model highlights four distinctive psychological paths that individuals may follow prior to actual turnover. Each decision path involves distinctive foci, psychological processes and external events, as highlighted below (Lee & Mitchell, 1994):

- **Path 1** begins with an environmental event (or shock) which triggers the enactment of the pre-existing action plan, and causes individuals to evaluate previous experiences for similarities to the present shock. If the shock matches the action plan, employees leave without making fit judgements and without considering job alternatives. Decision path 1 describes a fairly automatic, simple and script-driven process. It involves minimal mental deliberation.

- **Path 2** describes how a shock may lead individuals to reassess their commitment to and fit within an organisation. Should the shock lead to an assessment of misfit, individuals are more likely to leave an organisation even without searching for job alternatives. It describes a more employee-controlled process that focuses on the compatibility of images and involves more mental deliberation than path 1.

- The shock resulting in decision path 3 causes individuals to assess whether or not their commitment can be associated with a different organisation. If the individual believes that a job alternative will not provide better fit than the current job, he/she will remain with his/her current organisation. This path requires considerable mental deliberation and involves image compatibility and assessment of alternatives.

- Finally, in path 4, even when there is no shock (i.e. a jarring event), individuals change over time and reassess commitment to the organisation, which can lead to turnover. Turnover in path 4 may occur even when the individual does not have suitable alternatives. The individual realises he/she is dissatisfied and either leaves after searching for alternatives (path 4b) or leaves without searching for alternatives (path 4a).

While previous research on employee turnover focused on job dissatisfaction and perceived alternatives as catalysts for voluntary turnover, Lee and Mitchell’s (1994)
unfolding model of voluntary turnover focused on alternative pathways to voluntary turnover that are not induced by job dissatisfaction (Crossley et al., 2007). They maintained that whereas quitting a job is often preceded by some degree of mental consideration (e.g. comparison with alternative jobs), remaining with an organisation may simply be the result of maintaining the status quo (Crossley et al., 2007). On the basis of this notion, Mitchell et al. (2001a, 2001b) argued that individuals can become stuck or “embedded” in their jobs as a result of various on-the-job and off-the-job factors.

2.3.2.6 Job embeddedness theory

Mitchell et al. (2001a, p. 102) used the term “job embeddedness” to summarise “a broad constellation of factors influencing retention.” According to the job embeddedness theory, employees become embedded in their jobs in the following situations (Mitchell et al., 2001a):

- They have strong connections or links with the organisation. These links could be the result of other people in the organisation, the actual job or the organisation itself.
- Employees’ perceive compatibility or fit with an organisation. Factors influencing their feelings of fit include their actual jobs, colleagues and organisational culture.
- Leaving the organisation would entail great sacrifice.

Mitchell et al. (2001a, 2001b) labelled these three factors “links”, “fit” and “sacrifice”, and posited that these dimensions are important both on and off the job.

Job embeddedness has been negatively related to intention to leave and actual turnover. Individuals in the study who reported being more embedded in their jobs were less likely to leave their organisation (Mitchell et al., 2001a, 2001b).

With a sample of retail employees and another sample of hospital employees, Mitchell et al. (2001b) reported that job embeddedness was negatively correlated with intention to leave and predicted subsequent voluntary turnover. A study by Mallol et al. (2007) suggests that while job embeddedness may vary in strength across different demographic groups (Hispanics and Caucasians); it was still a good predictor of employee retention.
2.3.2.7 Recent research

Felps et al. (2009) developed and tested a model of turnover in which the job embeddedness and job search behaviours of co-workers influence employees’ decisions to quit. In a sample of 45 branches of a regional bank and 1,038 departments of a national hospitality firm, multilevel analysis revealed that co-workers’ embeddedness and job search behaviours explain variances in individual voluntary turnover over and above that explained by other individual and group-level predictors. Their results suggest that co-workers’ job embeddedness and job search behaviours play critical roles in explaining why people quit their jobs.

Hom et al. (2012) reconceptualised employee turnover by proposing “proximal withdrawal states” that motivate employees to stay with or leave an organisation. They looked at two overarching dimensions: desired employment status (whether employees want to stay or leave) and perceived volitional control (whether decisions to stay and leave are completely up to employees or also influenced by external variables). Hom et al. (2012) regard desire for leaving (or staying) as an immediate precursor to actual leaving.

2.3.3 Practical implications of turnover intention

There are many reasons why individuals voluntarily leave organisations. Some are personal, for example, changes in family situation, while other reasons are influenced by the organisation, for example, being passed over for promotion. Turnover is a problem because it incurs extensive costs for both individuals and organisations (Mitchell et al., 2001a).

Turnover has a negative impact on organisational effectiveness (Pienaar et al., 2007), and the personal and organisational costs of voluntary employee turnover are high (Mallol et al., 2007). Personal costs include the stress of starting a new job, uncertainty and ambiguity surrounding the new job, and the numerous possible adjustments such as a new house and schooling if relocation is involved. At organisational level, costs could include the loss of valuable knowledge and experience, replacement costs (recruiting and training new employees) and loss in production (Mitchell et al., 2001a).
Although researchers admit that there is no single identifiable variable that can be pinpointed as the leading cause of intention to leave, intention to leave the organisation has been positively correlated with, inter alia, age, years of employment, education, caseload complexity, self-esteem, organisational culture and job satisfaction (Kennedy, 2006). In their literature review on turnover, Mobley et al. (1979) found that turnover intention and commitment-attachment made a stronger contribution to turnover behaviour than job satisfaction and demographic variables.

According to the research findings of Tett and Meyer (1993), job satisfaction and organisational commitment are distinguishable but moderately related constructs; satisfaction and commitment each contribute uniquely to turnover intention; commitment does not correlate more strongly than satisfaction with turnover intentions; and turnover intention is the strongest predictor of actual turnover.

Using a large sample of over 10 000 information technology professionals working in the USA, Quan and Cha (2010) found that past turnover behaviour is a strong predictor of future intentions; and that age, education, work experience, salary, past turnover behaviour and work hours all play a role in formulating turnover intention.

An analysis of a study of engineers in 11 companies (based in Italy) indicated that employees report lower levels of turnover intention when organisational socialisation is prominent and there is an adequate range of opportunities that satisfy career aspirations in the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005). Specifically, the research tested the hypotheses that organisational socialisation, external career opportunities and internal career anchors impact on turnover intention. The results of the analysis revealed negative relationships between the degree of external career opportunities and turnover intention, the level of organisational socialisation and turnover intention and positive relationships between the level of organisational socialisation and the perceived external career opportunities in the organisation. The findings did not support the existence of a relationship between an engineer’s internal career anchors and turnover intention and between external opportunities and internal career anchors (Bigliardi et al., 2005).
2.3.3.1 Organisational perspective

Research on turnover intention can be used to manage the turnover process and help develop strategies or interventions to reduce employee turnover and its associated costs (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012).

Organisations must consider external factors on turnover intention, such as economic conditions, union activity and perceptions of alternate employment opportunities, although they may have little control over them (Wilson, 2006). Work-related factors, however, such as pay, performance and job satisfaction, can be directly influenced by organisations (Wilson, 2006).

A study conducted in the Greek tourism industry found that staff turnover was mainly instigated by factors that were beyond organisations’ control. According to this study, employee turnover negatively affected service quality levels in the industry, as well as the costs and time related to staff recruiting and training. However, the positive side of turnover is that it enhances idea generation, that is, new employees with new ideas (Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010).

Other studies indicate that organisations can exercise control in order to influence employees’ turnover intentions. The results of a study by Du Plooy and Roodt (2010), using a sample of employees in a large South African information and communication technologies sector, found that work engagement and organisational citizenship were significantly and negatively related to turnover intention, while burnout and work alienation were significantly and positively related to turnover intention.

Hsu et al.’s (2003) research examined how a sample of information system employees feel about incentives provided by employers and the significance of these in assessing the employee’s intent to leave. Job security and a service incentive were found to be the most important variables in reducing turnover intent.

Slåtten, Svensson, and Svaeri (2011) proposed that there are indications that employees’ perceived service quality has a direct negative effect on employees’ turnover intentions.
The effect of empowerment, coaching and role clarity on turnover intention appears to be mediated through employees’ perceived service quality.

A survey that included information on attitudes towards benefits and pay satisfaction was used to collect data from Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian employees and entrepreneurs, across a four-year time frame. The findings indicated that attitudes towards benefits were generally significant predictors of turnover for employees and entrepreneurs over a four-year period, while satisfaction with pay was typically significant for employees but not for entrepreneurs (Carraher, 2011).

Research by Wheeler et al. (2007) revealed statistical support that person-organisation misfit and job dissatisfaction do not necessarily lead to turnover intention. Their research suggests that intervening variables, such as job mobility, also influence employees’ turnover intentions. They proposed that individuals who feel misfit with an organisation will only leave the organisation if they believe that alternate job opportunities exist.

a. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has played a major role in turnover research. Pienaar et al. (2007) conducted research in a gold mining company in South Africa. Their results indicated that job satisfaction is the most significant predictor of turnover intention and is strongly and negatively correlated with turnover intention.

A study by Tian-Foreman (2009), involving respondents from a leading Chinese retail organisation, demonstrates strong support for the hypothesised negative relationship between employee turnover intention and job satisfaction.

The empirical results of a study by Ding and Lin (2006) indicate that two work-related attitudes – career satisfaction and job satisfaction – have the most significant effects on turnover intentions among hospital professionals, and organisational commitment plays a mediating role in the model.
b. Performance

McEvoy and Cascio (1987) conducted a meta-analysis (including 24 studies) to estimate the direction and magnitude of the correlation between turnover and employee performance. They found a significant, negative overall relationship between performance and turnover.

Zimmerman and Darnold (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of data from 65 studies to estimate the performance intentions to quit relationship. The results indicate that supervisor ratings of performance had the strongest relationship with turnover intention, followed by self-ratings and objective measures (the higher the ratings/measures, the lower the turnover intention). Poor performers were more likely to quit even after controlling for job satisfaction and turnover intentions, indicating that they were more likely to engage in unplanned quitting; while good performers were slightly more likely to intend quitting after controlling for job satisfaction (Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009).

c. Leaders

Wells and Peachey (2011) investigated the relationship between leadership behaviours, satisfaction with the leader and voluntary turnover intentions. The results revealed a direct negative relationship between leadership behaviours and voluntary organisational turnover intentions. They found that satisfaction with the leader mediated the negative relationship between leadership behaviours and voluntary turnover intentions.

Jones et al. (1996) found empirical evidence that sales managers’ leadership behaviour directly and indirectly influences job satisfaction, which in turn influences salespeople’s intentions to leave the organisation and actual turnover.

Researchers have also found statistically significant relationships between leader empowering behaviour, role clarity, psychological empowerment, work engagement and intention to leave (Mendes & Stander, 2011).
Albrecht and Andreetta (2011) tested whether employee engagement mediates the effects of empowering leadership and empowerment on affective commitment and turnover intention. Their results indicated that when employees perceive that their leaders and managers have an empowering style of leadership, they will feel empowered. These feelings of empowerment will lead employees to feel motivated and committed to the organisation. Furthermore, when employees experience such affective commitment they will be less inclined to harbour thoughts of leaving the organisation.

Canipe (2006) investigated the relationship between trust, organisational commitment, perceived organisational support and turnover intention. In this study, using a sample of participants from diverse industries, findings indicated that trust in co-workers, trust in supervisor, trust in the organisation, perceived organisational support and organisational commitment all had significant negative relationships with turnover intention.

Research by Tuzun and Kalemci (2012) and Newman, Thanacoody, and Hui (2012) also highlight the significance of perceived organisational support and turnover intention. Both studies emphasise the importance of leaders in reducing turnover intention. Tuzun and Kalemci (2012) found that perceived supervisory support moderates the relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover intention. Newman et al. (2012) found that perceived organisational support was positively related to affective commitment, which in turn was negatively related to turnover intention. They reported a direct negative relationship between perceived supervisory support and turnover intention.

2.3.3.2 Individual perspective

A South African study involving a group of employees employed at a financial services institution found that these respondents placed greater importance on intrinsic variables. Birt, Wallis, and Winternitz (2004) found that the five most important intrinsic variables that influenced decisions to either stay or leave an organisation were challenging and meaningful work, advancement opportunities, high manager integrity and quality and new opportunities/challenges. The authors, however, noted that extrinsic variables also influence decisions to leave - that is, market opportunities are also a significant factor in such decisions (Birt et al., 2004).
A cross-sectional survey (among employees representing more than 400 organisations from a wide range of industrial sectors) conducted by Dysvik and Kuvaas (2010) confirmed that intrinsic motivation has the strongest direct negative relationship with turnover intention.

An employee’s well-being also plays a role in turnover intention. Using a sample of South African professional nurses, Pienaar and Bester (2011) found that the respondents with the highest levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation and the lowest levels of personal accomplishment displayed a higher degree of intention to quit.

Another South African study found a positive relationship between workplace bullying and turnover intention. Role clarity, participation in decision making and a supervisory relationship were identified as factors that moderate the relationship between bullying by superiors and turnover intention (Van Schalkwyk, Els & Rothman, 2011).

### 2.3.4 Turnover intention research

Research by Cooper (2010) indicated no significant relationship between turnover intention and gender, years of experience or level of education. A study conducted by Martin and Roodt (2008) reported a significant negative relationship between turnover intention and age (as age increased turnover intention decreased) and length of service (turnover intention increased initially as tenure increased, and then decreased after a peak, usually at about six to ten years, was reached).

In a study exploring the relationship between the demographic characteristics of automobile sales consultants in the USA and their intentions to leave because of compensation, training or managerial leadership, no relationship between intent to quit, years of experience or level of education was identified. The results, however, did support an association between years of experience and intent to quit because of managerial leadership (Cooper, 2010).
2.3.4.1 Gender

Some studies have reported that no significant relationship exists between gender and turnover intention (e.g. Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008). A meta-analysis by Griffeth et al. (2000) revealed that women’s quit rate is similar to that of men.

Other researchers have acknowledged gender differences in employee turnover (e.g. Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). In two studies using 332 female executives (study 1) and 186 female managers and professionals (study 2), Jawahar and Hemmasi (2006) found support for the premise that perceptions of lack of organisational support for women’s advancement are related to turnover intentions. In both studies, organisational support for women’s advancement enhanced women’s satisfaction with the organisation, which in turn, influenced their turnover intentions.

2.3.4.2 Race

Race has been indicated as a poor and inconsistent variable when used as a predictor of turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008). Griffeth et al. (2000) found no relationship between race and turnover.

Using a sample of 5 370 managers, McKay et al. (2007), examined the role of diversity climate perceptions (i.e. employees’ perceptions that an organisation adheres to fair personnel practices) in predicting turnover intentions among black, Hispanic and white managerial personnel in the USA. Their goal was to investigate racial differences in the role of diversity climate perceptions in predicting employee retention. Their results indicated that there are race differences in the way diversity climate perceptions relate to turnover intentions. They found that pro-diversity work climate perceptions related most negatively with turnover intentions among blacks.

In a South African study by Vallabh and Donald (2001), it was found that far more black managers were seriously considering leaving their current positions than their white counterparts. Vallabh and Donald (2001) investigated what motivates managers to leave an organisation. They found that of the 25 managers who reported that they would like to
leave their jobs; factors in their current organisations were cited more frequently by black managers than white managers. However, both groups claimed to be influenced by jobs offering better salary packages, chances of promotion and the prospect of working for a dynamic company. The factors that were perceived as being most influential in convincing black managers to remain in their current jobs included better salaries and promotion. The white managers stated that they would probably be swayed by a salary increase, a change in management and a promotion.

2.3.4.3 Position

Tian-Foreman’s (2009) research suggests that non-managerial staff have a higher intention of leaving the organisation than managerial staff.

2.3.4.4 Age

Age has been consistently and negatively related to turnover (Mobley et al. 1979). Chawla and Sondhi’s (2011) research indicates that older employees have lower turnover intentions compared to their younger counterparts. According to Finegold et al. (2002, p. 656), “age is one factor that may shape differences in what people want from work and how attached they are to their organisation.”

Martin and Roodt’s (2008) research indicated a significant relationship between age of the respondent and turnover intention. They found that as age increased intentions to stay increased. They proposed that older employees have more of an investment in an organisation - hence their intention is to stay longer with it.

Using a large sample of 3 000 technical professionals, Finegold et al. (2002) pointed to the following differences between employees’ commitment and turnover intention. They found that for employees 30 years and younger, building competencies was their primary task, and they were willing to change organisations in order to improve their technical skills. This age group also had a more transactional relationship with the organisation and therefore job security was not as important to them as it was for older employees. They respond to rewards linked to their individual performance, and place more emphasis on work-life
balance. By contrast, for employees over 30 years of age job security was more strongly related to commitment and their desire to remain with the organisation. The researchers caution, however, that while they found statistically significant differences between the age groups, the differences were minor.

Ng and Feldman (2009) suggested that the relationship between age and turnover may have changed over the past two decades because of changes in the work environment and in norms of job mobility.

**2.3.5 Evaluating turnover intention**

Turnover intention is a key outcome of any study, because identifying its antecedents could help to prevent subsequent employee turnover (McKay et al., 2007). By understanding the predictors of turnover intention, organisations can introduce strategies to prevent turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

However, even though the relationship between turnover intention and turnover appears to be consistent, and turnover intention is a significant variable in the turnover process, it accounts for less than 24% of the variance in turnover (Mobley et al., 1979).

Mobley et al. (1979) cited the following possible reasons for the lack of a stronger relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover: (1) it does not account for impulsive behaviour; (2) it does not adequately capture perception and evaluation of alternatives; and (3) along with personal, organisation and external conditions, a change may occur between original measurement and the observation of actual behaviour. The more specific the turnover intention measure and the less time between the measurement and the actual behaviour of turnover, the stronger the relationship should be.

Labatmediene et al. (2007) suggest that conflicting research findings may be due to the fact that turnover intention is a more complex construct than many researchers think. They also suggest that turnover intention may be difficult to measure because it is influenced by factors such as social desirability and cultural effects.
2.4 THEORETICAL INTEGRATION OF CAREER ANCHORS, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION

The literature review in the previous sections of this chapter provided a critical overview of prominent research relating to the three constructs that are of relevance to this study. The purpose of the literature review was to conceptualise the concepts of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. These three concepts appear to be theoretically linked. As shown in figure 2.3, H1 represents the hypothesis that a statistically significant relationship exists between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. H2 represents the hypothesis that employees from different gender, race, position and age groups will differ significantly in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

As indicated in table 2.6, career anchors and organisational commitment are core variables influencing turnover intention. If there is a positive person-organisation fit and if employees’ talents, needs and values are matched to the organisation, these employees are more likely to remain with an organisation. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees are less likely to leave an organisation if their commitment levels are high.

The theoretical integration of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention is first considered by examining the theoretical relationship between the three constructs. The second part of the theoretical integration involves understanding the theoretical relationship between the three constructs and the variables, gender, race, position and age. The implications of the three constructs for career decision making and commitment strategies are also discussed.
Figure 2.3: Theoretical relationship between biographical variables, career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.
2.4.1 Theoretical relationship between career anchors and organisational commitment

The results of a South African study by Coetzee et al. (2007) indicate that although there are a number of significant relationships between participants’ organisational commitment levels and career anchors, career anchors are not significant predictors of organisational commitment. The results of a canonical correlation analysis indicated that the career anchors explain only 0.03% of the commitment variance, while the commitment variables explain only 0.04% of the career anchors variance.

Based on their findings, Coetzee et al. (2007) suggest that organisations wishing to increase the commitment of their employees should strive for congruence between organisational rewards and the important motivations and values underlying their employees’ career anchors. Their research is in line with that of Hsu et al. (2003) and Kniveton (2004).

Lumley’s (2009) research found career anchors to be significantly and strongly associated with organisational commitment. The COI subscale of security/stability was positively correlated with continuance commitment, which indicates that these respondents were more likely to stay with the organisation as a result of the perceived costs associated with leaving.

Mignonac and Herrbach (2003) studied the impact of several individual variables on engineers’ willingness to accept various internal mobility opportunities. Their findings suggest that mobility involving a major job change is linked to individuals’ career anchors, while mobility involving a minor change is generally influenced by job satisfaction variables. They found that organisational commitment did not influence willingness to accept internal mobility.
2.4.2 Theoretical relationship between career anchors and turnover intention

Schein’s (1978) career anchor model suggests that individuals tend to look for jobs that are consistent with their dominant career anchor. What holds individuals to their chosen organisation or drives them away is their career anchor (Schein, 1990, 1996).

Research by Jiang et al. (2001) indicates that career satisfaction is positively related to both individuals’ internal career orientation and the external career situations provided by their organisations. A number of research findings support the premise that employees who experience a match between their career anchors and their job setting report higher job satisfaction, more commitment to their organisation and lower intentions to leave than those employees who experience a mismatch (Chang, Chi & Chuang, 2009; Hardin, 1995; Igbaria et al., 1991; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012; Steele & Francis-Smythe, 2010).

Hardin (1995) reported a significant association between career anchors and job setting. He suggests that in order to reduce turnover, organisations need to consider person-job fit at the start of employment and assist individuals with career planning and development. In terms of individuals, he states that they need to play an active role in their careers by gaining self-insight (one way being to understand their dominant career anchor/s) and managing their own careers.

Hsu et al. (2003) support the view that employees whose internal career anchors are compatible with their job have lower intentions to leave their organisations. Based on their findings, they also suggest that organisations introduce appropriate strategies to reduce turnover based on their employees’ different career motivations.

The findings of a Taiwanese study suggest that the voluntary turnover of employees may be the result of organisations failing to satisfy their employees’ career anchors (Chang, 2010). This finding is also consistent with the perspective of Mobley (1977) and Mobley et al. (1978). Chang (2010) proposes that by understanding career anchors and thereby satisfying employees’ needs and intrinsic motivation, strategies can be developed to reduce turnover. His findings highlight the significance of the relationship between career anchors and turnover behaviour and demonstrate that national culture and age influence employees’ career anchor preferences.
2.4.3 Theoretical relationship between organisational commitment and turnover intention.

Meyer and Allen’s (1991) model implies a significant, negative and independent relationship between each form of commitment and turnover intention. The model also proposes that each form of commitment should have an equally strong relationship with turnover intention. Employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organisation because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they need to and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to (Carbery et al., 2003). According to Guimaraes (1997), organisational commitment reflects a positive attitude towards the organisation, thus having a direct influence on employee turnover intentions.

The significant correlation between turnover intention and organisational commitment has been substantiated by research with organisational commitment proving to be an accurate predictor of turnover intention (Bentein, Vandenberg, Vandenberghe & Stinglhamber, 2005; DeConinck & Bachmann, 1994; Griffeth et al., 2000; Joo & Park, 2010; Lazar, 2005; Lee & Liu, 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Peterson, 2003; Yin-Fah et al., 2010). Research studies have shown that greater organisational commitment can lead to a lowering of turnover intention (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Lazar, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000). According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees who are strongly committed are those who are least likely to leave. Numerous meta-analyses have substantiated the premise that the higher the commitment levels of the employee, the lower the predicted turnover intention will be (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

Rusbult and Farrell (1983) posit that the primary process of change in influencing turnover decisions is the process of declining commitment, although changes in rewards, costs, alternatives and investments are all significantly related to stay or leave decisions. In addition, although changes in each of these factors affect changes in job commitment, decline in job commitment appears to most directly and powerfully affect these decisions.

Research has also identified that affective and normative types of commitment are more significant predictors of turnover intention and actual turnover than continuance
commitment (Lazar, 2005; Somers, 1995), with affective commitment showing the strongest correlation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Research conducted by Meyer et al. (1993) and Somers (1995), both using multiple regression to examine the relationships between affective, normative and continuance commitment and turnover intention, found that affective and normative commitment were significant predictors of turnover intention, but continuance commitment did not contribute to prediction.

Data collected from a sample of engineering personnel, and university students employed full time in a variety of organisations, revealed that the three components of commitment differed in the significance of their effects on turnover intention (Jaros, 1997). The results of this study indicated that each form of commitment is significantly and negatively related to turnover intention – both concurrently and longitudinally. However, the three components of commitment differed in the strengths of their correlations with turnover intention. Affective commitment had a significantly stronger correlation with turnover intention than normative or continuance commitment. Furthermore, multiple regression analyses revealed that affective commitment was the only significant independent predictor of turnover intention.

Based on this study, Jaros (1997) suggests that an employee’s affective commitment to the organisation is the main component of organisational commitment in predicting turnover intention. Hence organisations interested in reducing turnover intention can do this by fostering affective commitment.

The results of a study by Kennedy (2006) found that only affective commitment independently predicted intentions to leave. Using a sample of USA soldiers, Bressler (2010) found that higher hope, optimism, affective commitment and continuance commitment all resulted in lower turnover intention. In this study, affective commitment and turnover intention had the strongest relationship. This research supports the idea that individuals who are emotionally attached to an organisation are most likely to stay.

In a meta-analytical study, Joseph et al. (2007) investigated antecedents to turnover intention and they found that affective commitment was significantly and negatively related to turnover intention, while continuance commitment was not significantly related.
João and Coetzee (2011) posit that organisations can be proactive about retaining employees by matching their knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, career needs and values to the requirements of the job, providing emotional care and support, along with the opportunities for further growth and development. They suggest that intrinsic and extrinsic job motivators need to be congruent with employees’ own needs, making them feel affectively and normatively committed to their employer to reduce turnover intention.

2.4.4 Theoretical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

The concept of career anchor is based on the fact that individuals shape their careers in different ways according to their perception of their talents, needs and values (Schein, 1990). Career anchors influence every major decision about career issues, affect decisions to move and shape employee reactions to work experiences (Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003). Research shows that individuals’ career anchors influence their subjective experiences of career success (Coetzee et al., 2013; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012), life satisfaction, career satisfaction, and sense of happiness (Coetzee et al., 2010). Career anchors also positively moderate the relationship between levels of work engagement and job commitment (Coetzee et al., 2013) and significantly predict organisational commitment (Coetzee et al., 2007).

A study of hotel managers in Ireland indicates that a manager’s age, education attainment, reported job satisfaction and organisational commitment (affective), in addition to the star rating of the hotel, are important in predicting turnover intention. The results of this study suggest that managers’ perceived commitment to the organisation, their perceptions of psychological contract violation, their career anchors and their perceptions of managerial competencies are significant in explaining the turnover cognitions of hotel managers (Carbery et al., 2003).

Research by Hardin (1995) suggests that when there is a match between job setting and dominant career anchor, organisational commitment is higher, job satisfaction is higher and turnover intention is lower. These findings are consistent with those of Igbaria et al. (1991) and Quesenberry and Trauth (2012).
According to Igbaria et al. (1991), the career anchors of employees can have vital implications for their job satisfaction, commitment and retention in organisations. Igbaria et al. (1991) postulated that person-environment fit is reflected by the extent to which (1) the resources and rewards provided by the job are compatible with the employee’s needs and preferences; and (2) the demands and requirements of the job are compatible with the employee’s skills and abilities.

Based on his findings, Hardin (1995) cautions, however, that owing to the diversity of career anchors, rewards and career opportunities suitable for one group of employees may be irrelevant or inappropriate for another group. This is in line with Schein’s (1990) premise that employees with different career anchors are motivated by differing types of work, pay and benefits, promotion systems and types of recognition.

2.4.5 Theoretical relationship between variables (gender, race, position and age) and the three constructs

The literature review in the previous sections of this chapter provided a critical overview of prominent research relating to the impact of gender, race, position and age differences on individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. This section of the literature review attempts to answer the research question pertaining to the differences in the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups. The research question was answered by highlighting critical findings discussed in the literature review.

The summary of the literature review below and the depiction in table 2.6 indicates the following relationship between the four variables and career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention:
2.4.5.1 Gender

The literature review indicates significant differences between the career anchors of males and females (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee et al., 2007; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Hardin, 1995; Kniveton, 2004; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ngokha, 2009).

There is conflicting research in terms of the relationship between gender and organisational commitment, with some research indicating no significant differences between gender and commitment (Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003), but other research showing significant differences (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Pretorius & Roodt, 2004).

Research findings suggest no significant differences between gender and turnover intention (Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008).

2.4.5.2 Race

Research indicates that race groups differ significantly regarding their career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) found that blacks and whites show similar career anchor preferences but differ significantly in terms of the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor.

There are conflicting findings on race and organisational commitment. Some research (Coetzee et al., 2007; Lumley, 2009) indicates no significant differences between race groups and commitment, while other research (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Vallabh & Donald, 2001) indicates significant differences.

Research has shown race to be a poor and inconsistent predictor of turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008).
2.4.5.3 Employment position

Researchers have found career anchors to be related to employment status (Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Yarnall, 1998).

There is limited research available on the impact of position (employment status) on organisational commitment and turnover intention (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Lumley (2009) found that supervisors showed a significantly higher score for affective commitment than staff. The results of a study by Ferreira and Coetzee (2010) suggest that employees in managerial positions have higher levels of normative commitment than employees employed at the staff level. DeConinck and Bachmann (1994) found that marketing managers’ intention to leave their jobs was highly influenced by their degree of organisational commitment. A study by Tian-Foreman (2009) found significant differences between managers and non-managers and their turnover intentions.

2.4.5.4 Age

Life and career stages have a significant impact on career orientations (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). Research indicates a significant relationship between age and career anchors (Hardin, 1995; Marshall & Bonner, 2003).

In the literature review, age was generally found to be positively related to organisational commitment (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1993; Ferreira et al., 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Suliman & Illes, 2000).

Mowday et al. (1982) postulate that the antecedents of commitment are likely to change as individuals grow older and their priorities change. Lok and Crawford (1999) found a small positive association between the ages of nurses working in various hospitals and their level of organisational commitment. The correlation between commitment and age was positive and statistically significant.
Research has also indicated that age is a key factor in the commitment-turnover relationship. Cohen (1993) notes that for younger employees, the shorter the time separating the measurement of organisational commitment and the occurrence of departure, the stronger the correlations will be.

Research indicates that age is consistently and negatively related to turnover intention (Chawla & Sondhi, 2001; Finegold et al., 2002; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979).

2.4.6 The theoretical implications for career decision making and commitment strategies

The aim of this section is to highlight the theoretical implications of the three constructs for career decision making and commitment strategies. The career anchor model seems to be a useful piece of information for individuals’ contemplating career changes and for organisations that are trying to assist employees in planning their careers (Schein, 1978). By being aware of and understanding what drives the commitment of employees to their organisation (Kennedy, 2006) and identifying factors that may be related to turnover intention (Pienaar et al., 2007), managers and researchers may act proactively in retaining their talented employees by creating an environment in which employees want to work (Kennedy, 2006; Pienaar et al., 2007).

2.4.6.1 Career decision making

In the current work environment, individuals are expected to make a wide range of career decisions during their life span. To be able to do this, individuals need to understand themselves and the options available to them (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000). Career orientations can have a major impact on individuals’ career and personal lives (Coetzee et al., 2010; Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). They provide a way of organising experiences and identifying long-term contributions and even serve as criteria for measuring career success (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012).
An employee’s career anchor is significant because it influences the selection of specific occupations and work settings, and affects the employees’ reactions to his/her work experiences (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Igbaria et al., 1991; Schein, 1971).

According to Feldman and Bolino (1996), Schein’s (1978) theory allows researchers to differentiate between career identity and vocational choice and examine the ways in which individuals shape and form their career identities. Research also indicates that values and career goals change as individuals’ age and go through different life and career stages (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Rodrigues & Guest, 2010; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

Research by Ellison and Schreuder (2000) focusing on mid-career employees (managerial and non-managerial) indicates that employees with a fit between career anchor and occupational type have a significantly higher level of general and intrinsic job satisfaction than those with no such fit. They suggest that the career anchor construct could probably serve as a useful tool for mid-career employees to make career choices, and that when negotiating the psychological contract, those career needs as identified by the career anchor model should be considered.

2.4.6.2 Commitment strategies

Employees who are strongly committed are less likely to leave their organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Coetzee et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2010; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Commitment strategies are therefore used by organisations to “shape desired employee behaviours and attitudes by forging psychological links between the organisation and the employee goals” (Döckel, 2003, p.14). Organisations need to focus on developing committed employees who can be trusted to perform their jobs in ways consistent with organisational goals (Döckel, 2003). Any human resource planning and development system must try to match the needs of the organisation with those of the individual (Hardin, 1995).

Van Straaten, Theron, and Dodd (2011) investigated organisational commitment in three merged higher education institutions. Their research findings indicated a positive correlation between the human resource management practices implemented prior to the
merger and general employee organisational commitment. Employees whose expectations for the organisation are consistent with their own expectations and these satisfy their basic needs tend to develop a stronger affective commitment to the organisation (Meyer et al. 1993). Visagie and Steyn's (2011) research findings indicate that affective and normative commitment is positively associated with change readiness.

Meyer and Allen (1997) suggest that organisations can “foster” a stronger sense of commitment in their employees by emphasising certain human resource management practices. Examples include providing accurate information to employees during the recruitment and selection process; using socialisation strategies to increase employees' sense of self-worth; and offering training programmes to provide employees with the knowledge and skills they need to do their work effectively. Meyer and Allen (1997), posit that employees will develop affective commitment to an organisation to the extent that it satisfies their needs, meets their expectations and allows them to achieve their goals.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), affective commitment can be increased through work experiences and characteristics of an organisation that make the employee feel “psychologically comfortable” (e.g. approachable managers and equitable treatment of employees) and that enhance the employee's sense of competence (e.g. challenging tasks and feedback). Continuance commitment can be developed by employees recognising the investments they have made in the organisation (e.g. time and effort and pension contributions) and/or the lack of comparable employment alternatives. Normative commitment can be increased through experiences in the organisation that make employees feel that the organisation is providing them with more than they can reciprocate (creating a sense of obligation or duty).

Using a random sample of 1 277 university alumni, Bentein et al. (2005) conducted a longitudinal study to investigate whether employees experience significant changes in commitment to organisation across time and, if so, whether these changes are meaningful to ones' understanding of work place behaviour. They found that individuals do experience a change in commitment across time, but only on the affective and normative commitment dimensions. According to Bentein et al. (2005), sustained reductions in turnover must be
accomplished through sustained, not only one-time, efforts to promote high levels of affective and normative commitment over time.

Döckel et al. (2006) investigated specific retention factors that induce the organisational commitment of high technology employees. In their research, using a sample of professional technicians from a South African-owned telecommunications company, they found that retention factors such as compensation, job characteristics, superior support, and work/life policies appear to have a statistically significant influence on the development of organisational commitment in high technology employees.

Lesabe and Nkosi’s (2007) research findings indicate that compensation, benefit packages, morale, motivation, career growth, leadership style, the nature of the job, training and development, performance management system and the work environment are significant factors that influence employees’ commitment in the workplace.

Behery, Paton, and Hussain’s (2011) research on the key organisational antecedents for nurses, paramedic professionals and nonclinical staff found that antecedents such as employee empowerment (positive relationship), leadership behaviours (positive relationship), role ambiguity (negative relationship) and role conflict (negative relationship) play a decisive role in affecting organisational commitment.

Research by SamGnanakkan (2010) supports the premise that human resource practices, compensation and training have significant direct and indirect effects on an employee’s commitment levels and turnover intention.
Table 2.6  
Integration of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptualisations (definitions)</th>
<th>Career anchors (Schein, 1978)</th>
<th>Organisational commitment (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991)</th>
<th>Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conceptualisations (definitions) | Career anchor is defined as “that one element in a person’s self-concept that he or she will not give up, even in the face of difficult choices” (Schein, 2006, p. 6). According to Schein (1978), an individual’s self-concept or career anchor has three components:  
  - self-perceived talents and abilities  
  - self-perceived motives and needs  
  - self-perceived attitudes and values | Organisational commitment can be defined as “…a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). | Turnover intention may be defined as an individual’s behavioural intention to leave the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Mobley et al., 1979). |
| Core constructs | Need-based anchors | Affective commitment refers to an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organisation.  
Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation.  
Normative commitment refers to a feeling of obligation to continue employment.  
(Meyer & Allen, 1991) |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career anchors (Schein, 1978)</th>
<th>Organisational commitment (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991)</th>
<th>Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value-based anchors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service/dedication to a cause: Seeks the opportunity to pursue work that achieves something of value, such as helping others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pure challenge: Seeks the opportunity to work on solutions to seemingly unsolvable problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talent-based anchors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical/functional competence: Seeks the opportunity to apply skills in a technical or functional area and to develop these skills to an even higher level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General managerial competence: Seeks the opportunity to climb to a level high enough in an organisation to make possible the integration of others’ efforts across functions and to be responsible for the output of a particular unit of an organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entrepreneurship creativity: Seeks the opportunity to create an organisation of one’s own, taking risks to overcome obstacles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adapted from Yarnall, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core variables influencing construct</td>
<td>Career anchors (Schein, 1978)</td>
<td>Organisational commitment (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gender: Males and females differ on career anchor preferences (Coetzee & Roythome-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee et al., 2007; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). | According to Meyer and Allen (1997), two groups of variables influence the development of organisational commitment in employees:  
  - Distal variables, which include characteristics of the organisation, personal characteristics (demographics), socialisation experiences, management practices and environmental conditions.  
  - Proximal variables, which include work experiences, role starts and psychological contracts.  
  For example, corporate ethical values and culture influence organisational commitment. | Factors influencing turnover intention include the following: organisational socialisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005); work engagement and organisational citizenship (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010); attitudes towards benefits (Carraher, 2011); job security (Hsu et al., 2003); performance (McEvoy & Cascio, 1987; Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009); leadership behaviours (Jones et al., 1996; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Wells & Peachy, 2011); and job satisfaction (Pienaar et al., 2007; Tian-Foreman, 2009).  
  Organisational commitment has been significantly linked as a contributor to turnover intention (Bentein et al., 2005; Joo & Park, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Lazar, 2005; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979; Neininger et al., 2010; Peterson, 2003; Somers, 1995).  
  Research indicates that employees whose internal career anchors are compatible with their jobs report lower turnover intentions (Chang, 2010; Hsu et al., 2003). | Gender: In general, there are no significant differences (Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008). |
<p>| Race: Significant difference between race and career anchor preferences (Coetzee &amp; Schreuder, 2008; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall &amp; Bonner, 2003). |  |  |  |
| Position: Occupational position appears to influence career anchor preference (Yarnall, 1998). Significant difference between salaried and self-employed individuals (Danziger &amp; Valency, 2006), and permanent and contract employees (De Villiers, 2009). |  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for career decision making and commitment strategies</th>
<th>Career anchors (Schein, 1978)</th>
<th>Organisational commitment (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991)</th>
<th>Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicating no significant differences, and others (Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008; Vallabh &amp; Donald, 2001) indicating significant differences.</td>
<td>Race: It is a poor and inconsistent predictor of turnover (Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position: There is limited research on this (Coetzee &amp; Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Lumley (2009) found that supervisors showed a significantly higher score for affective commitment than staff. The results of a study by Ferreira and Coetzee (2010) suggest that employees in managerial positions have higher levels of normative commitment than employees employed at the staff level.</td>
<td>Position: There is limited research. There are significant differences between managers and non-managers (Tian-Foreman, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Generally found to be positively related to organisational commitment (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1993; Ferreira &amp; Coetzee, 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok &amp; Crawford, 1999; Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008; Mathieu &amp; Zajac, 1990; Suliman &amp; Iles, 2000).</td>
<td>Age: It is consistently and negatively related to turnover intention (Chawla &amp; Sondhi, 2011; Finegold et al., 2002; Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness and identification of career anchor/s strengthen individuals' ability to make more informed career choices (Feldman &amp; Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Schein, 1996; Schreuder &amp; Coetzee, 2011). Informed decision</td>
<td>Career anchors are significantly associated with organisational commitment (Lumley, 2009). That is, employees make decisions concerning their careers and whether to stay with an organisation, based on how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover intention involves the deliberate intention of an employee to either leave or stay with an organisation (Mobley et al. 1979). In order to make an informed career decision, employees will take certain factors into account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career anchors (Schein, 1978)</td>
<td>Organisational commitment (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1991)</td>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making leads to higher levels of personal happiness and subjective and objective experiences of career success, resulting in higher organisational commitment and lower turnover intentions (Coetzee &amp; Schreuder, 2009b; Hardin, 1995; Yarnall, 1998).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Career anchors give organisations a framework to provide opportunities and conditions that are congruent with employees’ career anchors (Coetzee &amp; Schreuder, 2009b; Erdoğan, 2004, Hardin, 1995).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committed they are to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- By understanding what binds an employee to an organisation, organisations can introduce strategies (human resource management practices) to increase the commitment levels of their employees (Abdulkadir et al., 2012; Chew &amp; Chan, 2008; Hashim, 2010; Mowday et al., 1982). Increased organisational commitment results in organisational success (Jaros, 1997; Khalili &amp; Asmawi, 2012; Roodt, 2004; Suliman &amp; Iles, 2000), productive behaviour (Camilleri &amp; van der Heijden, 2007; Hunter &amp; Thatcher, 2007; Kelidbari et al., 2011; Meyer &amp; Maltin, 2010; Sinclair et al., 2005) and reduced turnover intentions (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1996; Ferreira, 2012; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu &amp; Zajac, 1990; Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997; Somers, 2010; Vallabh &amp; Donald, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment has been linked to employee well-being (Briscoe &amp; Finkelstein, 2009; Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997; Meyer &amp; Herscovitch, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including their emotional relationship with the organisation (commitment), and the personal costs of leaving the organisation (Meyer &amp; Allen, 1997).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- By identifying factors that may be related to turnover intention, organisations may proactively develop and manage strategies to decrease voluntary turnover and actual turnover (Cooper, 2010; Du Plooy &amp; Roodt, 2010; Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008; Mitchell et al., 2001a, 2001b; Pienaar et al., 2007; Tuzun &amp; Kalemci, 2012). Strategies will differ, depending on the costs to the organisation and the causes of turnover (Kochanski &amp; Ledford, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The theoretical framework presented in the previous section suggests that the constructs of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention are conceptually related. However, the relationship between the three variables needs to be empirically investigated. The objectives of the study were as follows:

- To conceptualise career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and to explain the theoretical linkages between these variables
- To determine theoretically (based on a review of the literature) the role of gender, race, position and age in career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention
- To conceptualise the implications of the theoretical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention on career decision making and commitment strategies in the South African organisational context

The literature review informed the hypotheses for the quantitative study, which were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESES</th>
<th>SUPPORTED EVIDENCE PROVIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H01: There are no significant relationships between individuals' career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: There are significant relationships between individuals' career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H02: Individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups do not differ significantly in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups differ significantly in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The aim of this chapter was to conceptualise the concepts of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention by means of a comparative examination of the existing literature and research on these concepts. An integrated model was presented to explain the theoretical linkage between these concepts.

The specific aims of the literature review were achieved in this chapter. Firstly, the theoretical linkage between the three concepts (career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention) was critically analysed and explained. Secondly, the influence of gender, age, position and age on the three concepts was identified and discussed. Lastly, the implications of the theoretical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention for career decision making and commitment strategies in the organisational context were discussed.

Chapter 3 presents the empirical study of the study in the form of a research article.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

ABSTRACT

Orientation: The impact of today’s changing and unstable world of work on organisational success and individual career decision making has led to renewed interest in understanding the relationship between employees’ motives and values, what keeps them psychologically bound to an organisation and what reduces the likelihood of them leaving the organisation.

Research purpose: The primary objectives of the study were as follows: (1) to explore the relationship between career anchors (as measured by the Career Orientations Inventory [COI]), organisational commitment (as measured by the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire [OCQ]) and turnover intention (as measured by a three-item questionnaire, developed by Mobley et al., 1978); and (2) to determine whether employees from different gender, race, employment positions and age groups differ significantly in their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

Rationale for the study: Organisations operating in the 21st century face significant challenges in the management of their most important assets, their human capital. By understanding their employees’ values and motives (career anchors) and the factors influencing their levels of organisational commitment, organisations can introduce strategies to reduce turnover intention.

Research design, approach and method: A quantitative survey was conducted on a non-probability sample of 343 employed adults at managerial and general staff levels in the South African retail sector.

Main findings: Correlational and inferential analyses reflected significant relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Significant differences between gender, race, employment position and age groups were also found.
Practical implications: When developing commitment strategies for employees from various biographical groups, organisations and HR practitioners need to recognise the way in which employees’ career motives and talents and commitment to the organisation influence turnover intention.

Contribution: The findings add to existing research literature on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and provide valuable information that can be used to develop strategies for organisations operating in the contemporary world of work.

Key words: affective commitment, career anchors, continuance commitment, normative commitment, turnover intention

3.1 INTRODUCTION

An organisation cannot perform successfully in today’s highly competitive world without employees who are committed to its objectives and strategic goals (Lesabe & Nkosi, 2007). Effectively attracting, developing, managing, motivating and retaining committed employees has become a critical success factor for sustained organisational performance (Beechler & Woodward, 2009; Chang, 2010; Döckel, 2003; Luthans et al., 2004; Spagnoli & Caetano, 2012).

As the world of work changes, it influences the way employees view their careers (Cascio, 2001; Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). The old psychological contract of stability, loyalty, predictability, permanence, job security, linear career growths, and one-time learning have changed to a new psychological contract that favours change, uncertainty, temporariness, flexible work, valuing performance and skills, self-reliance, employability, multiple careers, and lifelong learning (Cascio, 2001). Employees are placing far more emphasis on satisfying their own individual demands (Lumley et al., 2011) and being more responsible for their own futures and careers (Coetzee et al., 2010; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2011; Furnham, 2000). The responsibility of career management in a “contemporary career” falls on the individual and self-insight is required to make the right choice (Schein, 1990). According to Schein (1996), a career anchor is an individual’s occupational self-concept, consisting of self-perceived talents and
abilities, basic values and motives and needs. These talents, values and motives, in turn, influence an individual’s career decisions.

The concept of career anchor becomes especially applicable in today’s turbulent world (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Schein, 1996). In the South African career context, employees face high unemployment rates, large-scale retrenchments, employment equity targets, fewer employment opportunities in the formal sector, education and skills shortages and financial and emotional stressors (Van Vuuren & Fourie, 2000). As a result of these challenges, one of the characteristics of today’s workforce is its high level of mobility (Lumley et al., 2011; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004), with voluntary turnover being a significant challenge in the management of talent and human capital (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). Research indicates that an individual’s career motives and values (his/her career anchors) have an impact on career decision making and psychological attachment or commitment to an occupation or organisation (Coetzee et al., 2007; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Lumley, 2009; Schein, 1996). Employees who are strongly committed to their organisations are more likely to remain with the organisation compared with uncommitted employees (Coetzee et al., 2010; Delobbe & Vandenberghhe, 2000; Ding & Lin, 2006; Ferreira et al., 2010).

A changing workforce in terms of demographics (e.g. an ageing workforce, different cultures and generations working together) and global talent trends (the global war on talent) are forcing organisations to be more strategic in the way they recruit, train and develop, improve performance and retain their employees (Cascio, 2001; Moalusi, 2001; Rothmann & Cilliers, 2007). Organisations need to pay more attention to why individuals stay in organisations even when other (and better) opportunities are available elsewhere (Feldman & Ng, 2007). This is vitally important as the cost of labour turnover of high performance employees is high both in direct (financial) and indirect (nonfinancial) costs both to the employee and the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Davidson et al., 2010; Mallol et al., 2007; Sutherland & Jordaan, 2004). The key to success is a committed and loyal workforce (Lesabe & Nkosi, 2007). Reducing turnover is beneficial to organisations because the retention of key employees creates a sustainable competitive advantage (Lub et al., 2012).

The present study focused on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. It explored the way employees make career decisions (based on their career anchors) and what factors influence employees’ psychological
attachment or commitment to the organisation and therefore their intentions to either remain with or leave an organisation. By identifying the relationship between these variables, recommendations can be made to enhance human resource practices, thereby reducing turnover intention and actual turnover. By understanding the predictors of turnover intention, organisations can introduce strategies and measures to prevent turnover intention (Behery et al., 2011; Döckel et al., 2006; Martin & Roodt, 2008; SamGnanakkan, 2010; Siong et al., 2006; Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012). Commitment strategies may be used to forge psychological bonds between the organisation’s and employee’s goals (Döckel, 2003).

The main reason for the research study was to contribute to the broader research community by generating new knowledge and enhancing existing knowledge concerning career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention (and the relationship between these three variables) in the industrial and organisational field, especially from a South African perspective.

3.1.1 Career anchors

The early career is a time of mutual discovery between the new employee and the organisation (Schein, 1978). Through successive trials and job challenges, the new employee gradually gains self-insight into “what one wants out of one’s career, one’s talents and limitations, one’s values and how they will fit in with the organizational values” (Schein, 1978, pp. 252-253). An individual’s career self-concept or career anchor is built on feedback and self-insight, which matures with experience (Schein, 1978).

The self-concept has the following three components, which together make up what Schein (1978, p. 125) refers to as the individual’s career anchor:

- self-perceived talents and abilities (based on actual successes in a variety of work settings)
- self-perceived motives and needs (based on opportunities for self-tests and self-diagnosis in real situations and on feedback from others)
- self-perceived attitudes and values (based on actual encounters between self and norms and values of the employing organisation and work setting)

According to Schein (1978, 1996), career anchors evolve as one gains occupational and life experiences, but once the self-concept has been formed, it functions as a stabilising force or “anchor”. Schein (1978, p. 128) defined a career anchor as “that concern or value which the
person will not give up, if a choice has to be made.” It is through being forced to make choices that individuals become aware of what is important to them in terms of self-development, family or career (Schein, 1996).

According to Schein (1978), career anchors are “inside” the person, functioning as a set of driving and constraining forces on career decisions and choices. If one moves into a setting in which one is likely to fail or which fails to meet one’s needs or which compromises one’s values, one will be “pulled back” into something more congruent – hence the metaphor of an “anchor” (Schein, 1978, p. 125).

An individual’s career self-concept influences career choices, affects decisions to move, shapes career aspirations, determines an individual’s view of the future and sways employee reactions to work experiences (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003).

The concept of career anchors can be further categorised as internal and external (Hsu et al., 2003). Internal career anchors refer to an individual’s self-concept and are realised in terms of nonmonetary incentives such as job security and autonomy in the workplace (Hsu et al., 2003). External career anchors refer to the same set of career anchors, but are based more on the extent to which individuals perceive that their organisation currently satisfies their internal career anchors through benefits and incentives (Hsu et al., 2003).

Schein (1978) originally postulated that individuals’ self-concepts could be generalised into the following five categories: technical/functional competence (achievement of expert status among their peers); general managerial competence (willingness to solve complex, whole-of-organisation problems and undertake subsequent decision making); autonomy/independence (personal freedom in job content and settings); security/stability (long-term employment for health benefits and retirement options); and entrepreneurial creativity (opportunity for creativity and identification of new businesses, products or services) (Marshall & Bonner, 2003).

Follow-up studies revealed the following three additional career anchor categories: service/dedication to a cause (working for the greater good of organisations or communities); pure challenge (testing personal endurance through risky projects or physically challenging
work); and lifestyle (obtaining balance between personal and the family’s welfare with work commitments) (Chang, 2010; Kanye & Crous, 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003).

Feldman and Bolino (1996) reconceptualised Schein’s eight career anchors into three distinct groupings or higher-order categories along with the inherent motives underlying the various career anchors. These motives are described as being talent-based (which encompasses technical/functional competence, general managerial competence, and entrepreneurial creativity anchors), motive and need-based (including security/stability, autonomy/independence and lifestyle anchors), and value-based (i.e. dedication to a cause and pure challenge anchors).

The three career anchors grounded in an individual’s work talents focus on the type of work individuals do on a daily basis. The three anchors grounded in an individual’s motives and needs focus on how individuals want to structure their work roles consistent with their personal lives. The two career anchors grounded in a person’s attitudes and values focus on individuals’ identification with their occupations and the cultures of their organisations (Feldman & Bolino, 1996).

According to Feldman and Bolino (1996), for individuals whose career anchor is talent-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work effectiveness and job stability. For individuals whose career anchor is need-based, the impact on congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work role adjustment and outside role conflict. Finally, for individuals whose career anchor is value-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on job satisfaction and psychological well-being. Figure 3.1 reflects the integrated framework of career anchors based on this alternative classification of career anchors.
Figure 3.1: Integrated theoretical model of the construct career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, p. 48)
Feldman and Bolino (1996) maintain that other significant dimensions which determine the impact of career anchors on career decisions and outcomes include how self-aware individuals are of their career anchors and how important anchors are in guiding their career decisions (i.e. the salience of career anchors). They hypothesise that an employee’s age, length of service (tenure) and the number of organisations he/she has worked in will be positively associated with the durability of career anchors.

Schein (1996) predicted that change in the career environment would affect individuals differently, depending on their career anchor. Schein (1996) holds that individuals anchored in security/stability experience the most severe problems because of organisations no longer offering employment security. Their base of security and stability has to shift from dependence on an organisation to dependence on themselves (i.e. employability). Schein (1996) believes that individuals anchored in autonomy/independence find the occupational world an easier place to navigate - in other words, they respond positively to the move to employability. Individuals with a technical/functional competence need to adjust to the reality that they have to update and relearn using their own money and time because organisations are no longer willing to bear these costs. According to Schein (1996) increasingly more people are indicating service/dedication to a cause, that is, the need for their work to be meaningful in a larger context.

Schein’s (1996) predictions of the increasing dominance of the service/dedication to a cause career anchor is supported by more recent research (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007, 2013). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) the increasing emphasis on social responsibility and global and moral citizenship may explain the dominance of the service/dedication to a cause career anchor in recent research studies. Research also indicates a shift towards the lifestyle career anchor as being the primary career anchor in today’s world of work (e.g. Coetzee et al., 2013; Du Toit & Coetzee, 2012; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012). Meister and Willyerd (2010) predict that as the world of work becomes increasingly more global and driven by virtual employment and mobile technology; individuals will become increasingly more concerned with balancing and managing their personal and work lives better.
3.1.2 Organisational commitment

The concept of organisational commitment has been of interest to researchers for many years and has become a topic of increasing importance in the area of industrial and organisational psychology (Adzeh, 2013; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Chen et al., 2012; Joo & Park, 2010; Manetjie & Martins, 2009; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Somers, 2009; Tladinyane, 2012).

The ongoing interest in this topic has mostly been due to the theorised relationships between organisational commitment and employee behaviour such as productivity/performance (Camilleri & van der Heijden, 2007; Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Jaros, 1997; Kelidbari et al., 2011; Mehmud et al., 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000), turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Farris, 2012; Lew, 2009; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000), well-being (Briscoe & Finkelstein, 2009; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) and job satisfaction (Singh et al., 2011).

Researchers distinguish between the following four main approaches to the study of organisational commitment: the attitudinal, behavioural, motivational and multidimensional approaches (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Mester et al., 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997). These four approaches describe the different ways in which organisational commitment is developed and the implications relating to employee behaviour (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Core aspect of each approach towards organisational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal approach</td>
<td>Commitment is largely viewed as an employee’s attitude or a set of behavioural intentions which focuses on how he/she identifies with the organisation and its goals and chooses to remain committed to the organisation to be a part of achieving its goals (Mowday et al., 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural approach</td>
<td>Focuses on the behaviour where individuals are committed to a particular course of action as opposed to an entity (Allen &amp; Meyer, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational approach</td>
<td>Focuses on the state of commitment, known as cognitive predisposition which includes the realisation of salient values and the achievement of salient goals (Martin &amp; Roodt, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional approach</td>
<td>Organisational commitment develops through the interplay of emotional attachment, perceived costs and moral obligation (Suliman &amp; Iles, 2000).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisational commitment has been defined in a variety of ways, but common to all the definitions is the notion that commitment binds an employee to an organisation (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982; SamGnanakkan, 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000; Zangaro, 2001). All the definitions generally point to commitment (1) being a stabilising and obliging force; and (2) providing direction to behaviour (e.g. restricting freedom, binding the person to a course of action) (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Allen and Meyer (1990) contend that the difference between the various conceptualisations of commitment involve the psychological state, the antecedent conditions leading to its development and the behaviours that are expected to result from commitment.

“Regardless of the definition, “committed” employees are more likely to remain in the organisation than are “uncommitted” employees” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), it is also important to understand that commitment may assume different forms (i.e. the relationship between an employee and the organisation may vary) and committed individuals may be committed to different entities.

In the context of this study, organisational commitment was defined as “…a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252).

Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of organisational commitment was of relevance to this research because it can be regarded as the dominant model in organisational commitment research (Farris, 2012; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Nazari & Emami, 2012; Solinger et al., 2008; WeiBo et al., 2010) and has undergone the most extensive empirical evaluation to date (Johnson et al., 2009; Krishnaveni & Ramkumar, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2004).

Meyer and Allen (1991) integrated attitudinal and behavioural approaches to commitment in order to create three distinct dimensions. The different dimensions or mindsets are described in the three-component model of commitment as affective, continuance and normative (Meyer & Allen, 1991,1997), and differ in terms of the link between the employee and the organisation (Mester et al., 2003).The affective and normative components reflect employees’ attitudinal
dispositions, whereas the continuance component indicates their behavioural orientation (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen (1991) view affective, continuance and normative commitment as components rather than types of commitment. They believe that an employee can experience all three forms to varying degrees, and that all three components can exert independent (and possibly interactive) effects on a particular behaviour. Research by Martin (2008) indicates that affective commitment positively influences normative commitment; and continuance commitment is determined by affective commitment and normative commitment.

- **Affective commitment.** Meyer and Allen (1997, p. 11) define affective commitment as “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization.” The development of affective commitment is based on the exchange principle – individuals commit themselves to the organisation in return for the rewards received or the punishments avoided (Meyer & Allen, 1997). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), affective commitment is probably the most desirable form of commitment and the one that organisations are most likely to want to instil in their employees because it involves employees having an emotional attachment to the organisation. Affectively committed individuals continue their employment with an organisation because they want to (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

- **Continuance commitment.** Continuance commitment originated from Becker’s (1960) side bets theory. It can be described as the perceived cost an individual associates with leaving an organisation (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Individuals who experience continuance commitment remain with an organisation because they feel they need to or have to (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

- **Normative commitment.** Normative commitment refers to an employee’s feelings of obligation or duty to remain with an organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Employees internalise organisational goals and values, such that they become committed to the organisation because they believe it is the moral or “right” thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Wiener (1982) argued that normative commitment to the organisation develops on the basis of a collection of pressures that individuals feel.
during their early socialisation (from family and culture) and during their socialisation as newcomers to the organisation.

Organisational commitment has been analysed from several perspectives (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001). It has been studied as both a dependent variable for antecedents such as age, tenure, and education, and as a predictor of various outcomes such as turnover, intention to leave, absenteeism and performance (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001). Its impact and influence on work outcomes such as job satisfaction (Farris, 2012; Lumley et al., 2011; Meyer et al., 1993), job performance and business success (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Kelidbari et al., 2011; Kuo, 2013; Sinclair et al., 2005; Suliman & Iles, 2000), and turnover and turnover intention (Allen & Meyer, 1990, 1996; Labatmediene et al., 2007; O'Donnell et al., 2012; SamGnanakkan, 2010; Suliman & Iles, 2000) are well documented.

3.1.3 Turnover intention

Employee turnover intention has long been a topic of interest to researchers and practitioners mainly because of the negative consequences of actual turnover (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Griffeth et al., 2000; Hom et al., 2012; Jiang et al., 2012; Siong et al., 2006; Tian-Foreman, 2009).

Turnover has a negative impact on organisational effectiveness (Pienaar et al., 2007), and the personal and organisational costs of voluntary employee turnover are high (Jones et al., 1996; Mallol et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2001a).

Personal costs include the stress of starting a new job, uncertainty and ambiguity surrounding the new job and numerous possible adjustments such as a new house and schooling if this involves relocation (Brooks et al., 2005; Mitchell et al., 2001a). At organisational level, turnover can have a direct effect on an organisation’s bottom line by affecting costs, sales and profits (Holtom et al., 2008; Jones et al., 1996) as well as indirect costs such as the loss of valuable knowledge, skills and experience, and decreased levels of morale among the remaining employees (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Chalkiti & Sigala, 2010; Chang, 1999; Davidson et al., 2010; Holtom et al., 2008; Mitchell et al., 2001a). Standard estimates of turnover costs range from a one-time annual salary to a seven-time salary (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001). According to Allen, et al. (2010), the costs of recruiting and training replacement employees range from 90 to 200% of annual pay.
The literature on turnover intention uses many terms interchangeably to describe this construct. Some of the terms used are propensity to leave, staying or leaving intentions, intent to leave and intention to quit (Wilson, 2006). While turnover intention refers to an individual's reduced level of commitment which results in an increased desire to leave the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982), turnover is defined as voluntary or involuntary departure from an organisation (Jones et al., 1996).

Voluntary turnover research has traditionally followed two main paths, namely the study of turnover from an attitudinal perspective (i.e. looking at its link to organisational commitment and job satisfaction) and the influence of the labour market on turnover in terms of the perceived availability of alternative positions (Mallol et al., 2007).

Many theories have been advanced to explain why employees voluntarily leave their organisations (Joseph et al., 2007). Voluntariness of leaving is relevant to consider in evaluating turnover models because these models generally apply to voluntary termination of employment (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Models include the theory of organisational equilibrium (March & Simon, 1958) which focuses on the psychological constructs of perceived ease of movement and the desirability of leaving one's job (Crossley et al., 2007; Holtom et al., 2008; Joseph et al., 2007). The theory postulates that turnover occurs when individuals' perception of what they are contributing to the organisation exceeds the inducements or rewards they are receiving from an organisation (Joseph et al., 2007). The met expectations model (Porter & Steers, 1973) builds on the organisation equilibrium theory and proposes that met expectations are a key determinant in turnover decisions. Porter and Steers (1973) argue that dissatisfaction arises when an organisation fails to meet the employee's expectations, resulting in dissatisfaction and ultimately turnover.

The linkage model (Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1978) proposes a series of linkages between job satisfaction and turnover. According to this model, job dissatisfaction triggers a linear series of withdrawal cognitions in which employees examine the costs and benefits associated with leaving their jobs. These cognitive evaluations start with initial thoughts of leaving the job followed by the comparison between the current job and possible job alternatives. When a more attractive job is found, the employee develops an intention to quit and consequently leaves the organisation (Bluedorn, 1982; Jawahar & Hemmasi, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Mobley et al., 1978; Wheeler, et al., 2007). However, Mobley (1977) also recognised the fact that for some
individuals, the decision to leave an organisation was an impulsive act and did not follow his proposed steps.

The unfolding model of voluntary turnover (Lee & Mitchell 1994; Lee et al., 1999) examines different psychological paths individuals take when leaving organisations. Lee and Mitchell (1994) argue that turnover cannot be explained by linear decision making because turnover is a more complex process with both market-pull and psychological-push approaches contributing to the decisions and behaviours of people who voluntarily leave an organisation. Lee and Mitchell (1994) reasoned that expected or unexpected shocks to individuals’ status quo would lead them to assess their fit with their current job or organisation, causing them to take various decision paths.

While previous research on employee turnover focused on job dissatisfaction and perceived alternatives as catalysts for voluntary turnover, Lee and Mitchell’s (1994) unfolding model of voluntary turnover focused on alternative pathways to voluntary turnover that are not induced by job dissatisfaction (Crossley et al., 2007). They maintained that whereas quitting a job is often preceded by some degree of mental consideration (e.g. comparison with alternative jobs), remaining with an organisation may simply be the result of maintaining the status quo (Crossley et al., 2007). On the basis of this notion, Mitchell et al. (2001a, 2001b) argued that individuals can become stuck or “embedded” in their jobs as a result of various on-the-job and off-the-job factors. Mitchell et al. (2001a, 2001b) labelled these three factors “links”, “fit” and “sacrifice.”

According to the job embeddedness theory, employees become embedded in their jobs in the following situations (Mitchell et al., 2001a):

- They have strong connections or links with the organisation. These links could be the result of other people in the organisation, the actual job or the organisation itself.
- Employees’ perceive compatibility or fit with an organisation. Factors influencing their feelings of fit include their actual jobs, colleagues and organisational culture.
- Leaving the organisation would entail great sacrifice.

Job embeddedness has been negatively related to intention to leave and actual turnover. Individuals in the study who reported being more embedded in their jobs were less likely to leave their organisation (Mitchell et al., 2001a, 2001b).
The causal relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover is well established in research literature with the underlying premise being that turnover intention is the most important antecedent and predictor of turnover decision (Hsu et al., 2003; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wells & Peachey, 2011; Wilson, 2006). One way to reduce actual turnover is therefore to lower the rate of employees’ turnover intention (Hsu et al., 2003). The average correlation between turnover intention and actual turnover has been estimated to be between 0.38 (Griffeth et al., 2000) and 0.65 (Tett & Meyer, 1993) (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011).

However, turnover intention does not always result in actual turnover behaviour. Possible explanations include the following: (1) it does not account for impulsive behaviour; (2) it does not adequately capture perception and evaluation of alternatives; and (3) it does not take personal circumstances into account. Organisational and external conditions may result in a change of decision (Mobley et al., 1979).

Not all turnover is bad, with research distinguishing between functional and dysfunctional turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Brooks et al., 2005; Holtom et al., 2008). What employees do while they are with the organisation is as important (if not more important) as how long they remain with an organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1996). However, even if some forms of turnover are desirable (say losing poorly performing employees), most researchers use this term to refer to the loss of valued employees (Bigliardi et al., 2005). Because it is impossible to sustain zero turnover, organisations need to ensure they know who they are most and least willing to lose (Kochanski & Ledford, 2001).

In this study, turnover intention was defined as an individual’s behavioural intention to leave the organisation (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Mobley et al., 1979). The focus was on voluntary turnover, which is a function of perceived ease of movement and perceived desirability of movement (Carbery et al., 2003).

Turnover intention, instead of actual turnover, was used for this study, because not only have researchers found intention to be an accurate predictor of turnover (McKay et al., 2007; Zimmerman & Darnold, 2009), but it is also a more appropriate variable because it gives organisations the ability to intervene and influence the individual’s decision to leave the
organisation (Lazar, 2005). By understanding the predictors of turnover intention, organisations can introduce strategies to prevent turnover intentions (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

3.1.4 Career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

Career anchors generally explain why people stay engaged in a certain job or are committed to an organisation (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Organisational commitment is a variable that indicates the way in which individuals perceive their relationship with their organisation, what binds them to the organisation and what makes them want to stay with that organisation (Mowday et al., 1982). Intention to leave refers to an individual’s reduced level of commitment, which results in an increased desire to leave the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982).

Empirical evidence suggests that the main attribute of career anchor theory is congruence (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Wils et al., 2010). When individuals achieve congruence between their career anchor and their work environment, they are more likely to achieve positive career outcomes (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Wils et al., 2010). Research also indicates that individuals need congruence between their work and personal interests (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008), and that they make career choices and decisions based on personal preferences and current circumstances (Coetzee et al., 2007; De Villiers, 2009; Kanye & Crous, 2007). Career anchors influence every major decision about career issues, including their subjective experiences of career success, decisions to move, employee reactions to work experiences and their choice of career and workplace (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003).

The career anchor concept advocated by Schein (1978) is important to both the individual and the organisation. According to Schein (1978), people can make the difference between organisational success and failure. For example, having the wrong person for the job, or people working below their potential makes an organisation less likely to affectively achieve its goals (Schein, 1978). One can also expect certain occupations to attract individuals with specific career anchors more than others (Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003).

From an organisation’s perspective, research on career anchors can be used to guide current selection, placement, development and reward practices. In addition, an organisation might be able to reduce turnover of employees by matching career opportunities to employees’ career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2013; Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003; SamGnanakkan, 2010).
A number of research findings support the premise that employees who experience a match between their career anchors and their job setting report higher job satisfaction, more commitment to their organisation and lower intentions to leave than those employees who experience a mismatch (Chang et al., 2009; Hardin, 1995; Igbaria et al., 1991; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012; Steele & Francis-Smythe, 2010). Research conducted using a sample of information system employees indicated that employees whose internal career anchors were compatible with their jobs reported lower intentions to leave their organisations (Hsu et al., 2003).

The significant correlation between turnover intention and organisational commitment has also been substantiated by research (Bentein et al., 2005; DeConinck et al., 1994; Joo & Park, 2010; Lazar, 2005; Lee & Lui, 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Petersen, 2003; Yin-Fah et al., 2010), with organisational commitment proving to be an accurate predictor of turnover intention (Lazar, 2005; Mowday et al., 1982). Research studies have shown that greater organisational commitment can lead to a lowering of turnover intention (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Lazar, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Sjöberg & Sverke, 2000). According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees who are strongly committed are those who are least likely to leave. Numerous meta-analyses have substantiated the premise that the higher the commitment levels of the employee, the lower the predicted turnover intentions will be (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

### 3.1.5 Differences between groups

Research indicates significant differences between the career anchors of the following: males and females (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Coetzee et al., 2007; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Hardin, 1995; Kniveton, 2004; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ngokha, 2009); race groups (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009a; Coetzee et al., 2007; Lumley, 2009; Marshall & Bonner, 2003); employment position (Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Yarnall, 1998); and age groups (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Hardin, 1995; Marshall & Bonner, 2003).

There is conflicting research in terms of the relationship between gender and organisational commitment, with some research indicating no significant differences between gender and commitment (Al-Ajmi, 2006; Brimeyer et al., 2010; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003), while other research reported significant differences (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001; Khalili &
Asmawi, 2012; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982; Pretorius & Roodt, 2004). There are also conflicting findings on race and organisational commitment. Some research (Brimeyer et al., 2010; Coetzee et al., 2007; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Lumley, 2009) indicates no significant differences between race groups and commitment, while other research (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Vallabh & Donald, 2001) reports significant differences. Age is generally found to be positively related to organisational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Brimeyer et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2010; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Suliman & Iles, 2000).

Research findings suggest no significant differences between gender and turnover intention (Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008). Race has been shown to be a poor and inconsistent predictor of turnover (Martin & Roodt, 2008), whereas age has been consistently and negatively related to turnover intention (Finegold et al., 2002; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1982).

There is limited research available on the impact of position (employment position) on organisational commitment and turnover intention (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). DeConinck et al. (1994) found that marketing managers’ intention to leave their jobs was highly influenced by their degree of organisational commitment. A study by Tian-Foreman (2009) reported significant differences between managers and non-managers and their turnover intentions.
Figure 3.2: Theoretical relationship between biographical variables, career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention
3.1.6 Research objectives

The primary objectives of the study were as follows: (1) to explore the relationship between career anchors (as measured by the COI), organisational commitment (as measured by the OCQ) and turnover intention (as measured by a three-item scale, developed by Mobley et al., 1978); and (2) to determine whether employees from different gender, race, employment positions and age groups differ significantly in their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

Based on the primary objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated for the purposes of the study reported here:

H1: There are significant relationships between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

H2: Individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups differ significantly in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

3.1.7 The potential value-add of the study

This study extends the research on career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Understanding the relationships between these variables could provide valuable insights in terms of human resource strategies and practices that address the changing needs of organisations. An understanding of individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention will contribute new and valuable research to the field of industrial and organisational psychology. The ensuing sections describe the research design, the findings, conclusions and implications for practice and future research.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is “a strategic framework for action that serves as a bridge between research questions and the execution or implementation of the research” (Terre Blanche et al., 2006, p. 34). The research design in this study will be explained in the following section by referring to the research approach and method.
3.2.1 Research approach

A cross-sectional survey design using primary data was used to fulfil the research objectives. The primary data design allowed the researcher to control the data collection conditions (Babbie & Mouton, 2009). A quantitative approach was used to explore the relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

3.2.2 Research method

This section will clarify the research method followed in terms of the research participants, measuring instrument, research procedure and statistical analyses in this study.

3.2.2.1 Participants

A non-probability sample of 343 employees from an organisation in the South African retail sector was used.

Overall, there were more females (72%) than males (28%) in the sample. The racial composition of the sample \( n = 343 \) was as follows: 6% whites, 46% Africans, 36% Indians and 12% coloureds. Most of the participants were employed at staff level (73%) and the others at management level (27%). According to Super's (1980) career life stages, the participants were predominantly in the establishment life stage (ages 25-45), with 40% of the sample between the age of 25 and 29 and 40% between the age of 30 and 45; 20% of the sample was 46 years and older. Table 3.2 indicates that participants were predominantly female, African or Indian, general staff between the ages of 25 and 45.
Table 3.2

Biographical distribution of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.2 Measuring instruments

The Career Orientations Inventory (COI) (Schein, 2006), Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (Meyer & Allen, 1997), and a three-item turnover intention questionnaire developed by Mobley et al. (1978) were used to measure the variables of concern to this study. The participants were also asked to provide biographical information regarding their gender, race, employment position and age.

a. The COI

The COI (Schein, 2006) is an established instrument that has been used to measure career orientations both internationally and in South Africa. It is a self-report measure comprising 40 items. Responses are captured on a six-point Likert scale. The COI measures eight career preferences (technical/functional competence, general managerial competence, entrepreneurial creativity, security/stability, autonomy/independence, lifestyle, service/dedication to a cause and pure challenge).
Schein (1990) emphasises that the questionnaire provides a career orientation as opposed to the more accurate reflection of the individual’s career anchor. He believes that in order to determine an individual’s career anchor, a structured interview is necessary. For the purposes of this study, however, the career orientation is referred to as a career anchor. This approach was taken as it would have been too time consuming and costly to conduct a lengthy interview with each of the 343 participants in the study.

The COI has evidenced satisfactory psychometric validity and reliability in other South African multicultural samples (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Van Vuuren & Fourie, 2000). For example, Coetzee and Schreuder (2011) reported internal consistency of reliability estimates for the technical/functional as 0.77, general management as 0.79, autonomy as 0.80, security as 0.81, entrepreneurial creativity as 0.78, service/dedication to a cause as 0.78, pure challenge as 0.77 and lifestyle as 0.78. Although a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.75 is considered a desirable reliability coefficient, in the case of individual testing, reliabilities as low as 0.30 are acceptable when instruments are used to gather group data (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). In accordance with the guidelines provided by Terre Blanche et al. (2006), the psychometric properties of the COI were regarded as acceptable for the purpose of this study because its aim was to measure broad group-based trends.

Table 3.3 summarises the Cronbach alpha values of the COI scales and makes a comparison with some similar studies conducted in South Africa. The reliability has been calculated on part A of the COI form, which asks respondents to rate themselves on a scale of 1 to 6 on each of the items.
Table 3.3

*Internal reliability: Cronbach alpha coefficients of the COI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability values found in this study were fairly consistent with those of similar studies, with the exception of service/dedication to a cause which indicated a lower reliability of 0.45 compared to values of 0.66 and above found in other studies. The technical/functional scale also indicated a lower reliability of 0.47, although this is consistent with lower reliabilities evident in the other studies.

In order to investigate whether the Cronbach alpha coefficients of subscales could be improved, item analyses were conducted. It was found that removing certain items only improved the coefficients values marginally, and the researcher therefore decided to include all the items in the scales for the purpose of this study.

*b. The OCQ*

Organisational commitment was measured using the three-dimensional OCQ (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The OCQ is a multifactorial measure for assessing individuals’ affective (6 items), continuance (6 items) and normative commitment (6 items). Responses were made on a seven-point Likert-type scale and were averaged to yield composite commitment scores for each participant.

Meyer et al. (1993) reported internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach alphas) for affective commitment (0.82), continuance commitment (0.74) and normative commitment (0.83).
These meet the required 0.70 Cronbach alpha reliability standard to ascertain internal reliability. They also confirmed test-retest reliability. Briscoe and Finkelstein (2009) reported internal consistency reliability estimates for affective commitment (0.85), continuance commitment (0.80) and normative commitment (0.87). Allen and Meyer (1996) also attest to the questionnaire having convergent and discriminative validity. Studies by Coetzee et al. (2007), Lumley (2009), and Lumley et al. (2011) have confirmed the reliability and validity of the OCQ in the South African context.

Table 3.4

*Internal reliability: Cronbach alpha coefficients of the OCQ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCQ scales</th>
<th>Cronbach coefficients</th>
<th>alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability values for the organisational commitment scales in this study were adequately high, all showing values above 0.60. The Cronbach alpha value for total commitment (across all items of commitment) was 0.73.

The OCS (Meyer & Allen, 1997) was used in this study because of its high degree of reliability and validity, and the fact that it is affordable and easy to administer. In addition, the three dimensions and the contents pertaining to the affective, normative and continuance commitment scales were applicable to this study.

c. Turnover intention

Turnover intention in this study was measured using the following three items: desire to quit (“I think a lot about leaving this organisation”), seriously thinking about quitting (“I am actively searching for an acceptable alternative to this organisation”), and intention to quit (“When I can, I will leave the organisation”). These questions were developed by Mobley et al. (1978) to measure turnover intention, and this three-item scale has shown acceptable integral consistency. Morrison (2004) reported an internal consistency estimate (Cronbach alpha) of
0.82. Bigliardi et al.’s (2005) study determined a Cronbach alpha of 0.86. In additional research studies, Joo and Park (2010) and Yin-Fah et al. (2010) found that the alpha coefficient for the three items was 0.82 and 0.90 respectively. Responses were captured on a seven-point Likert scale.

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TI scale</th>
<th>Cronbach coefficients</th>
<th>alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover intention in this study showed a high internal reliability consistency, with a Cronbach alpha value of 0.77.

Since the purpose of this study was not to make individual predictions based on the COI, OCQ and turnover intention questionnaire, but to investigate broad trends and relationships between certain variables, the instruments were considered psychometrically acceptable.

3.2.2.3 Research procedure

Ethical clearance to conduct the study and permission for employees to participate in the research study were obtained from the CEO of the retail company. Participation was voluntary and employees were afforded the opportunity of attending allocated sessions. At the beginning of each session, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and the participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity and the voluntary nature of participation. A cover letter was provided explaining the purpose of the research, procedure, potential benefits, confidentiality, anonymity, participation and withdrawal. All the participants were also asked to complete a written consent form. They completed the questionnaires in a session allocated for this purpose and returned the completed questionnaires to the researcher who coordinated the session.
3.2.2.4 Statistical analysis

The Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS, 2010) was used to analyse the data for the quantitative analysis. Descriptive statistics, correlational and inferential statistics were calculated. Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to assess the internal consistency reliability of the measuring instruments.

In order to assess hypothesis H1 (there is a significant relationship between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention), Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to assess the direction and strength of the relationships between the variables. In order to counter the probability of a type 1 error, the significance value was set at the 95% confidence interval level ($p \leq 0.05$). For the purposes of this study, $r$ values larger than 0.30 (medium effect) (Cohen, 1992) were regarded as practically significant.

Standard multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to determine the proportion of variance that is explained by the independent variables (career anchors and organisational commitment) regarding the scores of the dependent variable (turnover intention). Since a number of independent variables had to be considered, the value of the adjusted $R^2$ was used to interpret the regression results. $R^2$ values of $\leq 0.12$ (small practical effect) and $\geq 0.13 \leq 0.25$ (medium practical effect) (Cohen, 1992) were also considered in the interpretation of the results.

Tests for mean differences were performed to test research hypothesis H2 (individuals from different gender, race, employment position and age groups differ in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention). T-tests were used to compute the differences between groups (males and females, Africans and Indians, management and general staff and age groups). ANOVAs were performed to test for significant mean differences between the various age groups.
3.3 RESULTS

This section reviews the descriptive and inferential statistics of significant value for each scale applied.

3.3.1 Descriptive statistics

The means and standard deviations of each of the eight COI scales, the three organisational commitment scales and turnover intention are presented in table 3.6.

In terms of the COI, the highest mean scores were obtained on the security/stability (M = 5.23; SD = 1.26), lifestyle (M = 4.97; SD = 1.35), service/dedication to a cause (M = 4.80; SD = 1.10) and pure challenge (M = 4.78; SD = 1.17) subscales. The score for technical/functional competence (M = 4.60; SD = 1.04) was in the middle range, while autonomy/independence (M = 3.81; SD = 1.32) and general managerial competence (M = 3.40; SD = 1.17) had the lowest mean scores. The standard deviations of the subscales were fairly similar, all ranging from 1.04 to 1.50.

The mean scores of all the OCQ scales ranged from 4.59 to 4.86. The sample of participants obtained the highest mean scores on the affective commitment subscale (M = 4.86; SD = 1.08) and the lowest scores on the continuance commitment subscale (M = 4.59; SD = 1.52). The standard deviations of the subscales ranged from 1.08 to 1.52.

The turnover intention average score for the sample was 4.10 out of 7. A higher score represents higher intentions to leave the organisation. A frequency distribution, which is indicated in table 3.7, further examines the intention of respondents to leave the organisation.
Table 3.6
*Descriptive statistics: mean scores for COI, OCQ and turnover intention (n = 343)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the sample, 30% scored a 3 or lower out of 7 on the turnover intention scale, indicating that there is potential for the organisation to lose 70% of these employees.
Table 3.7

*Descriptive statistics: frequency distribution for turnover intention (n = 343)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover intention values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 Correlational statistics

Pearson product-moment correlations \((r)\) allowed the researcher to identify the direction and strength of the relationships between each of the variables. A cut-off of \(p \leq 0.05\) \((r \geq 0.30,\) medium practical effect size) was used for the interpretation of significance of the findings (Cohen, 1992).

#### 3.3.2.1 Reporting of intercorrelations between career anchors (COI) and organisational commitment (OCQ): Pearson product-moment correlations

As indicated in table 3.8, significant positive relationships were observed between the following COI and OCQ variables: technical/functional career anchor and continuance commitment \((r =\)
0.12; \( p \leq 0.05 \); small practical effect size); technical/functional and normative commitment \((r = 0.13; \ p \leq 0.05\); small practical effect size); technical/functional and total commitment \((r = 0.15; \ p \leq 0.01\); small practical effect size); and security/stability and continuance commitment \((r = 0.12; \ p \leq 0.05\); small practical effect size).

The following significant negative correlations were also observed: autonomy/independence and affective commitment \((r = -0.19; \ p \leq 0.001\); small practical effect size); entrepreneurial creativity and affective commitment \((r = -0.28; \ p \leq 0.001\); small practical effect size); entrepreneurial creativity and normative commitment \((r = -0.20; \ p \leq 0.001\); small practical effect size); entrepreneurial creativity and total commitment \((r = -0.16; \ p \leq 0.01\); small practical effect size); and lifestyle and affective commitment \((r = -0.11; \ p \leq 0.05\); small practical effect size).

Table 3.8
**Correlations between COI and OCQ variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organisational commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12+</td>
<td>0.13+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.02+</td>
<td>0.02+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-0.19+</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12+</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.03+</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-0.28+</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>-0.11+</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.04+</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** \( p \leq 0.001 \); ** \( p \leq 0.01 \); * \( p \leq 0.05 \) (two-tailed). +++ \( r \geq 0.50 \) (large practical effect size) ++ \( r \geq 0.30 \leq 0.49 \) (medium practical effect size) + \( r \leq 0.29 \) (small practical effect size)

3.3.2.2 Reporting of intercorrelations between career anchors (COI) and turnover intention: Pearson product-moment correlations

Table 3.9 indicates that in this study there were significant positive correlations between the following COI scales and turnover intention:

- autonomy/independence ($r = 0.21; p \leq 0.001$; small practical effect size)
- entrepreneurial creativity ($r = 0.31; p \leq 0.001$; medium practical effect size)
- service/dedication to a cause ($r = 0.13; p \leq 0.01$; small practical effect size)
- lifestyle ($r = 0.21; p \leq 0.001$; small practical effect size)

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>0.21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>0.31++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>0.13+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq 0.001$  ** $p \leq 0.01$  * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed). +++ $r \geq 0.50$ (large practical effect size) ++ $r \geq 0.30 \leq 0.49$ (medium practical effect size) + $r \leq 0.29$ (small practical effect size)
3.3.2.3 Reporting of intercorrelations between organisational commitment (OCQ) and turnover intention: Pearson product-moment correlations

As indicated in table 3.10, significant negative correlations were observed between all the OCQ variables and turnover intention, except for continuance commitment. A strong negative correlation was evident between turnover intention and affective commitment ($r = -0.54; p \leq 0.001$; large practical effect size). Turnover intention also correlated negatively with normative commitment ($r = -0.43; p \leq 0.001$; medium practical effect size) and total commitment ($r = -0.40; p \leq 0.001$; medium practical effect size).

Table 3.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations between OCQ variables and turnover intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover intention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total commitment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq 0.001$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed). +++ $r \geq 0.50$ (large practical effect size) ++ $r \geq 0.30 \leq 0.49$ (medium practical effect size) + $r \leq 0.29$ (small practical effect size)

3.3.3 Multiple regression analyses

A stepwise multiple regression was conducted using the COI and OCQ variables as the independent variables and turnover intention as the dependent variable. The collinearity statistics (variance inflation factor [VIF] and the tolerance score) were computed, but are not reflected in the tables. Multicollinearity could be a concern when conducting regression analysis and the VIF and tolerance scores are examined to determine the extent of multicollinearity. Although there is no formal VIF value for determining the presence of multicollinearity, it is suggested that VIF values exceeding 10 should be regarded as indicators of multicollinearity (Field, 2005). The scores found for the current study were all well below 10, and multicollinearity was thus not considered to be a concern.
3.3.3.1 Multiple regression analysis with COI as the independent variables and organisational commitment as the dependent variable

Table 3.11 provides the summary of results from the stepwise multiple regression analyses with COI as the independent variables and total organisational commitment as the dependent variable. Three significant models were extracted ($p \leq 0.001$). Each of the three models explains only a small percentage of the variance in organisational commitment.

The first model predicts 2% of variance in organisational commitment ($R^2 = 0.02$; small practical effect) and includes only entrepreneurial creativity as a predictor. The second model increases the variance to 5% ($R^2 = 0.05$, small practical effect) and includes both entrepreneurial creativity and lifestyle as predictors. By adding a third predictor, service/dedication to a cause the variance increases to 7% ($R^2 = 0.07$, small practical effect).

Lifestyle had the largest correlation with organisational commitment ($\beta = 0.21; p \leq 0.001$) followed by entrepreneurial creativity ($\beta = -0.20; p \leq 0.001$) and service/dedication to a cause ($\beta = -0.13; p \leq 0.01$). Although there were some correlations between the COI variables (entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause) and organisational commitment, the correlations were generally very low (small effect sizes). These results indicated a weak relationship between career anchors and organisational commitment.
Table 3.11

Multiple regression analysis: COI and OCQ variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficients</th>
<th>Std coef.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>37.11</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>8.52**</td>
<td>0.02+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>(p = 0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>10.77**</td>
<td>0.05+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>(p = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>9.30***</td>
<td>0.07+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>(p = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent variable: organisational commitment

+++ $p \leq 0.001$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed). $R^2 \leq 0.12$ (small practical effect size) $++R^2 \geq 0.13 \leq 0.25$ (medium practical effect size) $++++R^2 \geq 0.26$ (large practical effect size)

EC = Entrepreneurial creativity, SV = Service/dedication to a cause, LS = Lifestyle

3.3.3.2 Multiple regression analysis with COI variables as the independent variables and turnover intention as the dependent variable

Table 3.12 provides the summary of results of the stepwise multiple regression analyses, with the COI variables as the independent variables and turnover intention as the dependent variable. Three possible models were extracted, and each model was significant ($p \leq 0.001$). The analysis shows that entrepreneurial creativity explains the most variance in turnover intention ($R^2 = 0.10$; small practical effect), with lifestyle adding an additional 3% ($R^2 = 0.13$, medium practical effect) and service/dedication to a cause increasing the variance by a further 2% ($R^2 = 0.15$; medium practical effect).

Although all three variables in the third model contributed significantly to the variance in the turnover intention scores, entrepreneurial creativity had the largest correlation with turnover intention ($\beta = 0.32; p \leq 0.001$), followed by lifestyle ($\beta = 0.23; p \leq 0.001$) and service/dedication to a cause ($\beta = -0.12; p \leq 0.05$).
### Table 3.12

**Multiple regression analysis: COI variables and turnover intention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficients</th>
<th>Std coef.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) 2.69 0.25 0.31</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>37.06***</td>
<td>0.10+</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC 0.35 0.06 0.31</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) 1.48 0.39 0.31</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>27.40***</td>
<td>0.13++</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC 0.34 0.06 0.31</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS 0.25 0.06 0.20</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant) 2.14 0.47 0.32</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>20.38***</td>
<td>0.15++</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC 0.36 0.06 0.32</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(p = 0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LS 0.28 0.06 0.23</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SV -0.18 0.08 -0.12</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3.3 Multiple regression analysis with OCQ as the independent variables and turnover intention as the dependent variable

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was again performed, this time with OCQ as the independent variables and turnover intention as the dependent variable. The results are presented in table 3.13.

Two significant models were extracted ($p \leq 0.001$). Each of the models explains a large percentage of the variance in turnover intention. The first model predicts 29% of variance in organisational commitment ($R^2 = 0.29$; large practical effect) and includes only affective commitment. The second model increases the variance to 32% ($R^2 = 0.32$, large practical effect) and includes both affective and normative commitment as significant negative predictors of turnover intention.

Affective commitment had the largest correlation with turnover intention ($\beta = -0.43; p \leq 0.001$) followed by normative commitment ($\beta = -0.21; p \leq 0.001$).
Table 3.13
Multiple regression analysis: OCQ variables and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardised coefficients</th>
<th>Std coef.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. error</td>
<td>Beta (β)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>136.63</td>
<td>0.29+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-11.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79.81</td>
<td>0.32+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affective</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-8.23</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>normative</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-4.09</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq 0.001$  ** $p \leq 0.01$  * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed). + $R^2 \leq 0.12$ (small practical effect size) +++$R^2 \geq 0.13 < 0.25$

(medium practical effect size) ++++$R^2 \geq 0.26$ (large practical effect size)
Figure 3.3 and table 3.20 indicate the most significant relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

Figure 3.3: Relationship between career anchors (COI), organisational commitment (OCQ) and turnover intention
Table 3.14
Correlations (size effects) between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Correlation Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large effect (-ve)</td>
<td>- Negative correlation exists between affective commitment and turnover intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium effect (+ve)</td>
<td>- Positive correlation exists between COI variable, entrepreneurial creativity and turnover intention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Medium effect (-ve) | - Negative correlation exists between normative commitment and turnover intention.  
- Negative correlation exists between total commitment and turnover intention. |
| Small effect (+ve) | - Positive correlation exists between COI variable, technical/functional competence, and continuance, normative and total commitment.  
- Positive correlation exists between COI variable, security/stability and continuance commitment.  
- Positive correlation exists between COI variable, autonomy/independence and turnover intention.  
- Positive correlation exists between COI variable, service/dedication to a cause and turnover intention.  
- Positive correlation exists between COI variable, lifestyle and turnover intention. |
| Small effect (-ve) | - Negative correlation exists between COI variable, autonomy/independence and affective commitment.  
- Negative correlation exists between COI variable, entrepreneurial creativity, and affective, normative and total commitment.  
- Negative correlation exists between COI variable, lifestyle and affective commitment. |
Figure 3.4 shows a summary of the multiple regression analyses results.

The main objective of this study was to determine the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Overall, the stepwise regression analyses indicated that there are significant relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention variables. The results provided evidence in support of the research hypothesis (H1).
3.3.4 Inferential statistics: T-tests for significant mean differences

Parametric tests such as the t-test and ANOVA tests assume a normal distribution of data, interval measurements and homogeneity of variance. However, it has long been established that moderate violations in parametric assumptions have little or no impact on the substantive conclusions of most studies (Cohen, 1969).

While not all of the variables in the current study were normally distributed, they did not deviate greatly from the normal distribution. COI variables are mostly normally distributed when using a 99% confidence interval. An examination of turnover intention and OCQ box plots show that they deviated only moderately from the normal distribution. It was therefore decided to use parametric statistics to test for differences in means. The Levene's test for equality in this study shows that, in most instances, equal variances can be assumed, with the exception of turnover intention ($p = 0.00$).

3.3.4.1 Gender

The mean scores of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of males of females were compared using an independent t-test. Table 3.15 provides the results from the t-test and table 3.16 provides a summary of the mean scores that were tested.
Table 3.15
Independent t-test results for gender: COI, OCQ and turnover intention (n = 343)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COI subscales</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCQ subscales</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *** p ≤ 0.001 ** p ≤ 0.01 * p ≤ 0.05 (two-tailed)

The results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between gender and the COI variables autonomy/independence (p ≤ 0.05) and entrepreneurial creativity (p ≤ 0.001). Males and females did not differ significantly on any of the organisational commitment scales or in terms of turnover intention.

Table 3.16 shows that the male participants (M = 4.06; SD = 1.29) obtained a significantly higher score for autonomy/independence than the females (M = 3.71; SD = 1.32). The men also scored significantly higher (M = 4.70; SD = 1.45) than the women in entrepreneurial creativity (M = 3.82; SD = 1.44).
Table 3.16

Mean scores for significant differences for gender on COI, OCQ and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.2 Race

In this study, the white and coloured respondents had small base sizes that were not deemed sufficient for including in the comparison statistics.

The t-test results in table 3.17 show that the African and Indian respondents differed significantly on the COI variables of general managerial competence \((p \leq 0.05)\), autonomy/independence \((p \leq 0.001)\), security/stability \((p \leq 0.001)\) and entrepreneurial creativity \((p \leq 0.001)\). They also differed significantly in terms of affective commitment \((p \leq 0.001)\) and total commitment \((p \leq 0.01)\), and in turnover intention \((p \leq 0.001)\). Table 3.18 shows the mean scores of the African and Indian respondents on each of these variables where there were significant differences.
Table 3.17
Independent t-test results for race: COI, OCQ and turnover intention ($n = 343$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COI subscales</th>
<th>t-test for equality of means</th>
<th>Levene’s test for equality of variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ subscales</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq 0.001$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed)

Table 3.18 shows that the African respondents ($M = 3.52; SD = 1.20$) obtained a significantly higher score for general managerial competence than the Indian respondents ($M = 3.26; SD = 1.02$). This difference was only significant at the 0.05% level. The African respondents also scored significantly higher than the Indian respondents on autonomy/independence and on entrepreneurial creativity. The Indian respondents ($M = 5.45; SD = 1.25$) scored significantly higher on security/stability than the African respondents ($M = 5.00; SD = 1.27$).
In terms of commitment, the Indian respondents ($M = 5.03; SD = 1.12$) scored higher on affective commitment than the African respondents ($M = 4.59; SD = 0.93$). The Indian respondents ($M = 4.79; SD = 0.80$) also scored higher on total commitment than the African respondents ($M = 4.53; SD = 0.74$).

On turnover intention, the Indian respondents scored significantly lower at 3.93 (SD = 1.78) compared to 4.55 (SD = 1.39) for the African respondents.

Table 3.18  
*Mean scores for significant differences for race on COI, OCQ and turnover intention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.3 Employment position

The t-test results in table 3.19 show that there was a statistically significant difference between management and staff in terms of the COI variables technical/functional competence ($p \leq 0.05$) and entrepreneurial creativity ($p \leq 0.05$). There was also a significant difference between the
two groups in terms of affective commitment \((p \leq 0.001)\), normative commitment \((p \leq 0.05)\) and total commitment \((p \leq 0.01)\). A significant difference was also observed in terms of turnover intention \((p \leq 0.01)\).

Table 3.19

*Independent t-test results for position: COI, OCQ and turnover intention \((n = 343)\)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COI subscales</th>
<th>t-test for equality of means</th>
<th>Levene's test for equality of variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ subscales</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(*** p \leq 0.001 \quad ** p \leq 0.01 \quad * p \leq 0.05\) (two-tailed)

Table 3.20 shows that the management participants \((M = 4.79; \ SD = 1.06)\) obtained a significantly higher score for technical/functional competence than the staff \((M = 4.53; \ SD = 1.03)\). The managers \((M = 3.81; \ SD = 1.37)\), however, scored significantly lower than the staff on entrepreneurial creativity \((M = 4.16; \ SD = 1.53)\).
In terms of commitment, the managers appeared to be significantly more committed than the staff members. The managers (M = 5.38; SD = 1.06) scored higher on affective commitment than the staff (M = 4.68; SD = 1.02). On normative commitment, the managers scored 4.92 (SD = 1.11) compared to the staff at 4.62 (SD = 1.10).

The managers had a significantly lower intention of leaving the organisation, with a turnover intention score of 3.63 (SD = 1.71) compared to 4.27 (SD = 1.61) for the staff members.

Table 3.20

Mean scores for significant differences for position on COI, OCQ and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>Mgt</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.4.4. Age

In the case of the age groups, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to investigate whether the three age groups (25-29, 30-45 and 46-65) differed significantly regarding their mean scores obtained on the COI, OCQ and turnover intention questionnaire. Table 3.21 shows that the age groups only differed in terms of the COI variables: general managerial competence (p ≤ 0.05), autonomy/independence (p ≤ 0.01) and entrepreneurial
creativity ($p \leq 0.001$). There were also significant differences between the age groups in terms of affective commitment ($p \leq 0.001$), normative commitment ($p \leq 0.001$), total commitment ($p \leq 0.001$) and turnover intention ($p \leq 0.001$).

Table 3.21
ANOVA results for age groups: COI, OCQ and turnover intention ($n = 343$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COI subscales</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Levene's test for equality of variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/dedication to a cause</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure challenge</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>0.00***</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p \leq 0.001$  ** $p \leq 0.01$  * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed)

Table 3.22 presents the means scores and standard deviations of each of the age groups on those scales where significant differences were found. A post-hoc Duncan test was performed to determine between which of the age groups the significant differences lay. The results of this test were incorporated into the table below and shown by the use of one, two or three asterisk/s (*') next to the groups that differed.
The results revealed that the youngest age group of 25 to 29 most often differed from the two older age groups (while the two age groups of 30-45 and 46-65 did not differ from one another. This was the case with autonomy/independence, where the youngest group (\(M = 4.10; \ SD = 1.24\)) scored significantly higher than both the older age groups (\(M = 3.57; \ SD = 1.26\) for 30-45 and \(M = 3.70; \ SD = 1.49\) for 46-65). The 25 to 29 age group (\(M = 4.57; \ SD = 1.39\)) also scored significantly higher than both the older age groups (\(M = 3.87; \ SD = 1.49\) for the 30-45 group; \(M = 3.48; \ SD = 1.43\) for the 46-65 group) on entrepreneurial creativity. In terms of general managerial competence, the youngest age group (\(M = 3.54; \ SD = 1.18\)) only differed significantly from the oldest age group (\(M = 3.12; \ SD = 1.23\)), while the middle age group did not differ significantly from either of the other two scores.

In terms of affective commitment, a linear trend was observed. Each of the age groups differed significantly from one another, with the youngest respondents (\(M = 4.45; \ SD = 1.05\)) showing the lowest score, followed by the 30 to 45 group (\(M = 5.02; \ SD = 1.01\)) and the 46 to 65 group showing the highest scores (\(M = 5.37; \ SD = 0.99\)). For normative and total commitment, however, once again, only the younger respondents (aged 25-29) differed from the two older age groups, while the respondents aged 30 and over did not differ significantly from one another.

Turnover intention again showed a linear trend with the youngest respondents, aged 25 to 29, being the most likely to declare an intent to leave the organisation (\(M = 4.75; \ SD = 1.32\)). The respondents over the age of 46 were not very likely to leave the company, with a low turnover intention score of 2.83 (\(SD = 1.67\))
Table 3.22
Mean scores for significant differences for age groups on COI, OCQ and turnover intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3.54*</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.12**</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.10*</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.57**</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.70**</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.57*</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3.87**</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.48**</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.02**</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.37***</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.42*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.81**</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.03**</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.84**</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.01**</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>25-29 yrs</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 yrs</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.10**</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 yrs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.83***</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p ≤ 0.001  ** p ≤ 0.01  * p ≤ 0.05 (two-tailed)

Overall, the relationship between the different instruments (COI, OCQ and turnover intention) and the demographic variables (gender, race, position and age) suggest that the participants did differ in career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. There was therefore supportive evidence for research hypotheses H1 and H2.
Table 3.23 provides a summary of the key significant differences by scales/subscales and biographical groups for COI, OCQ and turnover intention.

**Table 3.23**

*Summary of the significant differences by scales/subscales and biographical groups for COI, OCQ and turnover intention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measuring instrument</th>
<th>Scales/subscales</th>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical/functional competence</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General managerial competence</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy/independence</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security/stability</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneurial creativity</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring instrument</td>
<td>Scales/subscales</td>
<td>Demographic variable</td>
<td>Total mean score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ</td>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>African Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29 Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Management High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29 Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total commitment</td>
<td>African Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29 Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>African High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-29 High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-45 Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-65 Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.5 Decisions regarding the research hypotheses

The results provided evidence in support of both H1 (which states that there are significant relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention variables) and H2 (which states that there are significant differences between the gender, race, position and age groups regarding their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention).

3.4 DISCUSSION

The primary objective of the study was to explore the relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention as manifested in a sample of participants employed in the South African organisational context.

The secondary objective was to determine the differences between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of individuals from various gender, race, employment position and age groups, as manifested in the sample of participants.

3.4.1 Career anchors profile

Career anchors influence every major decision about career issues, including decisions to move, employee reactions to work experiences and their choice of career and workplace (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003).

In terms of the participants’ dominant career anchors profile, the mean scores indicated that security/stability, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause were the dominant career anchors guiding the participants’ career decisions. These findings are in line with research conducted by Coetzee and Schreuder (2008, 2011), who also found the same three career anchors to be dominant in their studies. They attributed their results to be in part due to the participants working in the service industry, as was the case in this study (i.e. retail is based on customer service). One would expect certain occupations to attract individuals with specific career anchors more than others (Ramakrishna & Potosky, 2003).
The high mean score for the security/stability (need-based) career anchor suggests that in this study, the participants preferred working in environments offering stable, secure and steady employment (Schein, 1978). A study by Erdoğmus (2004) found that security/stability was the most important career anchor among participants in Turkey. He attributed these findings to rising levels of unemployment and a volatile economic situation in the country at the time. Schein (1996) maintains that individuals anchored in security/stability experience the most severe problems because of organisations no longer offering employment security. According to Erdoğmus (2004), their base of security and stability has to shift from dependence on an organisation to dependence on themselves (i.e. employability). It is interesting to note that other studies (e.g. Marshall & Bonner, 2003) have found a reduction in the importance of the security/stability career anchor. Instead, research indicates that managers and employees now show a higher preference for jobs that are more oriented towards serving people and making the world a better place (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b, 2011; Coetzee et al., 2007; Schein, 1996). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2013) the increasing emphasis on social responsibility and global and moral citizenship may also explain the increased preference for the service/dedication to a cause career anchor.

Since the participants in the current study worked in retail, it makes sense that these participants would indicate a high mean score for service/dedication to a cause (value-based career anchor). They value working in an environment where they serve others because this is in main part the key function of their job. Individuals generally strive for congruence between their career anchors and the work environment in which they pursue their careers (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Schein, 1990; Wils et al., 2010), indicating that the participants in this study would share the service/dedication to cause value with the organisation (i.e. both emphasise the value of serving others).

The high mean score for the lifestyle (need-based) career anchor indicates that the participants in this study seemed to prefer working in an environment that allows them to express their desire for balancing their family and other personal interests with their work commitments. Other studies (e.g. Coetzee et al., 2013; Du Toit & Coetzee, 2012; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012) have highlighted the shift toward the lifestyle career anchor as being the dominant career anchor in today's world of work. Danziger and Valency (2006) postulated that the dominance of the lifestyle anchor may reflect a growing desire of working adults to balance the different facets of their lives: work, family and leisure. Coetzee and Schreuder (2009a) found that the lifestyle
career anchor was related to two underlying dimensions: being able to develop and maintain a lifestyle that balances one’s career and family needs; and having the freedom and autonomy to choose and maintain a certain lifestyle. Meister and Willyerd (2010) predict that as the workplace evolves in terms of increased globalisation, virtual employment and mobile technology, individuals’ concerns about work-life flexibility will increase as they attempt to manage both their work and personal lives better.

The low mean scores obtained for the general managerial competence (talent-based) and autonomy/independence (need-based) career anchors suggest that advancing up the corporate ladder (and taking on more managerial responsibilities and decision making) and/or working independently with little supervision were not as important to the participants in this study. These results are in line with other research. In a study by Mignonac and Herrbach (2003), the dominant career anchors in their sample of French engineers were lifestyle, technical/functional and service/dedication to a cause. Autonomy/independence and general managerial competence scored the lowest. Igbaria et al. (1991) also reported that service/dedication to a cause and lifestyle were the strongest, and general managerial competence among the weakest career anchors in a sample of US research and development, and engineering professionals.

3.4.2 Organisational commitment profile

In this study, the participants scored the highest on affective commitment and the lowest on continuance commitment. The high score obtained for affective commitment suggests that the participants continue their employment with the organisation because they want to - that is, they have an emotional attachment to the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). This high score is important to the organisation because research (Albrecht & Andreetta, 2011; Canipe, 2006; Labatmediene et al., 2007) indicates that affective commitment is the main predictor of intention to leave.

The high score for normative commitment indicates that the participants in this study remain with the organisation because of feelings of obligation or duty (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Döckel, 2003; Meyer & Allen 1991, 1997). According to Meyer and Allen (1991), these feelings motivate individuals to behave appropriately and do what is right for the organisation.
The lowest mean score obtained was for the continuance commitment variable suggesting that these participants do not stay with the organisation because of the perceived costs involved in leaving the organisation and/or fewer job alternatives outside the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Overall, the findings of this study are in line with other research. Lazar (2005) found that affective and normative levels of commitment are the best predictors for examining an employee’s intent to leave an organisation. Research by Somers (2010) indicates that highly committed employees and those specifically with an affective-normative commitment dominant profile have lower turnover intentions due to higher person-organisation value congruence.

As reported in Allen and Meyer (1996), various studies have measured the correlations between organisational commitment and turnover intention. Turnover intention is consistently and significantly related to affective commitment (with correlations between 0.29 and 0.61) and normative commitment (correlations range from 0.20 to 0.38). Correlations between continuance commitment and turnover intentions are less consistent across studies, ranging from 0.00 and 0.42.

### 3.4.3 Turnover intention profile

The relatively high mean score of 4.1 for the sample should be of concern to the organisation in terms of the number of employees intending to leave the organisation. The findings indicate that 70% of the participants have high turnover intentions. With 70% of the sample scoring over 3.00, commitment strategies need to be implemented to reduce the potential number of employees voluntarily leaving the organisation.

By identifying factors that may be related to turnover intention, organisations and researchers may proactively identify the key determinants of turnover, and develop and manage strategies to decrease voluntary turnover (Cooper, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2001a; Pienaar et al., 2007). Identifying the key determinants of turnover may assist organisations to reduce replacement costs, and prevent them from spending time and money on factors that do not correct the problem (Cooper, 2010).
3.4.4 Relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

In terms of the multiple regression analysis, a significant and positive relationship was found between the lifestyle career anchor and organisational commitment; and a significant and negative relationship between the entrepreneurial creativity and service/dedication to a cause career anchors and organisational commitment. The relationship between career anchors and organisation commitment was significant but weak (with small effect sizes).

In terms of the participant’s career anchors and turnover intention, significant and positive relationships were found between entrepreneurial creativity and lifestyle career anchors and turnover intention, with service/dedication to cause showing a negative relationship with turnover intention.

Affective and normative commitment both indicated significant and negative correlations with turnover intention, with affective commitment being the best predictor of turnover intention.

3.4.4.1 Career anchors and organisational commitment

The results of a South African study by Coetzee et al. (2007) indicated that although there were a number of significant associations between the participants’ organisational commitment levels and career anchors, career anchors were not significant predictors of organisational commitment. Using canonical correlation analysis, Coetzee et al. (2007) indicated that career anchors explained only 0.03% of the commitment variance in their study, while the commitment variables only explained 0.04% of the career anchor variance. In this study, the results indicated significant but low (small effect sizes) correlations between the COI and OCQ variables. The results also showed that COI variables only predict a small percentage of the variance in organisational commitment. These results combined, point to a weak relationship between career anchors and organisational commitment.

The positive relationship observed between the COI variables of technical/functional (talent-based career anchor) and continuance, normative and total commitment suggests that the participants in the current study may believe that they have invested too much in the organisation to leave, and/or that there are no suitable job alternatives outside the organisation.
(continuance commitment), and/or that the organisation has invested time and money in them and they thus feel obliged to stay (normative commitment) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Schein (1996) cautions that individual's with a preference for using their technical/functional competence may have difficulty finding work in other organisations if they do not take on the responsibility of investing their own time and energy in updating their skills.

Individuals who need stable and secure work environment and place an emphasis on benefit packages (Schein, 1978) are less likely to leave an organisation when they believe the perceived costs of leaving are too great (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The positive correlation between security/stability (need-based career anchor) and continuance commitment therefore makes sense. They may be staying with the organisation because they wish to preserve, say, their pension benefits.

The negative relationship between autonomy/independence (need-based career anchor) and affective commitment suggests that participants who need autonomy and independence (personal freedom in job/work context) are not as emotionally attached to the organisation as other participants. These participants want to be valued for their expertise, do not like close supervision and prefer jobs in which they can work on their own time and terms (they are not team players). Their primary need is to be on their own - setting their own pace, schedules, lifestyles and work habits (Schein, 1978). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), affective commitment is developed through work experiences like job challenge, degree of autonomy, the variety of skills used by the employee, knowing the role that the employee plays in his/her organisation and the relationship between the employee and his/her co-workers and supervisor. Ferreira et al.'s (2010) research revealed that participants who value the general managerial and autonomy/independence career anchors feel both affectively and normatively committed to the organisation. They posit that feelings of responsibility engendered by having authority and influence over others tend to increase a sense of accountability to stay in the occupation and organisation, and include an enhanced awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation.

Participants with a high entrepreneurial creativity career anchor place a great deal of emphasis on creating new products and services; they constantly want new challenges and value wealth, ownership, freedom and power (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008). The negative relationship between this career anchor and affective, normative and total commitment indicates that an
emotional bond or sense of duty will not increase their organisational commitment if they are unable to work in an environment that allows them to use their entrepreneurial and creative talents.

The negative relationship between lifestyle (need-based career anchor) and affective commitment suggests that participants who rate work-life balance high as a preference will not remain in the organisation out of an emotional attachment to it. If flexibility and work-life balance cannot be achieved, they are less likely to remain with the organisation, indicating that their commitment to their family and personal life is higher than their commitment to the organisation.

In terms of the multiple regression analysis results, in this study, entrepreneurial creativity was the strongest predictor of organisational commitment, followed by lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors. The results indicate that entrepreneurial creativity and service/dedication to a cause career anchors are negative predictors of organisational commitment. This suggests that the higher participants’ preferences were for creating and experiencing new challenges (entrepreneurial creativity), and the higher their value of serving others (service/dedication to a cause), the lower their organisational commitment would be. By contrast, the lifestyle career anchor was a positive predictor of organisational commitment. In other words, the higher the participants’ need to balance individual, family and work commitments (lifestyle), the higher their organisational commitment would be. Meyer and Allen (1997) emphasise the importance of person-job fit. They postulate that when an individual's needs, values and personalities are congruent with his/her job, this will influence his/her commitment levels.

The implication of these results and the fact that 70% of the participants in this study indicated that they have high intentions of leaving, is that the organisation is not fulfilling the career needs, values and talent preferences (career anchors) of these participants and this lack of person-job fit, in turn, is affecting organisational commitment and ultimately turnover intention. These findings need to be viewed with caution, however, owing to the weak relationship between career anchors and organisational commitment.
3.4.4.2 Career anchors and turnover intention

An understanding of career anchors is vital for organisations because individuals with different career anchors want quite different things from of their careers (Schein, 1978). According to Ramakrishna and Potosky (2003), an organisation might be able to reduce its employee turnover by matching career opportunities to employees’ career anchors.

In this study, a significant positive correlation was found between turnover intention and the COI variables: autonomy/independence (small effect), entrepreneurial creativity (medium effect), service/dedication to a cause (small effect) and lifestyle (small effect). These findings suggest that participants who prefer working on their own, value ownership, freedom, flexibility and work-life balance may not be able to fulfil these values/needs in this organisation and would therefore be more likely to leave it. A study by Hardin (1995), using a sample of certified public accountants, demonstrated that matching the needs of the individual and the organisation tends to achieve greater organisational commitment, stronger job satisfaction, and lower turnover intentions among employees.

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that the largest predictors of turnover intention for this sample were entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause. In this study, entrepreneurial creativity and lifestyle career anchors were positive predictors of turnover intention, while the service/dedication to a cause career anchor was a negative predictor of turnover intention. This is hardly surprising since individuals with a need to create and experience new challenges (entrepreneurial creativity) would prefer to own their own business instead of working for someone else. Wealth, ownership freedom and power are vital to these individuals (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Schreuder & Coetzee, 2011). Feldman and Bolino’s (2000) research suggests that individuals vary greatly in their motivations to pursue self-employment and career anchors do influence individuals’ satisfaction with self-employment and their intentions to remain self-employed.

Working in the retail environment involves long hours, including weekends. Individuals who prioritise the need to integrate individual, family and career commitments and who look for company benefits that allow flexible working arrangements (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008) may find that their values and needs do not align with the values and needs of the organisation and they are therefore more likely to have higher turnover intentions. A number of research findings
support the premise that employees who experience a match between their career anchors and their job setting report higher job satisfaction, more commitment to their organisation and lower intentions to leave than those employees who experience a mismatch (Chang et al., 2009; Hardin, 1995; Igbaria et al., 1991; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012).

Research by Hsu et al. (2003) supports the view that employees whose internal career anchors are compatible with their job have lower intentions to leave their organisations. Working in a retail organisation involves serving others (customers), therefore implying that individuals with a high service/dedication to a cause career anchor would find that their values match those of the organisation. These individuals would therefore more likely have lower intentions to leave the organisation.

**3.4.4.3 Organisational commitment and turnover intention**

According to research, employees who are strongly committed to their organisations are more likely to remain with the organisation, compared with uncommitted employees (Delobbe & Vandenberge, 2000; Ding & Lin, 2006; Ferreira, 2012; Luna-Arocas & Camps, 2008; Somers, 2010). By increasing employees’ organisational commitment, turnover intention and therefore actual turnover may be reduced (DeConinck & Bachmann, 1994; Labatmediene et al., 2007; SamGnanakkan, 2010; Suliman & Al-Junaibi, 2010; Yin-Fah et al., 2010).

Meyer and Allen’s (1991) model implies a significant, negative and independent relationship between each form of organisational commitment and turnover intentions. Research conducted by Meyer et al. (1993) and Somers (1995), both using multiple regression to examine the relationships between affective, normative and continuance commitment and turnover intentions, indicated that affective and normative commitment were significant predictors of turnover intention, but continuance commitment did not contribute to prediction. In a meta-analysis study, Joseph et al. (2007) investigated the antecedents to turnover intention. They found that affective commitment was significantly and negatively related to turnover intention, while continuance commitment was not significantly related.

These findings were replicated in the current study, with turnover intention correlating significantly and negatively with all OCQ variables, except for continuance commitment. The major impact in reducing turnover intention came from a sense of affective and normative
commitment. Both of these factors can be interpreted to suggest that the more emotionally attached individuals are to the organisation (affective commitment), the less likely they are to leave it, and if individuals feel an obligation or duty to stay with their organisation (Normative commitment), their turnover intentions are lower. This relationship with normative commitment may indicate that a relational psychological contract may have developed between these participants and the organisation and therefore participants may be staying as a result of loyalty to the organisation in exchange for, say, job security (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The mean scores indicated that the participants scored high on the security/stability career anchor, which ties in with this argument.

The stepwise multiple regression analyses revealed that affective commitment was the best predictor of turnover intention in this study, followed by normative commitment. These findings imply that employees stay with the organisation mainly because of their emotional attachment to it and feelings of obligation or duty towards it. These findings are in line with research by Albrecht and Andreetta (2011), Canipe (2006) and Meyer and Allen (1997), who all found that individuals who are more emotionally attached (affectively committed) to the organisation are, in turn, less likely to have thoughts of leaving it.

Manetjie and Martins (2009) investigated the relationship between organisational culture and commitment in a South African motor manufacturing company. They found that affective and normative commitment were the best predictors for the retention of employees. A study by Lazar (2005) reported that affective and normative levels of commitment are the best predictors for examining an employee’s intent to leave an organisation. In a sample of 288 hospital nurses, commitment profiles were compared to turnover intentions, job search behaviour, work withdrawal (absenteeism and lateness) and job stress. The results indicated that the most positive work outcomes were associated with the affective-normative dominant profile which included lower turnover intentions and lower levels of psychological stress (Somers, 2009).

A significant deduction from the results of this study is that by focusing on the affective and normative commitment of employees, the organisation will be able to positively influence employees’ turnover intentions. The opposite, that is, mainly focussing on continuance commitment or the cost of leaving, will not ensure the same result. Allen and Meyer (1996) propose that affective commitment can be increased through work experiences and the characteristics of the organisation that make the employee feel “psychologically comfortable”
(e.g. approachable managers and equitable treatment of employees) and that enhance the employee’s sense of competence (e.g. challenging tasks and feedback). Normative commitment can be increased by making employees feel that the organisation is providing them with more than another organisation would be able to (Allen & Meyer, 1996).

According to João and Coetzee (2011), organisations can be proactive about retaining employees by matching employees’ knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, career needs and values with the requirements of the job, providing emotional care and support, along with opportunities for further growth and development. They suggest that intrinsic and extrinsic job motivators need to be congruent with employees’ own needs, making them feel affectively and normatively committed to their employer to reduce turnover intentions.

3.4.5 Differences between groups regarding career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

The secondary objective of the research was to measure the differences in the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of various gender, race, employment position and age groups.

Overall, significant differences were found between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intentions of males and females, different races (African and Indian), position (management and staff) and age groups (25-29, 30-45, 46-65). However, no significant differences were found between males and females in terms of organisational commitment and turnover intention.

3.4.5.1 Gender

The literature review indicates significant differences between the career anchors of males and females (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Coetzee et al., 2007; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Hardin, 1995; Kniveton, 2004; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ngokha, 2009). Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) found that the male participants showed a significantly high preference for general managerial competence, pure challenge and entrepreneurial creativity career anchors, while the female participants showed a higher preference for the security/stability career anchor.
In this study, there were statistically significant differences between gender and COI variables. The male participants valued autonomy and independence in the work environment as well as entrepreneurial creativity more important than their female counterparts. Similar findings were reported by Ellison and Schreuder (2000), with the male participants also scoring higher on the entrepreneurial creativity anchor in their study. A study conducted by Kniveton (2004) indicated that males and females had similar views on what was important to them, with gender differences limited to the talent based anchors, with males scoring higher for technical and entrepreneurial anchors. Hardin (1995) found that males were more than twice as likely as females to possess the general managerial or entrepreneurial creativity career anchors, while a higher percentage of females than males were lifestyle oriented. Igbaria et al. (1991) reported that career anchors were significantly related to gender. A higher percentage of men than women were technically oriented, whereas as higher percentage of women than men were lifestyle oriented.

Marshall and Bonner’s (2003) research indicated that females place more emphasis on factors such as working conditions, facilities for child rearing, career certainty and working hours, while males are more likely to run their own businesses than females. They noted that gender was a significant predictor of certain career anchors, including entrepreneurial creativity. Research by Coetzee et al. (2007) indicated that females tend to be more committed to organisations that respect personal and family concerns, whereas males tend to be more committed to organisations that provide them with the autonomy and independence that enable them to work independently.

Coetzee and Roythorne-Jacobs (2012) highlighted the need for organisations to acknowledge women’s subjective career experiences as they appear to influence their commitment to the organisation and are different from men’s experiences. These differences arise as a result of women’s historical experiences as a minority group in a predominantly male-dominated work environment as well as differences in their values (e.g. since women tend to be the primary caregivers, they prioritise family over work commitments).

There is conflicting research in terms of the relationship between gender and organisational commitment, with some research indicating no significant differences between gender and commitment (e.g. Al-Ajmi, 2006; Brimeyer et al., 2010; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003), and other research showing significant differences (e.g. Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001;
Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982; Pretorius & Roodt, 2004). In this study, no difference was evident in terms of gender and organisational commitment.

Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found significant correlations between gender and turnover and their findings suggest that women are more likely than men to leave an organisation. However, in line with other research findings (e.g. Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008), no significant differences were reported between gender and turnover intention in this study.

3.4.5.2 Race

The race groups in the sample comprised of white (6%), African (46%), Indian (36%) and coloured (12%) participants. Since the white and coloured groups were so small, only the African and Indian results were compared. They formed the majority of the sample (82%).

Based on the culture and social differences between racial groups in South Africa, it was decided not to combine any of the groups in this study.

Previous research indicates that race groups differ significantly in their career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2009b; Coetzee et al., 2007; Lumley, 2009; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). Coetzee and Schreuder (2008) found significant differences between race and career anchor preferences. Their findings indicate that Indians, coloureds and whites have a stronger preference for the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor, while Africans have higher mean scores for general managerial competence, lifestyle, security/stability and technical/functional competence.

The results of this study indicated significant differences between race groups in terms of the general managerial competence, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurial creativity and security/stability career anchors. The African participants scored significantly higher than their Indian counterparts on all of these career anchors except security/stability, indicating that they prefer working in environments that afford them the opportunity to climb the corporate ladder, work independently and create new products or services. The Indian participants appeared to be significantly more concerned with the organisation providing them with job security and steady, stable work. Coetzee and Schreuder’s (2008) research also found a significant difference between race and entrepreneurial creativity. In Lumley’s (2009) research, the Indian
participants scored higher on security/stability career anchor compared to their white counterparts.

The literature review showed conflicting findings on race and organisational commitment. Some research (e.g. Coetzee et al., 2007; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Lumley, 2009) indicates no significant differences between race groups and commitment, while other research (e.g. Martin & Roodt, 2008; Vallabh & Donald, 2001) indicates significant differences. In this study, the results showed that the Africans and Indians did differ significantly in terms of their commitment to their employing organisation. The Indian participants indicated higher overall commitment and affective commitment in particular. A South African study by Martin and Roodt (2008) found that organisational commitment had a significant relationship with the race of the respondent.

Research has shown race to be a poor and inconsistent predictor of turnover (Martin & Roodt, 2008). Vallabh and Donald (2001) found the correlation between organisational commitment and intention to leave to be significant and negative for both white and black managers. However, the correlation was stronger for the black managers. The results of this study indicate that African participants would be more likely to leave the organisation than their Indian counterparts.

Overall, the findings suggest that the Indian participants prefer a stable, steady work environment (job security); they are more emotionally attached to the organisation (affective commitment) and are less likely to leave it. The African participants prefer an organisation that affords them the opportunity to advance up the corporate ladder. They also value independence and the opportunity to build or create something new (or have ownership of their own business). They are less committed to the organisation, which ties in with their higher turnover intentions.

3.4.5.3 Position

Researchers have found career anchors to be related to employment status (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Lumley, 2009; Yarnall, 1998). According to Coetzee and Schreuder (2008), occupational position appears to influence career anchor preference. Lumley's (2009) research highlights the fact that supervisors and staff differed significantly in terms of general managerial competence, autonomy/independence and security/stability career anchors. Supervisors had a significantly higher preference towards
general managerial competence and autonomy/independence than staff, while staff indicated significantly higher preference towards security/stability. In research by Yarnall (1998), it was also found that higher grade employees were more likely anchored in general managerial career anchors and the lower grades in security/stability.

In agreement with other research, the findings of this study suggest that participants who occupy positions of management and general staff differ significantly in their career anchors. However, managers in this study appear to favour technical/functional competence, implying that they prefer working in environments where they are given challenging work assignments and are able to utilise their expert knowledge. General staff scored higher on entrepreneurial creativity, indicating they enjoy creating new products or services.

In research by Ellison and Schreuder (2000), it was reported that mid-career employees (managers and non-managers) with a fit between their career anchor and occupational type were likely to experience a higher level of general and intrinsic job satisfaction than mid-career employees with no such fit. Whether the participants in this study would stay with the organisation would therefore depend on whether their career anchors could be fulfilled. If managers in this organisation are able to use their expertise and are paid according to their skills, they are more likely to remain with the organisation. General staff are less likely to be afforded the opportunity to create new products or services, or have sufficient power and freedom in the organisation because of their position. They would therefore be more likely to leave the organisation.

There is limited research available on the impact of position (employment status) on organisational commitment and turnover intention (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Lumley (2009) found that supervisors showed a significantly higher score for affective commitment than staff. The results of a study by Ferreira and Coetzee (2010) suggest that employees in managerial positions have higher levels of normative commitment than employees employed at the staff level. DeConnick and Bachmann (1994) found that marketing managers’ intention to leave their jobs was highly influenced by their degree of organisational commitment.

In this study, the results indicated a significant difference between the two groups in terms of affective, normative and total commitment; with the management group scoring higher on all three variables. This indicates that the managers in this study were more emotionally attached
to the organisation, had a higher sense of obligation towards the organisation and were generally more committed to the organisation than the general staff.

The lower commitment levels of the general staff correlated with their preference for the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor and higher turnover intention score. In other words, general staff were not able to fulfil their need for wealth, ownership, freedom and power through creating new products and services in this organisation and therefore less committed and more likely to leave the organisation than the management group.

3.4.5.4 Age

Although research by Igbaria et al. (1991) showed that career anchors were unrelated to age, other studies recorded a significant and positive relationship between age and career anchors (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Hardin, 1995; Marshall & Bonner, 2003). In this study, the significant differences observed between the age groups suggest that participants aged between 25 and 29 had a higher preference towards general managerial competence, autonomy/independence and entrepreneurial creativity than the other two age groups. This implies that these participants preferred working in environments that afford them the opportunity to climb the corporate ladder, work independently and create new products or services than their older counterparts. Kniveton (2004) also reported that younger participants in managerial positions are more inclined towards the general managerial competence career anchor.

In the literature review, age was generally found to be significantly and positively related to organisational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Brimeyer et al., 2010; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Ferreira et al., 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Suliman & Iles, 2000). Mowday et al. (1982) propose that the antecedents of commitment are likely to change as individuals grow older and their priorities change. Both Martin and Roodt (2008) and Lok and Crawford (1999) found that the correlation between commitment and age was positive and statistically significant. Allen and Meyer's (1993) study indicated that affective and normative commitment increases as age increases. This is supported by research by Ferreira et al. (2010) who found that older employees tend to be affectively and normatively more committed to their organisations than their younger counterparts.
This study suggests that as participants age they become more affectively committed to the organisation. This is in line with research conducted by Döckel et al. (2006), which indicates that older employees generally become more attitudinally committed to an organisation for a variety of reasons, including greater satisfaction with their jobs, possible promotions, and having “cognitively justified” their continuance in an organisation.

In this study, for normative and total commitment, there were significant differences between the participants younger than 30 and those over 30. The 30+ group showed higher mean scores for both normative and total commitment, suggesting that not only were they generally more committed, but they stayed with the organisation because they felt they had a duty or obligation to do so.

Research indicates that age is consistently and negatively related to turnover intention (Chawla & Sondhi, 2011; Finegold et al., 2002; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1982; Ng & Feldman, 2009; Yin-Fah et al., 2010). In this study, the younger the participants were, the more likely they were to leave the organisation, with the respondents over the age of 45 indicating that they would be the least likely to leave voluntarily. This is in line with research by Martin and Roodt (2008), whose findings showed that as age increases, turnover intention decreases. They proposed that older employees tend to invest more in the organisation and are therefore less inclined to leave.

According to Finegold et al. (2002), age shapes what individuals want from work and how attached (committed) they are to their organisation. Using a large sample of 3 000 technical professionals, Finegold et al. (2002) highlighted the following differences between employees’ commitment and turnover intention. They found that for employees 30 years and younger, building competencies was the most important task, and they were willing to change organisations in order to improve their technical skills. This age group also had a more transactional relationship with the organisation and job security was thus not as important to them as it was for older employees. They responded to rewards linked to their individual performance, and placed greater emphasis on work-life balance. In comparison, for employees over 30 years job security was more strongly related to commitment and their desire to remain with the organisation. Finegold et al. (2002) cautioned, however, that while they found statistically significant differences between the age groups, the size of these differences was small.
3.5 CONCLUSIONS

In terms of the findings of the present study, there was a significant relationship between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Groups differing in gender, race, employment position and age differed significantly in their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

The results of this study suggest that there was a significant but weak relationship between employees’ career anchors and their organisational commitment. Career anchors were also found to be significantly related to organisational commitment and turnover intention, with entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors being the best predictors of these two variables. The relationship between organisational commitment and turnover intention were significant and negative, with affectively and normatively committed participants being more likely to remain with the organisation (i.e. having lower turnover intention). In addition, the findings indicated that although gender has no relationship with turnover intention; race, employment position and age do. African, general staff, and 30 years and younger participants indicated higher intentions to leave the organisation.

The overall findings of the study contribute valuable knowledge by shedding new light on how the career anchors and organisational commitment levels of individuals employed in the South African retail environment relate to turnover intention. The new insights derived from the findings may help to broaden the perspective on the ways in which individuals’ career anchors potentially influence their career decisions. The findings could also be used to help organisations develop commitment strategies in order to reduce turnover intention and therefore actual turnover.

3.6 LIMITATIONS

Since the present study was limited to participants employed in a retail company based in KwaZulu Natal and Gauteng (South Africa), the results cannot be generalised to other occupational contexts or regions. Future research efforts should focus on obtaining a larger and more representative sample of employees in the retail environment. Furthermore, given the exploratory nature of the research design, this study can yield no statements about causation.
The observed associations between the variables were therefore interpreted rather than established.

It should also be noted that the lower Cronbach alpha coefficients of this study (particularly for the COI subscales) may have been the result of the nature of the sample (predominantly African, with standard grade Matric) and an understanding of the questions. With English as their second language, certain terms and words may be more difficult for these participants to understand.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the results of the study show potential for the analysis of the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, as well as differences between biographical groups’ experiences of these constructs. This study could be used as a basis for understanding these relationships and differences in order to inform the formulation of commitment strategies.

3.7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of the study confirm the existence of significant relationships between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. This provides a useful framework for career decision making and commitment strategies. Organisations could use the results of the study to design specific interventions aimed at reducing turnover intention. A primary implication is that, at group level, career anchors and organisational commitment are significant antecedents to turnover intention.

There is a need for more research on career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, specifically in the multicultural South African context. Owing to the limited scope of the study, it is strongly recommended that further studies be conducted in order to address this limitation. Further studies would be helpful for assisting organisations to introduce strategies to increase employee-organisation fit and commitment, thereby reducing turnover intention.
3.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter, the core aspects of the literature and empirical study were discussed, the results of the study were interpreted by analysing the findings, conclusions were drawn, the limitations of the study were highlighted and recommendations were made. Chapter 4 presents a more comprehensive discussion of the conclusions, the limitations of the study and the recommendations for practical application of the findings.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with the conclusions of the study, discusses its limitations and makes recommendations for the practical application of the findings and for future research studies.

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The sections below focus on the formulation of conclusions based on the literature review and the empirical study.

4.1.1 Conclusions relating to the literature review

The general aim of this study was to explore the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and to determine whether individuals from different gender, race, employment position and age groups differ significantly regarding these three variables. The general aim was achieved by addressing and achieving the specific aims of the research.

Conclusions were drawn on each of the specific aims regarding the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

4.1.1.1 The first aim: to conceptualise career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and to explain the theoretical linkage between these variables

This aim was achieved in chapter 2. The following conclusions were drawn on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention:

As the world of work changes, it influences the way in which employees view their careers (Cascio, 2001; Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Employees are placing far more emphasis on satisfying their own individual demands (Lumley et al., 2011) and being more responsible for their own futures and careers (Coetzee et al., 2010; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2011; Furnham,
The responsibility of career management in a “contemporary career” falls on the individual, and in order to make the right choice, he/she requires self-insight (Schein, 1990).

The concept of career anchor is based on the fact that individuals shape their careers in different ways according to their perception of their talents, needs and values (Schein, 1990). Career anchors influence every major decision about career issues, affect decisions to move and shape employee reactions to work experiences (Bigliardi et al., 2005; Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003). According to Schein (1978, 1996), career anchors evolve as one gains occupational and life experiences, but once the self-concept has been formed, it functions as a stabilising force or “anchor”. Schein (1978, p. 128) defines a career anchor as “that concern or value which the person will not give up, if a choice has to be made.” It is through being forced to make choices that individuals become aware of what is important to them in terms of self-development, family or career (Schein, 1996). Empirical evidence suggests that the main attribute of career anchor theory is congruence (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Wils et al., 2010). It is when individuals achieve congruence between their career anchor and their work environment that they are more likely to achieve positive career outcomes (Feldman & Bolino, 1996; Wils et al., 2010).

According to Feldman and Bolino (1996), for individuals whose career anchor is talent-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work effectiveness and job stability. For individuals whose career anchor is need-based, the impact on congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on work role adjustment and outside role conflict. Finally, for individuals whose career anchor is value-based, the impact of congruence between career anchor and work environment should be the greatest on job satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Career anchors generally explain why people stay engaged in a certain job or are committed to an organisation, with organisational commitment being regarded as an outcome of the career choices that are determined by an individual’s career anchors (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). Organisational commitment, which is generally defined as a psychological link between the employee and his/her organisation, has been found to be related to major work outcomes, including turnover intention and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990, 1996; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; O'Donnell et al., 2012; SamGnanakkan, 2010; Suliman & Illes, 2000). Researchers have distinguished between four main approaches to studying
organisational commitment, namely the attitudinal, behavioural, motivational and multidimensional approaches (Mester et al., 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997). These four approaches describe the different ways in which organisational commitment is developed and the implications for employee behaviour (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Meyer and Allen (1991) integrated attitudinal and behavioural approaches to commitment in order to create three distinct dimensions. The different dimensions or mindsets are described in the three-component model of commitment as affective, continuance and normative (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997), and differ in terms of the link between the employee and the organisation (Mester et al., 2003). The affective and normative components reflect employees’ attitudinal dispositions, whereas the continuance component indicates their behavioural orientation (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Employees who are strongly committed to their organisations are more likely to remain with the organisation than uncommitted employees are (Delobbe & Vandenberghhe, 2000; Ding & Lin, 2006; Ferreira, 2012; Luna-Arocas & Camps, 2008; Somers, 2010). For the purposes of this study, Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-component model of organisational commitment (affective, normative and continuance) was used. According to Meyer and Allen (1997, p. 11), affective commitment refers to “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization.” Employees with a strong affective commitment stay with the organisation because they want to. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organisation. Employees whose primary link to the organisation is based on continuance commitment stay with the organisation because they feel they need to or have to. Normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation or duty to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment remain with the organisation because they feel it is the moral or right thing to do.

The following definition of organisational commitment, as formulated by Allen and Meyer (1996, p. 252) was adopted in this study: “Organizational commitment can be defined generally as a psychological link between the employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization.” Intention to leave refers to an individual’s reduced level of commitment that results in an increased desire to leave the organisation (Mowday et al., 1982).
Turnover has a negative impact on organisational effectiveness (Pienaar et al., 2007), and the personal and organisational costs of voluntary employee turnover are high (Jones et al., 1996; Mallol et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2001a). Turnover intention is conceptualised as an individual's behavioural intention to leave the organisation (Bigiardi et al., 2005; Mobley et al., 1979). By identifying factors that may be related to turnover intention, organisations and researchers may proactively identify the key determinants of turnover, and develop and manage strategies to decrease voluntary turnover (Mitchell et al., 2001a; Pienaar et al., 2007). The causal relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover is well established in research literature, with the underlying premise being that turnover intention is the most important antecedent and predictor of turnover decision (Hsu et al., 2003; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Wells & Peachey, 2011; Wilson, 2006). One way to reduce actual turnover is therefore to lower the rate of employees’ turnover intention (Hsu et al., 2003).

Reducing turnover is beneficial to organisations because the retention of key employees creates a sustainable competitive advantage (Lub et al., 2012). Identifying the key determinants of turnover may help organisations to reduce replacement costs, and prevent them from spending time and money on factors that do not correct the problem (Cooper, 2010).

It can be concluded, according to the literature, that a theoretical relationship exists between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. A number of research findings support the premise that employees who experience a match between their career anchors and their job setting report more commitment to their organisation and lower intentions to leave than those employees who experience a mismatch (Chang et al., 2009; Hardin, 1995; Igbaria et al., 1991; Quesenberry & Trauth, 2012). Both career anchors and organisational commitment were found to be instrumental in affecting an employee’s turnover intention. What holds individuals to their chosen organisation or drives them away is their career anchor (Schein, 1990, 1996). According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees who are strongly committed are those who are least likely to leave.
4.1.1.2 The second aim: to determine theoretically (based on a review of the literature) the role of gender, race, employment position and age on career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

On the basis of the literature review, it can be concluded that a theoretical relationship exists between different biographical variables (gender, race, position and age) and career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

The most consistent theoretical relationship exists between career anchors and gender, race, position and age. The literature review indicates significant differences between the career anchors of males and females (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012; Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Coetzee et al., 2007; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Hardin, 1995; Kniveton, 2004; Marshall & Bonner, 2003; Ngokha, 2009); race groups (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008, 2009b; Coetzee et al., 2007; Lumley 2009; Marshall & Bonner, 2003); employment position (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Lumley, 2009; Yarnall, 1998); and age (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Ellison & Schreuder, 2000; Hardin, 1995; Marshall & Bonner, 2003).

Age was also generally found to be positively related to organisational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Brimeyer et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2010; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Lok & Crawford, 1999; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Suliman & Iles, 2000), while research indicates that age is consistently and negatively related to turnover intention (Chawla & Sondhi, 2011; Finegold et al., 2002; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979; Ng & Feldman, 2009; Yin-Fah et al., 2010).

There is conflicting research in terms of the relationship between gender and organisational commitment, with some research indicating no significant differences between gender and commitment (Al-Ajmi, 2006; Coetzee et al., 2007; Marshall & Bonner, 2003) and other research showing significant differences (Elizur & Koslowsky, 2001; Khalili & Asmawi, 2012; Labatmediene et al., 2007; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Pretorius & Roodt, 2004). There are also conflicting findings on race and organisational commitment. Some research (Coetzee et al., 2007; Ferreira & Coetzee, 2010; Lumley, 2009) indicates no significant differences between race groups and commitment, while other research (Martin & Roodt, 2008; Vallabh & Donald,
2001) highlights significant differences. Research has generally shown race to be a poor and inconsistent predictor of turnover (Martin & Roodt, 2008).

Literature findings generally indicate no significant differences between gender and turnover intention (Cooper, 2010; Joseph et al., 2007; Martin & Roodt, 2008).

There is limited research available on the impact of position (employment status) on organisational commitment and turnover intention (Coetzee & Roythorne-Jacobs, 2012). DeConnick and Bachmann (1994) found that marketing managers’ intention to leave their jobs was highly influenced by their degree of organisational commitment.

4.1.1.3 The third aim: to conceptualise the implications of the theoretical relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention for career decision making and commitment strategies in the South African organisational context

The literature review elaborated on the way career decision making and commitment strategies were influenced by the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

In the current work environment, individuals are expected to make a wide range of career decisions during their life span. In order to make these career decisions, individuals need an understanding of themselves and of the options available to them (Ellison & Schreuder, 2000).

In general, research indicates that an individual's career motives and values (his/her career anchors) have an impact on career decision making and psychological attachment or commitment to an occupation or organisation (Coetzee et al., 2007; Feldman & Bolino, 2000; Kniveton, 2004; Lumley, 2009; Schein, 1996).

According to Schein (1978), people need to gain self-awareness of their career anchors in order to make more informed career choices at critical points in their lives, and organisations should become more aware of the career anchors of their employees so that appropriate career moves can be made. The goal is to match the needs of the organisation with those of the individual (Schein, 1978). It also assists organisations to determine the most appropriate career
interventions for rewarding and retaining talented staff; that is, it helps organisations to design appropriate reward, recognition and promotion systems (Erdoğan, 2004).

By implementing organisational conditions and career development support practices that result in individuals experiencing higher levels of career satisfaction and success, other significant outcomes such as organisational commitment, talent retention, employee engagement and job performance can be achieved by the organisation (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2009b).

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees who are strongly committed are less likely to leave their organisation. Organisations therefore use commitment strategies to “shape desired employee behaviours and attitudes by forging psychological links between the organisation and the employee goals” (Döckel, 2003, p. 14). Organisations need to focus on developing committed employees who can be trusted to perform their jobs in ways consistent with organisational goals (Döckel, 2003). Any human resource planning and development system must try to match the needs of the organisation with those of the individual (Hardin, 1995).

Meyer and Allen (1997) suggest that organisations can “foster” a stronger sense of commitment in their employees by emphasising certain human resource management practices. For example, providing accurate information to employees during the recruitment and selection process; using socialisation strategies to increase employees’ sense of self-worth; and offering training programmes to provide employees with the knowledge and skills they need to do their work effectively.

In the South African context, Coetzee et al. (2010) posit that organisations should consider the importance of and need for career matching by offering multiple rewards and career paths that address the diverse interests and needs of a multicultural workforce. Research by SamGnanakkan (2010) supports the premise that human resource practices, compensation and training, have significant direct and indirect effects on an employees’ commitment levels and turnover intention.
4.1.2 Conclusions relating to the empirical study

The empirical study was designed to answer three research questions. The research aims of the empirical study were as follows:

Research aim 1: To investigate the relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention as manifested in a sample of respondents employed in the South African organisational context

Research aim 2: To determine the differences between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of individuals from different gender, race, position and age groups as manifested in the sample of respondents

Research aim 3: To formulate recommendations for the discipline of industrial and organisational psychology, with particular focus on career decision making, commitment strategies and possible future research

The results of this study suggest that there is a significant but weak relationship between employees’ career anchors and their organisational commitment. Career anchors were also found to be significantly related to turnover intention. Entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors were the best predictors of both organisational commitment and turnover intention. The relationship between organisational commitment and turnover intention was significant and negative, with affectively and normatively committed participants being more likely to remain with the organisation (i.e. having lower turnover intentions). In addition, the findings indicate that there were significant differences between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of males and females, different races (African and Indian), employment position (management and staff) and age groups (25-29, 30-45, 46-65 years). The exception was that no significant differences were found between males and females in terms of organisational commitment and turnover intention.
The results provided evidence in support of the H1 hypothesis (there is a significant relationship between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention) and the H2 hypothesis (there are significant differences between the gender, race, position and age groups regarding their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention).

4.1.2.1 The first empirical aim: to investigate the relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention as manifested in a sample of respondents in the South African organisational context

The following three specific conclusions were drawn in terms of this research aim:

a. Conclusion 1: participants’ career anchors are significantly but weakly related to their organisational commitment

The findings of this study showed significant but low (small effect size) correlations between the COI and OCQ variables, with COI variables only predicting a small percentage of the variance in organisational commitment. These results combined led to the conclusion that a significant but weak relationship exists between career anchors and organisational commitment.

Significant, positive relationships were observed between the technical/functional competence (talent-based) career anchor and continuance, normative and total commitment; and security/stability (need-based) career anchor and continuance commitment. Based on the findings, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Participants who prefer working in organisations that allow them to develop their expert knowledge (technical/functional competence) will stay with an organisation if they feel a sense of obligation/duty towards the organisation (normative commitment). This obligation may arise out of a number of factors - for example, a sense of duty may be fostered by the time and money invested by the organisation in their training. Participants may also feel that they cannot leave the organisation because they themselves have invested too much in it and/or cannot find another organisation that can match or exceed benefits they currently have in the organisation (continuance commitment).

- Participants with a stronger preference for stable and steady employment (security/stability career anchor) will stay with an organisation if they feel that the perceived cost of leaving is
greater than staying (Schein, 1990). Individuals stay with the organisation because they have to (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Significant, negative relationships were found between the autonomy/independence (need-based) career anchor and affective commitment; entrepreneurial creativity (talent-based) and affective, normative and total commitment; and lifestyle (need-based) career anchor and affective commitment. The following conclusions were therefore drawn:

- Participants with higher preferences for autonomy and independence and who need balance between work and family life will have lower emotional attachment to the organisation (affective commitment). According to Meyer and Allen (1997), the development of affective commitment is based on the exchange principle, with participants staying because they want to. The conclusion is that participants whose needs are not met by the organisation will not feel emotionally attached to it and will have higher turnover intentions.
- Participants with a high entrepreneurial creativity career anchor place a great deal of emphasis on creating new products and services; they constantly want new challenges and value wealth, ownership, freedom and power (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008). The negative relationship between this career anchor and affective, normative and total commitment indicates that an emotional bound or sense of duty will not increase their organisational commitment if they are unable to work in an environment that allows them to use their particular talents.

On the basis of the multiple regression analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- The entrepreneurial creativity career anchor is the strongest predictor of organisational commitment for the participants in this study, followed by the lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors.
- The results showed that the higher participants’ preferences are for creating and experiencing new challenges (entrepreneurial creativity) and the higher their value of serving others (service/dedication to a cause), the lower their organisational commitment will be.
- In contrast, the higher the participants’ need to balance individual, family and work commitments (lifestyle), the higher their organisational commitment will be. Individuals
attracted to the lifestyle career anchor typically value company benefits that allow for flexible working arrangement and options (Schein, 1996).

Meyer and Allen (1997) emphasise the importance of person-job fit. They postulate that when an individual’s needs, values and talents are congruent with his/her job, this will influence his/her commitment levels. This study concluded that those participants whose needs are not being met have lower organisational commitment, while those whose needs are met have higher organisational commitment.

Taking into account the environment and corresponding conditions these participants are working in, the relationship between the service/dedication to a cause and lifestyle career anchors and organisational commitment appears to be contrary to expectations. One would expect a positive relationship between the service/dedication to a cause career anchor and organisational commitment because these individuals work in a predominantly service-oriented industry. One would also expect a negative relationship between the lifestyle career anchor and organisational commitment because the retail industry is characterised by long hours, and balancing work and personal life is difficult. However, the negative relationship between the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor and organisational commitment is in line with expectations, because working in the retail environment does not provide much opportunity for freedom to create new products and services. These results should be viewed with caution, however, because of the weak relationship between the COI and OCQ variables.

Overall, it can be concluded that knowing individuals’ career anchor preferences may give individuals more self-sight, assisting them to make more informed career decisions. It may also enable organisations to make more informed assumptions about career anchor preferences and why individuals are likely to feel a psychological link with the organisation – in other words, which career preferences are likely to result in affective, normative and/or continuance commitment.

b. Conclusion 2: participants’ career anchors are significantly related to their level of turnover intention

The findings of this research study showed that participants’ career anchors are significantly and positively related to turnover intention. From the results, it can be concluded that
participants with stronger preferences towards autonomy and independence (autonomy/independence), freedom to create something new (entrepreneurial creativity), serving others (service/dedication to a cause) and achieving work-life balance (lifestyle) have higher turnover intention. The high turnover intention of these participants suggest that their needs are not being met by the organisation and this could be the result of a lack of congruence between their talents, needs and values and the organisation’s needs and values.

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that the largest predictors of turnover intention for this sample are the entrepreneurial creativity, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause career anchors. The entrepreneurial creativity and lifestyle career anchors are positive predictors of turnover intention, while there is a negative relationship between service/dedication to a cause career anchor and turnover intention. The conclusion is that as the need for creativity and work-life balance increases, turnover intention increases, and as the preference for serving others increases, turnover intention decreases. These results make sense in light of the nature of the retail work environment where job functions are highly structured with limited freedom to create new services and products and where long hours make work-life balance extremely difficult. Serving customers in the retail organisation is one of the main functions of the job, indicating that those participants, whose preference for service is high, will find a person-environment fit and therefore have lower turnover intention.

c. Conclusion 3: participants’ organisational commitment is significantly related to their turnover intention

In this study, turnover intention correlated significantly and negatively with all OCQ variables, except for continuance commitment. The stepwise multiple regression analyses revealed that affective commitment was the best predictor of turnover intention in this study, followed by normative commitment.

These results suggest that participants stay with the organisation if they feel emotionally attached to it (affective commitment) or if they feel an obligation or duty towards the organisation (normative commitment). As affective and normative commitment increases, turnover intention decreases. The conclusion is that the organisation can reduce turnover intention by increasing affective and normative commitment. João and Coetzee (2011) propose that organisations can be proactive about retaining employees by matching employees'
knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, career needs and values with the requirements of the job. They suggest that intrinsic and extrinsic job motivators need to be congruent with employees’ own needs, making them feel affectively and normatively committed to their employer to reduce turnover intentions.

Overall, it can be concluded that employees in the organisation should not be treated the same way in terms of rewards and career opportunities. According to Schein (1990), employees with different career anchors are motivated by different types of work, pay and benefits, promotion systems and types of recognition. The results also imply that a mismatch between career anchor and work environment can lead to lower organisational commitment and higher turnover intention.

4.1.2.2 The second aim: to determine the differences between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention of individuals from different gender, race, employment position and age groups as manifested in the sample of respondents

Overall, significant differences were found between the career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intentions of males and females, different races (African and Indian), position (management and staff) and age groups (25-29, 30-45 and 46-65). The exception was that no significant differences were found between males and females in terms of organisational commitment and turnover intention.

a. Conclusion 1: males and females differ in terms of their career anchors, but not in terms of their organisational commitment and turnover intention

It can be concluded that males and female participants differ in terms of their career anchors, but not in terms of their organisational commitment and turnover intention. The males in the study showed a stronger preference towards autonomy/independence in the work environment as well as the freedom and opportunity to create new ventures and products (entrepreneurial creativity). Similar findings were reported by Ellison and Schreuder (2000), with the male participants also scoring higher on the entrepreneurial creativity anchor in their study. Igbaria et al. (1991) found that career orientation was significantly related to gender. A higher percentage of men than women were technically oriented, whereas as higher percentage of women than men were lifestyle oriented.
In Coetzee and Schreuder’s (2008) research, males showed higher preferences for general management competence, autonomy/independence, pure challenge and entrepreneurial creativity career anchors, while females showed a high preference for the security/stability career anchor.

b. Conclusion 2: African and Indian participants differ in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

The results of this study indicate significant differences between race groups in terms of the general managerial competence, autonomy/independence, entrepreneurial creativity and security/stability career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The following conclusions can be drawn:

- The African participants prefer working in environments that afford them the opportunity to climb the corporate ladder, work independently and create new products or services, whereas the Indian participants appear to be significantly more concerned with the organisation providing them with job security and steady, stable work.
- The Indian participants are overall more organisationally committed than their African counterparts, and in particular, are more emotionally attached to the organisation (affective commitment).
- In line with their lower organisational commitment levels, the African participants are more likely to leave the organisation than the Indian participants (i.e. the African participants have higher turnover intentions than the Indian participants).

c. Conclusion 3: participants from different employment position groups differ in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

In agreement with other research (Coetzee & Schreuder, 2008; Danzinger & Valency, 2006; De Villiers, 2009; Lumley, 2009; Yarnall, 1998), the findings of this study suggest that participants in different employment positions differ significantly in their career anchor preferences. The managers in this study appear to favour technical/functional competence, implying that they prefer working in environments in which they are given challenging work assignments and are able to utilise their expert knowledge. General staff scored higher on entrepreneurial creativity, indicating they prefer creating new products or services.
The study also indicated significant differences between the two groups in terms of affective, normative and total commitment, with the management group scoring higher on all three variables. The conclusion drawn was that managers in this study are more emotionally attached to the organisation, have a higher sense of obligation towards the organisation and are overall more committed to the organisation than the general staff. Again the link between organisational commitment and turnover intention is highlighted with the managers’ higher organisational commitment indicating lower turnover intentions, and the general staffs’ lower organisational commitment indicating higher turnover intentions.

d. Conclusion 4: participants from different age groups differ in terms of their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention

It can be concluded that participants from different age groups differ in terms of their career anchors. The participants younger than 30 have a higher preference for general managerial competence, autonomy/independence and entrepreneurial creativity career anchors. This implies that these participants prefer working in environments that afford them the opportunity to assume more leadership responsibility and climb the corporate ladder, prefer working independently with less supervision, and want to create new products and services.

This study also showed that as participants age they become more affectively committed to the organisation. This in line with research conducted by Döckel et al. (2006), which indicates that older employees generally become more attitudinally committed to an organisation for a variety of reasons, including greater satisfaction with their jobs, possible promotions and having “cognitively justified” their continuance in an organisation. For normative and total commitment, there are significant differences between participants younger than 30 and those over 30 years. The fact that the 30+ group showed higher mean scores for both normative and total commitment suggests that not only are they overall more committed, but they stay with the organisation because of they feel they have a duty or obligation to stay with it.

In line with other research (e.g. Chawla & Sondhi, 2011; Finegold et al., 2002; Martin & Roodt, 2008; Mobley et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1982; Yin-Fah et al., 2010), the significant and negative relationship between age and turnover intention showed that as age increases, turnover intention decreases. In this study, the youngest participants (under 30) had the highest turnover intentions.
4.1.2.3 The third aim: to make recommendations for the discipline of industrial and organisational psychology, particularly with regard to career decision making, commitment strategies and possible future research

The findings of the literature survey and the empirical results make several contributions to the field of industrial and organisational psychology, and in particular to career decision making and organisational commitment strategies. The literature review provided new insight into the conceptualisation of the constructs of relevance to the study (career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention), the possible relationship between these constructs, and the differences between biographical groups (in terms of gender, race, employment position and age) regarding these constructs.

The conclusions drawn from the literature review indicate that practitioners should consider the theoretical models of career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention when working in the field of industrial and organisational psychology. The theoretical relationship between these three variables and the differences between biographical groups should also be considered because the findings shed new light on the value of these variables in career decision making and organisational commitment strategies.

The empirical findings contribute new knowledge on the relationship dynamics between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The conclusions drawn from the empirical study indicate that there is a relationship between the constructs of relevance to this study, and that career anchors and organisational commitment influence employees’ turnover intentions. These new insights may help to add a broader perspective on the ways in which individuals’ career anchors and organisational commitment explain their turnover intention. The findings could be used to help promote greater self-insight for employees thereby assisting them in their career decision making. The findings also provide greater insight for organisations, allowing them to develop more appropriate organisational commitment strategies to reduce turnover intention and ultimately actual turnover.

The study highlights the possibility of differences between biographical groups’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, and this finding is of particular relevance in the multicultural South African context. Industrial and organisational psychologists should ensure the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments prior to using them, particularly
when using them in the multicultural South African context. The conclusions drawn from this study indicate that the instruments generally displayed acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability.

4.1.3 Conclusions relating to the central hypothesis

It can be concluded from the empirical study, that statistically significant relationships exist between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Furthermore, individuals of varying genders, races, positions and ages, differ significantly with regards to their career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The empirical study provided statistically significant evidence to support the central hypothesis.

4.2 LIMITATIONS

The limitations of the literature study and empirical investigation are outlined below.

4.2.1 Limitations of the literature review

The limitations of the literature review include a lack of research in the South African context and abroad on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Although there is a broad research base on the relationship between career anchors and organisational commitment, career anchors and turnover intention, and organisational commitment and turnover intention, only a few studies have focused specifically on the relationship between all three variables.

Only three variables (career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention) were used in the study, and therefore it cannot give a holistic indication of factors or variables that may potentially impact on career decision making and commitment strategies.

The study made use of a limited number of paradigms (humanistic and positivist) in the discipline of industrial and organisational psychology.
4.2.2 Limitations of the empirical study

The findings of the empirical study have limited generalisability and practical applicability. These limitations are a result of the research design, which included the use of a non-probability sample that was relatively small. A larger sample in the retail sector and across different industries, with a more balanced gender, race, position and age distribution, could produce a broader distribution of scores. Only being able to investigate the differences between African and Indian participants impacts on the generalisation of results to the broader, multicultural South African population. Furthermore, given the exploratory nature of the research design, this study was unable to yield any statements on causation. The observed associations between the variables were therefore interpreted rather than established.

The psychometric properties of the COI, OCQ and the turnover intention three-item scale are viewed as a limitation in the current study. The COI (Schein, 2006), OCQ (Allen & Meyer, 1997) and the turnover intention three-item scale (Mobley et al., 1978) were dependent on the respondent's self-awareness and personal perceptions, which could have potentially affected the validity of the results. It should also be noted that the lower Cronbach alpha coefficients of this study (particularly for the COI subscales) could have been due to the nature of the sample (predominantly African with standard grade Matric) and an understanding of the questions. With English as a second language, certain terms and words may have been more difficult for these participants to understand.

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the results of the study show potential for the analysis of the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, as well as differences between biographical groups' experiences of these constructs. This study could be utilised as a basis for understanding these relationships and differences in order to inform the formulation of commitment strategies.
4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, conclusions and limitations of this study, recommendations for industrial and organisational psychology and further research in the field are outlined in the sections below.

4.3.1 Recommendations on career decision making and commitment strategies

The findings of this study confirm the existence of significant relationships between individuals’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. This provides a useful framework for career decision making and commitment strategies. Organisations could use the results of the study to design specific interventions aimed at reducing turnover intention. A primary implication is that, at group level, career anchors and organisational commitment are important antecedents to turnover intention.

Based on the literature review and research findings, the following interventions are recommended:

(1) Career anchors influence every major career decision, including decisions to move, how employees react to work experiences, and choice of career and workplace (Herrbach & Mignonac, 2012; Mignonac & Herrbach, 2003). Organisations should explore and determine to what extent they can accommodate their employees’ specific work preferences. The research findings suggest that the dominant career anchors guiding participants’ career decisions in this study are security/stability, lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause. The organisation should therefore focus on providing these employees with secure and steady employment, flexibility to balance family and other personal interests with work commitments, and opportunities to serve others. By matching individual preferences with the work environment, organisational commitment can be achieved resulting in reduced turnover intention. Individuals generally strive for congruence between their career anchors and the work environment (Schein, 1990).

(2) A more personalised approach should be adopted by organisations when developing commitment strategies. Commitment strategies should be adaptable in order to accommodate different employees within the organisation, appealing to their talent, needs
and values. Identifying one’s career anchors through a self-diagnostic process (such as the COI) strengthens the individual’s ability to make more informed career decisions and choices. For the organisation, a measure of career anchors enables it to find a match between the needs of the organisation and those of the individual, in order to achieve a person-environment fit. The better the fit, the less likely the individual would be to leave the organisation (i.e. the lower his/her turnover intention).

(3) Organisations that are endeavouring to reduce turnover intention and therefore the actual turnover of key employees, should attempt to introduce strategies and human resource practices that are consistent with their employees’ talents, needs and values (career anchors) and what binds them to the organisation (organisational commitment).

(4) The overall results and conclusions of this study show that it is necessary to consider career anchors and organisational commitment in order to predict turnover intention. In the current study it was shown that 70% of the participants scored higher than 3 (on the turnover intention questionnaire), indicating high intentions to leave the organisation. Strategies to reduce turnover intention are therefore vital.

(5) The research results indicate that the entrepreneurial creativity career anchor was the strongest predictor of turnover intention followed by lifestyle and service/dedication to a cause. If participants make career decisions based on their career anchors it makes sense for the organisation to focus on employing and retaining employee whose needs, motives and talents match those of the organisation - that is, person-environment fit is obtained. In order to reduce turnover intention, the organisation needs to increase feelings of ownership and opportunities to create something new (entrepreneurial creativity), flexibility to achieve work-life balance and opportunities to serve others.

(6) As indicated in other research (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1996; Lazar, 2005) and in the current study, affective and normative levels of commitment are the best predictors for examining an employee’s intention to leave an organisation. An important deduction from the results of this study is that by focusing on the affective and normative levels of commitment of employees, the organisation will be able to positively influence the turnover intentions of employees. In other words, introducing strategies to increase emotional attachment and/or a feeling of duty/obligation towards the organisation results in lower turnover intention. The
opposite focus, mainly focusing on continuance commitment, or the cost of leaving, will not ensure the same result.

(7) Commitment strategies should also be individualised to take biographical factors into consideration. For example, the organisation in the current study should develop commitment strategies focusing on:

- The specific talents, needs and values (career anchors) of males and females, different race groups, managers and general staff, and age groups. By understanding what shapes and guides employees’ career choices, the organisation could develop strategies in line with employees’ needs and preferences.

- Interventions to increase African employees’ organisational commitment to the organisation thereby reducing their turnover intention. For example, the organisation could provide African employees with more opportunities to climb the corporate ladder, work independently and the freedom to create new products or services.

- Determining what factors contribute to Indian participants feeling emotionally attached to the organisation and/or feeling obligated to stay with the organisation. By increasing their commitment levels, the organisation could further increase the likelihood of this race group remaining with the organisation. Since the Indian employees in the current study showed a strong preference for stable and steady work, the organisation could increase their emotional attachment or sense of obligation by providing them with job security and benefits such as pension funds.

- The specific needs of managers and general staff and how this affects their commitment levels and turnover intention. For example, allowing managers to utilise their expert knowledge in the work environment could increase their organisational commitment levels even more and in turn reduce their turnover intention even further. The general staff in this study indicated a high preference for creating new products and services which indicates that there may not be a person-environment fit resulting in lower organisational commitment and higher turnover intention. Recruitment and selection practices should be reviewed.

- The specific needs of different age groups and how this affects their commitment levels and turnover intentions. The organisation needs to recognise that age groups differ in career anchor preferences, organisational commitment levels and turnover intention. Generational differences need to be investigated to ascertain whether certain interventions could attract the right individuals into the organisation in terms of person-environment fit (career
anchors), increase organisational commitment levels (particularly affective and normative commitment) and thereby, as indicated in the research, reduce turnover intention.

4.3.2 Recommendations for industrial and organisational psychologists working in organisational settings

The literature review relating to career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention could potentially provide a useful framework for career decision making and commitment strategies that could influence both individuals and organisations. The empirical study confirmed that significant relationships exist between employees’ career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

The industrial and organisational psychologist in an organisation is often required to fulfil the role of career counsellor, to guide an individual in making informed and appropriate career decisions. He/she also fulfils a role in guiding the organisation in terms of developing human resource strategies to increase organisational commitment and reduce turnover intention. Understanding the link between individuals’ career anchors (work preferences) and what binds them to the organisation (organisational commitment) will enable the industrial and organisational psychologist to design more appropriate career counselling tools, as well as organisational commitment strategies aimed at reducing turnover intention, thereby, enabling the organisation to retain key employees.

Industrial and organisational psychologists should use the COI in career counselling and development to assist individuals with their career-related talents, needs and values, empowering them through self-insight to make more informed career decisions. They could also assist organisations through the use of the COI, OCQ and turnover intention three-item scale to gain greater insight into what type of individual would do well in their organisations (in terms of a match between the needs and values of the individual and the needs and values of the organisation), what keeps the individual bound to the organisation and how to reduce turnover intention by introducing appropriate commitment strategies.
4.3.3 Recommendations for future research

The study provided some insight into the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Recommendations for future research in the field of industrial and organisational psychology are outlined below.

In order to enhance external validity, future research efforts should focus on obtaining a larger representative sample, across various occupational groups and economic sectors. This study was limited to a small sample that was predominantly female, African or Indian, general staff between the ages of 25 and 45 working in a specific retail company in South Africa. Future research should focus on broadening the sample to include a more balanced representation of employees across biographical variables (especially race groups). The sample could also include different demographics, for example, differences between permanent and full-time employees, and tenure. Since the sample included in this study consisted of retail employees, it is recommended that the study be conducted with a larger, randomised sample from various industries.

The low coefficient alphas, particularly for the COI, should be investigated in order to determine the validity of using this instrument in the South African multicultural context, especially with participants with English as a second language.

Valuable insight could be gained through the inclusion of the analysis of additional variables such as job satisfaction and retention factors.

Future research should focus on qualitative research in order to provide more information on the reasons behind turnover intention. This would add another dimension to the research and give more clarity in terms of specific reasons for high turnover intentions within the organisation and its relationship with career anchors and organisational commitment. This could be achieved by administering an open-ended questionnaire to participants.

There is a need for more research on the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention, specifically in the South African context. Further studies would be helpful for human resource practices. The results of these studies could assist
organisations and industrial and organisational psychologists to provide guidance to individuals making career decisions and to organisations developing commitment strategies.

4.4 INTEGRATION OF THE RESEARCH

This study explored the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The results suggest that relationships do exist between these three variables, and that these variables play a critical role in building career decision making competence and developing organisational commitment strategies in the 21st century working environment.

The literature review indicated the existence of relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The contemporary world of work requires individuals to develop self-insight in order to make informed career decisions. It is also vital for organisations to understand their employees’ needs and values (career anchors) and to develop strategies to increase organisational commitment levels in order to reduce turnover intention. In addition, differences between biographical groups in terms of the three variables also have to be considered.

The empirical study explored the relationships between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The study provided statistically significant evidence to support the central hypothesis on the existence of a relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. The statistical analysis also revealed that different biographical groups (gender, race, employment position and age) have significantly different scores on some of these constructs. The new insights derived from the findings could help to broaden the perspective on the ways in which individuals’ career anchors potentially influence their career decisions, particularly in relation to turnover intention. The findings could also be used to help organisations to develop commitment strategies in order to reduce turnover intention and therefore actual turnover.

In conclusion it is hoped that the findings of this study provided insight into the relationship between career anchors, organisational commitment and turnover intention. Hopefully, organisations and industrial and organisational psychologists will be able to effectively use these insights to enhance employees’ career decision making and human resource practices in the workplace. Recommendations were made for future research, and this study should be seen
as a step towards making a positive contribution to the field of industrial and organisational psychology in the South African context.

4.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter discussed the conclusions relating to the study, in terms of both the theoretical and empirical aims. Possible limitations of the study were also discussed and recommendations were made for future research. Finally, an integration of the research was presented.
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