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SUMMARY

The retention of skilled employees is crucial for the success of South African organisations. An understanding of the influence and relationships of employees’ emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement on employee turnover intention is necessary. The aim of the study was to explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intentions of employees in selected organisations.

The authors’ applied a cross-sectional survey design. Convenient samples of employees were drawn from five volunteering organisations in the Durban area of South Africa (N = 274) so as to ensure a sample size in excess of 200 for the purposes of applying structured equation modelling. The organisations included two private higher education institutions, a management consulting/outsourcing company, an information technology company and a packaging company. They administered the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, the Job Satisfaction Scale, The Work Engagement Scale and the Turnover Intention Scale.

The effect of emotional intelligence upon the job satisfaction and work engagement of employees in explaining their turnover intention could not be established. Emotional intelligence was found to have a significant effect on the work engagement of employees but not job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had a significant effect on the turnover intention of employees.

KEY TERMS

Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement, turnover intention.
CHAPTER 1: SCIENTIFIC ORIENTATION TO THE RESEARCH

This study explored the empirical relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intentions of employees within five selected South African (SA) organisations in the Durban (KwaZulu-Natal) area: Two private higher education institutions, a management consulting/human resources outsourcing company, an information technology company and a packaging company. The following chapter will describe the background and aims of the study, the research paradigm, research design and research methods employed in the study.

1.1. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

Employee turnover is costly to organisations due to the direct and indirect costs associated with loss of productivity, loss of intellectual capital, recruitment and selection costs and training and development costs for new employees (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011; Coetzee & Gunz, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira, Coetzee, & Schreuder, 2014). The difficulties associated with employee turnover are exacerbated by increased competition for limited talented pools and the increased mobility of skilled employees within the knowledge economy (Coetzee & Gunz, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira et al., 2014). This is particularly true within the South African context due to the lack of skilled workers (Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Rothmann, Diedericks, & Swart, 2013; van Schalkwyk, du Toit, Bothma, & Rothmann, 2010; Wöcke & Heyman, 2012).

Understanding why employees leave and developing strategies to better retain valuable employees can reduce the costs associated with turnover and enhance an organisations competitive advantage particularly in the context of rising skills scarcities and increased global competition (Rothmann et al., 2013; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

Turnover intention is characterised by thoughts of leaving the organisation (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010; Wöcke & Heyman, 2012; Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013) and is regarded to be a valid and reliable predictor of actual turnover (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Rothmann et al., 2013) Turnover intention is a useful construct for research within organisations so as to understand conditions that lead to thoughts of leaving (Ng & Butts, 2009; Rothmann et al., 2013). The commonly
held view is that unhappy/dissatisfied employees seek to leave organisations (Pienaar, Sieberhagen, & Mostert, 2007; Yalabik et al., 2013).

South African employees are increasingly encountering changes to business strategies, technology, processes and systems, market conditions and employment patterns as organisations implement initiatives to remain competitive in the turbulent global economy (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Martins & Coetzee, 2007; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Pillay, Viviers, & Mayer, 2013). Constant change puts strain on employees and managers, making a strong case for well-being interventions within organisations (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Ramesar, Koortzen, & Oosthuizen, 2009).

Creating a healthy organisation is a useful strategy to address employee turnover (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Ramesar et al., 2009; Rothmann et al., 2013). Within the realm of positive psychology; the role of emotional intelligence in healthy organisations is one possible area of interest to organisations and managers in reducing the turnover intentions of employees. The workplace is an emotional place; with emotions influencing the interactions between individuals in the workplace (Klem & Schlechter, 2008; Härtel, Gough & Härtel, 2008; Jonker, 2009; Wollard & Shuck, 2011), work outcomes such as job performance (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004; Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008; Dahl & Cilliers, 2012), and the general health and wellbeing of employees (Bar-On, 2010, Dahl & Cilliers, 2012, Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005, Mendes & Stander, 2011). Of significance to this study; very little research could be found illustrating the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover intentions of employees in a South African context.

In contrast to emotional intelligence; the positive psychological constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement are well established determinants of turnover intention amongst employees (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Simpson, 2009; Takawira et al., 2014; Yalabik et al., 2013).

This study aims to contribute to the literature by exploring the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and the turnover intentions of employees. It aims to build on exiting theory by investigating the effects of emotional
intelligence on employee job satisfaction and work engagement and consequent turnover intention applying structured equation modelling.

1.2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Employee turnover is costly and disruptive to organisations. The retention of skilled employees is crucial for the success of South African organisations. An understanding of the influence and relationships of employees’ emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement on employee turnover intention is necessary.

Various studies have been conducted with combinations of emotional intelligence with job satisfaction, work engagement or turnover intention as constructs. The most significant research related to this particular study was that of Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, and Farr-Wharton. (2012) which demonstrated that emotional intelligence was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction \( (r = .21) \) and well-being \( (r = .38) \). In the same study Brunetto et al. (2012) demonstrated that Job satisfaction was significantly positively correlated with employee engagement \( (r = .40) \). A direct relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction with turnover intention could not be demonstrated by the researchers.

From a national perspective no research could be found exploring the relationships between emotional intelligence with the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement. As an ability, emotional intelligence is purported to assist individuals understand and act upon emotional information in the workplace in useful and adaptive ways. Emotional intelligence may be beneficial to assisting employees cope with emotional responses associated with turbulence and change in the work context thereby maintaining or enhancing job satisfaction and work engagement.

Links between the constructs of job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention, however, are well established in international and national research literature. International research findings of Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Brunetto et al. (2012), Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013) confirm the positive relationship between the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement. Internationally Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013); and nationally Bothma and Roodt (2012), Mendes and
Staner (2011), Robyn and du Preez (2013) and Takawira et al. (2014) have confirmed the positive relationship between work engagement and the turnover intentions of employees.

For the purpose of this study, a structural model identifying the theoretical interactions of the constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention was developed (Figure 1.1). The model seeks to explain the potential role of emotional intelligence in influencing the turnover intentions of employees though the mediating variables of job satisfaction and work engagement.

In the section that follows – a brief literature review is offered to orient the reader to the constructs investigated in this study.

1.3. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.3.1. Emotional intelligence

The term “emotional intelligence” has achieved “buzzword” status as a result of the success of Daniel Goleman’s book on the topic published in 1995 (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Jordan, Dasborough, Daus, & Ashkanasy, 2010; Nel & De Villiers, 2004; Ramesar et al., 2009). The success of Goleman and others on the topic of emotional intelligence supported the growing realisation that emotions in the workplace are worthy of study (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000; Lopes and Salovey, 2004). The study of emotional intelligence within organisations in the 21st century seems more relevant than ever due to the constantly changing nature of work and the global economic context organisations currently face (Castro & Martins, 2010; Mendes & Stander, 2011).

In 1990 Salovey and Mayer first introduced their ability based conceptualisation of emotional intelligence as a form of social intelligence consisting of the ability to monitor emotion in self and others, discriminate between emotions, and use emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour (Jonker, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotions are viewed as motivational forces directing and focusing one’s attention, with individuals varying in their ability and skill to do so (Stuart & Paquet, 2001).
As an ability, emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions, recognise and manage emotions and to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, 2004; Davis & Humphrey, 2014; Jonker, 2009; MacCann, Joseph, Newman, & Roberts, 2014; Mayer et al., 2008; Mayer et al., 2004). Emotion represents a response to a situation eliciting categories of associated emotions – such as threat, fear, and happiness. Emotional information elicits motivated or learned reactions based on experience and emotional knowledge (Mayer et al., 2004). From this perspective emotional intelligence is seen as the ability to understand and act upon this emotional information in useful and adaptive ways (Bar-On, 2005; Brunetto et al., 2012).

The Salovey and Mayer (1990) model of emotional intelligence takes the view that emotional intelligence is a useful set of abilities for processing emotional information and using it to guide thinking, solve problems and focus on required behaviours for success (Salovey, Mayer, Caruso, & Yoo, 2008). Salovey and Mayer (1990) divided the abilities associated with emotional intelligence into four interdependent domains or branches: (1) The ability to perceive emotion; (2) the ability to use emotion to facilitate thought; (3) the ability to understand emotion and emotional information; and (4) the ability to manage emotion (Jonker, 2009, Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

The Salovey and Mayer model and definition of emotional intelligence has garnered overwhelming support by academics and researchers compared to the mixed-model approaches of Goleman and Bar-On (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012). Salovey and Mayer’s definition of emotional intelligence was adopted by the American Psychological Association (APA) as the authoritative definition of emotional intelligence (Jordan et al., 2010). According to Ashkanasny and Daus (2005), Salovey and Mayer’s model of emotional intelligence is the only scientifically defensible model of emotional intelligence.

1.3.2. **Job satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is commonly defined as how much one likes or dislikes their job (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Rothmann, 2002; Yalabik et al., 2013). Job satisfaction results when employees’ internal needs are met and have positive implications for enhancing well-being and reducing employee turnover (Martins & Coetzee, 2007). Job satisfaction reflects an individual’s feelings and beliefs which develop as a result of cognitive and emotional
processes (Yalabik et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is thus an emotional state based upon how individuals think and feel about their jobs (Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Yalabik et al., 2013).

Job satisfaction is widely recognised as a predictor of employee productivity and organisational performance (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009). It is thus important for organisations to enhance employee job satisfaction so as to enhance organisational outcomes, quality of outputs and performance levels (Robyn & du Preez, 2013). Employees with higher levels of job satisfaction experience greater well-being and are less likely to leave organisations (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Sempane, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002).

Job satisfaction is influenced by a variety of factors such as recognition, communication, co-worker relations, working conditions, job characteristics, the nature of the organisation, systems, policies and procedures, compensation, security and supervisory practices (Liu et al., 2011; Locke, 1969; Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Rogelberg, Allen, Shanock, Scott, & Shuffler, 2010). Where an individual’s needs are frustrated or the expectancy and valence of the attainment of a need is high in relation to the relative achievement of the need – job dissatisfaction is likely to occur (Locke, 1969). Meeting employees’ needs, in relation to the above factors, is viewed as the primary strategy for enhancing job satisfaction of employees (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008).

1.3.3. **Work engagement**

The term work engagement has taken a variety of forms over the course of its history depending on the approach of the various researchers and authors. Personal engagement and disengagement (Kahn, 1990), work engagement (Maslach & Leiter, 2008) and more recently employee engagement (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Simpson, 2009) are terms used in the engagement research literature. While terms, approaches and definitions of engagement may differ, the development of the construct has been driven by the view that enhancing work engagement of employees enhances the competitive advantage of organisations as well as working conditions and well-being of employees (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011; Rothmann, 2002; Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes, & Delbridge, 2013; Wollard & Shuck, 2011; Yalabik et al., 2013).
According to Wollard and Shuck (2011) work engagement literature suggests that engaged employees experience positive work outcomes, are unafraid to portray their true selves, and feel that they have the necessary resources to succeed. Organisations with higher levels of work engagement enjoyed far higher rates of success (Harter et al., 2002; Viljevac, Cooper-Thomas, & Saks, 2012). The opposite of work engagement – namely disengagement and burnout – predicts outcomes such as lower performance and high employee turnover (Shuck & Wollard, 2010).

According to Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, and Taris (2008) and Bakker and Demerouti (2008) engaged employees perform better than their counterparts because:

- They experience more positive emotions such as happiness and joy towards their work;
- They experience greater psychological and physical health and well-being;
- They are more open to work opportunities and are more optimistic and confident;
- They foster the personal and job resources required to sustain their own engagement; and
- They transfer their engagement to others around them.

Engaged employees display high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work and are immersed in the performance of their work and roles (Bakker et al., 2008). Such individuals see their work as fulfilling, personally rewarding and challenging as opposed to stressful and unrewarding (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006). Engaged employees are also more committed to their organisations, take greater personal initiative and are motivated to learn and develop (Botha & Mostert, 2014).

The positive experiences associated with work engagement are expected to enhance individual outcomes such as employee well-being and job satisfaction as well as organisational outcomes such as increased attachment to organisations, enhanced work performance and lower turnover intentions (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).
In his seminal writing on the psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Kahn (1990) sought to explain the phenomenon by which individuals apply varying degrees of themselves at work: (1) Physically; (2) cognitively; and (3) emotionally (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; May, Gilson & Harter, 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Simpson, 2009; Truss et al., 2013). Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as the employment and expression of one’s preferred self in the execution of tasks at work. Given the appropriate conditions, work engagement occurs when an individual uses and expresses their preferred full selves in the performance of their work roles (Bakker et al., 2008; Kahn, 1990; Kahn, 1992; May et al., 2004; Viljevac et al., 2012).

Central to Kahn’s conceptualisation is that work engagement is an internal state of being influenced by external conditions, forces or contexts (Shuck, 2011). Kahn (1990) concluded in his findings that context and individual’s perceptions and experiences of the context would lead to either engagement or disengagement at work (May et al., 2004; Shuck, 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012). In this approach to work engagement – the more individuals identify with their role the more the work role provides the opportunity for self-expression (Bakker et al., 2008; May et al., 2004; van Zyl, Deacon, & Rothmann., 2010).

1.3.4. Turnover intention

Turnover intention (also referred to as intention to leave) is defined as the conscious and deliberate willfulness of an employee to leave or plan to leave an organisation in the near future (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). According to Mendes and Stander (2011) intention to leave consists of both thoughts and statements. Intention to stay refers to employees’ conscious and deliberate willingness to stay with the organisation (Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009; Tett and Meyer, 1993).

Turnover intention is understood to be the final stage in an employee’s decision making short of actually leaving the organisation and can be viewed as a coping strategy used by employees to escape a perceived undesirable employment condition (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011).
In their study of 100 employees in the United States; Vandenberg and Nelson (1999) found that:

- High turnover intention does not inevitably result in actual turnover;
- Individuals intentions to leave are influenced by a wide variety of motives and factors (push and pull);
- Turnover intention can be lowered if the source(s) of dissatisfaction are dealt with;
- Individual differences variables (psychological factors and resources) influence an individual’s control of their context and may influence turnover intention.

Of significance to the findings of Vandenberg and Nelson (1999) are the findings of Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Brunetto et al. (2012) Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013) which found correlations between job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intentions of employees.

1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the background of the study, the problem statement and the brief literature review presented the following research questions were formulated for the purposes of this study:

1. Is emotional Intelligence positively related to job satisfaction and work engagement of employees?
2. Is job satisfaction and work engagement negatively related to turnover intention of employees?
3. Does job satisfaction and work engagement mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover intentions of employees?

1.5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The aim of the study was to explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and the turnover intentions of employees in selected organisations applying structural equation modelling. Based on the above the following research hypotheses were empirically tested in this research:
1.6. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H₁: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the job satisfaction of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₂: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the work engagement of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₃: Job satisfaction and work engagement relates negatively to the turnover intention of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₄: Emotional intelligence mediates turnover intention of employees indirectly via work engagement and job satisfaction.

The stated hypotheses can be represented in the structural model as presented in Figure 1.1.

![Image of the structural model](image)

Figure 1.1. The hypothesised structural model

1.7. AIMS OF THE RESEARCH

1.7.1. General aim of the study

The general aim of the study was to explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees within a sample of South African organisations.
1.7.2. **Specific aims of the study**

The specific aims of the study will be presented in terms of the literature review aims and the empirical study aims.

1.7.2.1. **Literature review aim**

The aim of the literature review was to conceptualise emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention from the literature.

1.7.2.2. **Empirical study aims**

The aims of the empirical study were:

1. To determine whether emotional intelligence is positively related to job satisfaction and work engagement of employees.
2. To determine whether job satisfaction and work engagement are negatively related to turnover intention of employees.
3. To determine whether job satisfaction and work engagement mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence and turnover intentions of employees.

1.8. **THE PARADIGM PERSPECTIVE**

Paradigms are the frameworks and models through which social research is understood and explained (Babbie, 2013). According to Terre Blanche, Durrheim and Painter (2006) theory provides the basis for paradigms from which we develop research hypotheses. Interpretation of research observations leads to the affirmation of the theory underpinning these paradigms. Research paradigms provide the frameworks informing the nature of what is being studied (ontology), the role of the researcher in the process (epistemology) and how to conduct the research (methodology) (Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter 2006).
Given the nature of the research questions, the positivist research paradigm was employed in this study. The positivist paradigm is based on the assumption that the realities of social behaviour can be understood and explained by means of collecting data and facts (McKenna, Richardson, & Manroop, 2011). Research data can be scientifically tested by the researcher using reliable and valid quantitative, statistical research methods (Babbie, 2013; McKenna et al., 2011; Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter 2006). The broader theoretical paradigms informing this research will now be described in terms of the intellectual climate, meta-theoretical statements and central hypothesis.

1.8.1. **Intellectual climate**

This study was conducted within the field of industrial organisational psychology (IOP). The constructs under investigation in this study are presented from the ecosystemic and positive psychological paradigms.

IOP is an applied field of psychology concerned with the behaviour of people at work (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). According to Rothmann and Cilliers (2007, p.10) IOP encompasses the following four broad aims: (1) Explain individual, group and organisational behaviour, through psychological theory, and optimise performance, (2) measure behaviour and predict potential, (3) contribute towards organisational development and (4) translate IOP research findings into applications and interventions in the workplace.

The ecosystemic psychological paradigm holds that human systems and experience cannot be isolated but should be viewed in context (Barron, 2013; Tyler, 1996). The social world is a system; and in understanding the system the approach of the researcher is to seek to understand “the whole in terms of its parts, and the parts in terms of the contribution they make to the whole” (Tyler, 1996, p.32). The constructs under investigation in this study were approached as interacting in a systemic way represented by the hypothesised model (Figure 1.1).

Positive psychology has grown in its influence and application in the field of IOP and is concerned with enhancing organisational and individual performance via the quest to enhance employee wellness and happiness (Rothmann & Cilliers, 2007). Positive psychology
advocates the ideal of humans as capable of exercising control in their lives leading to autonomy, happiness and well-being (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

1.8.2. **Conceptual descriptions**

*Emotional intelligence* is a form of intelligence described as the mental processes by which individuals appraise and express emotions in themselves and others, regulate emotions in themselves and others, and use emotions to adapt to their environment (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

*Job satisfaction* is defined as the negative or positive feelings individuals feel about their work (Spector & Fox, 2003).

*Work engagement* has been defined as the varying degree to which individuals employ themselves – cognitively, physically and emotionally – in their work being influenced by the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004).

*Turnover intention* is defined as an individual’s own expectation that he/she will leave the organisation at some point in the near future (Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). Turnover intention is related to actual turnover in that it is a predictor of turnover behaviour (van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

1.9. **RESEARCH DESIGN**

The following research design was employed for the purpose of this study.

1.9.1. **Research Approach**

For the purposes of this study a non-experimental quantitative research approach was applied consisting of a cross-sectional survey design. The survey consisted of items from the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS), the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS), The Work Engagement
Scale (WES) and the Turnover Intention Scale (TIS) to measure employees experiences across the constructs within a work context.

1.9.2. **Research Method**

The study was conducted over two phases; the literature review in phase one and empirical study in phase two

1.9.2.1. *Phase one: Literature review.*

Information for the literature review was obtained from various publications such as peer reviewed journals, textbooks, theses, dissertations and reports from research institutions. Reference databases such as Ebscohost, Sabinet and Proquest were used to search for online academic resources. The internet was a secondary source to research general topics associated with the constructs under investigation.

In pursuit of the literature review aims, the following steps were followed:

Step 1: Conceptualise emotional intelligence from a theoretical perspective.
Step 2: Conceptualise job satisfaction from a theoretical perspective.
Step 3 Conceptualise work engagement from a theoretical perspective
Step 4: Conceptualise turnover intention from a theoretical perspective.
Step 5: Triangulate the research variables and conceptualise the theoretical relationships between the variables.

1.9.2.2. *Phase two: Empirical study.*

Phase two entailed the quantitative empirical study. This phase consisted of a quantitative empirical study, and encompassed the gathering of cross-sectional data, analyses with Mplus and interpretation of the results. The empirical part of the research is encapsulated in the sections that follow.
1.9.3. **Research Participants/Sample**

A non-probability convenient sample of five South African organisations participated in the study: Two private higher education institutions, a management consulting/outsourcing company, an information technology company and a packaging company. A total of 274 employees across the five companies agreed to participate in the study. The number of participants varied from nine employees in the smallest company to 139 in the largest participating company.

1.9.4. **Measuring instruments**

A questionnaire was used to elicit biographic and occupational details of the participants followed thereafter by five parts assessing the constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention.

The *Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale* (SEIS) (Schutte et al., 1998) was used to measure emotional intelligence of Salovey and Mayer (1990). The SEIS consists of 33-items (e.g. “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others” and “I expect that I will do well on most things I try”). Responses range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total emotional intelligence score. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the SEIS in international research (Schutte et al., 1998) and national research (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008).

*Job satisfaction* was measured by five items (e.g. “I feel that my job is valuable” and “In my job, I feel that I am doing something worthwhile”) adapted from the Industrial Salesperson scale by Johlke and Duhan (2000). Responses range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total job satisfaction score. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the instrument, with reliabilities indices of up to .98 (Brunetto et al., 2012).

*Work engagement* was measured by the adapted May Gilson and Harter (2004) *Work Engagement Scale* (WES) (May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; van Zyl et al., 2010) and was used to measure the cognitive, emotional and physical conditions of engagement at work. The instrument consists of 17 items (e.g. “Performing my job is so absorbing that I
forget about everything else” and “I really put my heart in my job”). Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total engagement score. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the instrument; with reliabilities indices of up to .77 (May et al., 2004) in international research and up to .93 (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010; van Zyl et al., 2010) in national research.

Turnover intention was measured by an adapted version of the turnover intention scale (TI-6) (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The TI-6 consists of six items (e.g. “How often do you dream about getting another job that will suit your personal needs?” and “How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?”). The turnover intention scale was adapted by adding two-items (“How often do you think about leaving your job” and “How likely are you to look for a new job within the next year”) formulated by van Schalkwyk et al. (2010). Responses range from 1 (rarely or never) to 5 (very often) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total turnover intention score. National research has established the items of the TI-6 and the van Schalkwyk et al. scale to have satisfactory internal reliabilities of up to .81 (Bothma & Roodt, 2013) and .75 respectively (van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

1.9.5. Research Procedure

The research project was evaluated and accepted by the Ethics Committee of UNISA. The heads of human resources gave the authors written approval to conduct the study within their organisations.

Participants were given a covering letter detailing the purpose of the project, roles and responsibilities of the role players and the rights to confidentiality of the participants. Participation was voluntary with each participant being provided with an informed consent form to sign prior to completing the questionnaire. The informed consent form explained that the result of the study were to be used for research purposes only. Participants were given the opportunity to raise any questions and to receive feedback on the results of the study.

A secure, online survey system (Limesurvey) was used for the purpose of generating and distributing the questionnaire. Employees within the participating organisations were sent a
link allowing them to access and voluntarily complete the questionnaire. The online questionnaire was made available to participants between May 2013 and July 2013. The data was collected and securely stored by the administrator via password controls. Once the raw data was collected it was coded and entered into an SPSS dataset format for statistical analysis.

1.9.6. **Data analysis.**

Descriptive statistics were identified in terms of the means and standard deviations identifying trends and distributions of scores. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationships between the variables under investigation.

Structural equation modelling was applied to test the interrelationships between the independent variables (emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement) and the dependant variable of turnover intention (Pallant, 2011). The data was analysed using Mplus version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012).

To assess model fit, the comparative fit index (CFI; > .90), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; > .90), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; < .08), and standardised root mean residual (SRMR < 1) were used. Reliabilities ($\rho$) of scales were measured using a formula based on the sum of squares of standardized loadings and the sum of standardized variance of error terms instead of Cronbach’s alpha, which is not a dependable estimate of scale reliability when latent variable modelling is used (Diedericks & Rothmann, 2013).

The following Mplus indexes were used to analyse the data in this study:

1. Absolute fit indices – Chi-square ($\chi^2$) statistic (test of absolute fit of the model), the standardised root mean residual (SRMR) and the root means-square error of approximation (RMSEA).
2. Incremental fit indices which include the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI).
3. The comparative fit index (CFI).
4. The Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC).
In interpreting the fit statistics of competing models; the authors regarded TLI and CFI values higher than .90 as acceptable. SRMR and RMSEA values lower than .08 were regarded as acceptable; indicating a good fit between the model and the data.

1.9.7. **Methods used to ensure reliability and validity**

Validity in research refers to the extent to which research conclusions are appropriate (Van der Riet & Durrheim, 2006). Reliability refers to the dependability of research results (Durrheim & Painter, 2006). The following strategies were employed within the research process to ensure reliability.

Internal validity refers to the extent to which causal conclusions can be drawn from the study. The research conclusions and recommendations of this study will be offered in terms of the stated purpose and aims.

While generalising the findings to the broader population may not be possible the sampling method will ensure that the results are generalisable within the participating organisations, a feature of external validity.

Measurement validity was ensured through the use of valid instruments bearing substantial construct and content validity as ascertained by the literature (Durrheim & Painter, 2006).

Interpretative validity of this study was ensured through the analysis and interpretation of the findings of the study in relation to the proposed model devised from the literature.

1.10. **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Ethical considerations for this study can be viewed in terms of the potential harm to the participant organisations and employees.

Prior to conducting the research the research project was evaluated and accepted by the Ethics Committee of UNISA.
For both participating organisations and employees, confidentiality and anonymity have been maintained. The heads of human resources of the participating organisations gave the authors written approval to conduct the study within their organisations. Participating employees were required to give their informed consent prior to engaging with the online survey.

Participants were given a covering letter detailing the purpose of the project, roles and responsibilities of the role players and the rights to confidentiality of the participants. Participation was voluntary with each participant being provided an informed consent form to sign prior to completing the questionnaire. The informed consent form explained that the result of the study were to be used for research purposes only. Participants were given the opportunity to raise any questions and to receive feedback on the results of the study.

A secure, online survey system (Limesurvey) was used for the purpose of generating and distributing the questionnaire. Employees within the participating organisations were sent a link allowing them to access and voluntarily complete the questionnaire. The data was protected by strict password controls, thereby ensuring that participants’ responses were protected.

1.11. CHAPTER LAYOUT

The chapters of the study are presented as follows:

Chapter 1: Scientific orientation to the study.
Chapter 2: Literature review.
Chapter 3: Research article.
Chapter 4: Conclusions, limitations and recommendations.
1.12. CHAPTER SUMMARY

In chapter 1 the scientific orientation to the research was discussed. This contained the background and motivation for the study, the research problem, aims, the paradigm perspective, the research design and method. The chapter concluded with the chapter layout.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Against the backdrop presented in Chapter 1, the existing literature relating to emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention will be explored. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a systematic review of the literature in order to conceptualise the constructs and the associative inter-relationships. Each construct will be explored giving insight into their history, development and characteristics as well as to its operationalization within individual and organisational contexts. Finally, the theoretical relationships amongst these variables will be established.

2.1 EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotions play an important role in organisational and work life; and, until recently the relevance of emotions of individuals within the workplace has been undervalued or not considered (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Jonker, 2009; Khalili, 2012). Emotions are a component of a holistic view of the person and his/her interaction with the environment – including the workplace. Emotional intelligence has emerged as a means by which individuals may adapt to their environments; using emotions and emotional information appropriately to maximise benefits (Bhullar, Schutte, & Malouff, 2013; Ford & Tamir, 2012; Stuart & Paquet, 2001). Broad examples of benefits include enhanced self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and enhanced relationship management (Khalili, 2012). Since emotional intelligence is viewed as a competency or construct that can be developed and enhanced (Golnaz, 2012; Jonker, 2009; Stoller, Taylor, & Farver, 2013), organisations are increasingly investigating the value of emotional intelligence and including the construct into their competency frameworks (Boyatzis, 2011; Jonker, 2009).

A wide variety of competing conceptualisations and definitions (e.g. Salovey and Mayer (1990), Petrides (2010) and Goleman (1995), approaches (e.g. ability, trait and mixed approaches) and measuring instruments (e.g. SEIS, MSCEIT) have emerged since the term emotional intelligence gained popularity in the 1990’s. Despite the apparent lack of a unifying definition of emotional intelligence, most definitions of emotional intelligence include the following elements (Bar-On, 2005):
• the ability to be aware of, understand and express emotions;
• the ability to relate with others as a result of understanding emotions in others;
• the ability to manage, control or regulate emotions;
• the ability to manage and adapt to and solve problems of an intra- and interpersonal nature; and
• the ability to harness emotions constructively aiding self-motivation.

2.1.1 Conceptualising emotional intelligence

Prior to the conceptualisation of emotional intelligence, the concepts of emotion and intelligence were researched and treated as separate, unrelated concepts (Spector & Fox, 2000; Mayer, et al., 2008). Research on the role of emotions at work focussed on aspects such as emotional labour, emotional expression and the influence of mood in the workplace (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Intelligence research focused primarily on general intelligence and measures of intelligence (Mayer, Caruso, Panter, & Salovey, 2012). A surge in interest in multiple intelligences emerged in the 1980’s and 1990’s following the publication of multiple intelligence theories by Gardner and Sternberg (Mayer et al., 2008; Ekinci, 2014). It was Salovey and Mayer (1990) who first defined the relationship between emotion and intelligence.

On the biological level, an emotion is a chemical and neural response to a stimulus (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007). Emotion is defined as involving changes in physiological, motor skills, behaviour, cognition and subjective experience as a result of the appraisal of the self or situation (Mayer et al., 2008). Emotion is viewed differently from mood given that it is experienced in shorter durations and more intensely (Ramesar, et al., 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

According to Salovey and Mayer (1990), traditionalists considered emotion to be disorganised and disruptive mental activities which needed to be controlled. However, the emerging view of emotion describes emotions as useful, aiding in prioritising action, focusing and motivating behaviour and leading to enriched personal and social outcomes (Mayer et al., 2008; Meisler, 2014). Applying the appropriate emotional response in the appropriate context
could also be useful to individuals. Even anger directed in the right ways can assist individuals attain their goals (Ford & Tamir, 2012).

Intelligence, on the other hand, assists individuals to adapt to the environment and to cope with life (Mayer et al., 2008). Intelligence is generally defined as a mental ability or abilities that allows for the recognition, learning, memory for and capacity to reason about various forms of information and abstract thought (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Mayer, et al., 2004; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). However, traditional one-dimensional views of intelligence are considered too narrow in scope and as a result theories relating to multiple intelligences have emerged (Davis, Christodoulou, Seider, & Gardner, 2011).

For a construct to be considered an intelligence, it is generally accepted that it must meet the following conditions: (1) It must be a mental ability and not a trait, disposition or non-intellectual construct; (2) it must be psychometrically associated with other known forms of intelligence; (3) it must be shown to have a developmental trajectory from childhood to adulthood and (4) it must be a distinct form of intelligence (Boyatzis, 2011; Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; MacCann, et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2004).

Emotional intelligence is viewed by proponents to be one of a number of human intelligences including social, cultural, practical and personal intelligences (Crowne, 2013; Mayer et al., 2004). While much criticism abounds whether emotional intelligence can be considered a true intelligence, the Salovey and Mayer model of emotional intelligence: (1) is a distinct form of intelligence yet has been associated with other forms of intelligence; (2) has been shown to be affected by individual differences in ability; and (3) develops over the lifespan and with training (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002; Crowne, 2013; Jonker, 2009; Jordan, Ashkanasy & Härtel, 2003; MacCann, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014).

2.1.2 History of emotional intelligence

Much debate abounds the origins of the concept of emotional intelligence. The term emotional intelligence was first used in passing by Jane Austen (Mayer et al., 2008) and more deliberately by Payne in 1986 (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). Emotional intelligence is rooted in earlier concepts of social (e.g. Thorndike, 1920) and personal intelligences (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Social intelligence emerged as a theory which sought to explain how
individuals might vary in the ability to perceive both one’s internal states and the internal states of others, motives and behaviours, and to respond accordingly (Crowne, 2013; Nel & De Villiers, 2004; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Personal intelligence, closely related to social intelligence, can be separated into interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence or knowledge about oneself and about others (Coetzee, 2008; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

The 1980’s saw a surge in the interest in multiple intelligences in particular how emotion and cognition interact (Nel & De Villiers, 2004). In 1990 Salovey and Mayer published their seminal article on the concept of emotional intelligence as a distinct construct based on a review of existing literature (Mayer et al., 2008). Salovey and Mayer (1990) integrated social intelligence and constructive thinking to formulate their conceptualisation of emotional intelligence (Nel & De Villiers, 2004). Salovey and Mayer (1990) originally posited a three branch model of emotional intelligence which included (1) the appraisal and expression of emotion in self and others; (2) the regulation of emotion in self and others; and (3) the utilisation of emotion.

Goleman’s book “Emotional Intelligence” published in 1995 – catapulted the construct into the domain of popular psychology (Jordan et al., 2010; Nel & De Villiers, 2004) with the construct even making the cover of Time Magazine (Ramesar et al., 2009). Bar-On, likewise, remodelled his earlier doctorate research to capitalise on the emotional intelligence revolution (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). The popularisation of emotional intelligence and the ensuing “gold-rush” of emotional intelligence research had the unintended consequence of creating confusion about the topic and concept (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007).

Despite criticisms, Goleman’s work both promoted the concept of emotional intelligence to a broader audience and created excitement of the possibility of a new intelligence (Jordan et al., 2010; Mayer et al., 2008). While the popularity of emotional intelligence soared, Mayer and Salovey published their revised ability-based model of emotional intelligence in 1997 which is widely regarded as the authoritative definition of emotional intelligence (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005). The Salovey and Mayer model and definition of emotional intelligence has garnered overwhelming support by academics and researchers compared to the other models and approaches (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Jordan et al., 2010; MacCann et al., 2014).
2.1.3 Approaches to emotional intelligence

Various theories and approaches towards emotional intelligence exist within the literature (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014; Martins & Coetzez, 2007; Nel & De Villiers, 2004). Each approach aims to conceptualise emotional intelligence in relation to a specific school of thought (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007) and has resulted in three generally accepted models: (a) The ability model (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), (b) the trait model (Bar-On, 1997) and (c) the mixed-model (Goleman, 1995).

The ability model assumes that emotional intelligence is an ability that can be developed over time (Clarke, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2008; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). The trait model suggests that emotional intelligence is a constellation of behaviours and personality dispositions or traits (Davis & Humphrey, 2014; Jonker, 2009; Petrides, 2010; Pillay et al., 2013). The mixed model refers to emotional intelligence in broad terms including cognitive ability, competencies and behaviours and personality dispositions or traits (Bar-On, 2010; Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Clarke, 2010; Khalili, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2008; Ravichandran, 2011).

2.1.3.1 Specific-ability approaches

As an ability, emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions, recognise and manage emotions and to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thought (Brackett et al., 2004; Davis & Humphrey, 2014; Jonker, 2009; MacCann et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2008; Mayer et al., 2004). According to Mayer et al. (2008), reasoning within the scope of emotional intelligence is not the case of logic over emotion but rather enhanced reasoning as a result of reasoning about emotions. From this perspective emotional intelligence is seen as the ability to understand and act upon emotional information in useful and adaptive ways (Bar-On, 2005; Brunetto et al., 2012).

In 1990, Salovey and Mayer first introduced their ability based conceptualisation of emotional intelligence as a form of social intelligence consisting of the ability to monitor emotion in self and others, discriminate between emotions and use emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour (Farh & Tesluk, 2012; Jonker, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). The guiding premise of Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) definition is the high degree of
emotional information in life; and that individuals differ in their ability to process and utilise this emotional information to guide thinking, solve problems and focus on required behaviours for success (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Salovey et al., 2008). Emotions are viewed as motivational forces directing and focusing one’s attention (Stuart & Paquet, 2001).

Salovey and Mayer (1990) originally posited a three branch model of emotional intelligence which included (1) the appraisal and expression of emotion in self and others; (2) the regulation of emotion in self and others; and (3) the utilisation of emotion. In 1997 Mayer and Salovey revised their original definition of emotional intelligence as the capacity to reason about emotions, and of emotions to enhance thinking. The original three branch model was extended to a four branch model consisting: (1) The ability to perceive emotion; (2) the ability to use emotion to facilitate thought; (3) the ability to understand emotion and emotional information; and (4) the ability to manage emotion (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Farh & Tesluk, 2012; MacCann, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 2004; Jonker, 2009).

The four branches of Salovey and Mayer’s model of emotional intelligence follows a hierarchy with each branch laying the foundation for the operationalization of the abilities associated with the next branch (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Farh & Tesluk, 2012; MacCann, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). In this way, emotion perception (the least complex branch) lays the foundation for facilitation of emotion, followed by understanding emotion and finally the ability to manage emotions (most complex branch) (Ford & Tamir, 2012; MacCann, 2010; Mayer et al., 2004). That is the ability to perceive and use emotion to facilitate thought precedes and assists in the understanding and regulation of emotion to achieve desired outcomes (Ford & Tamir, 2012).

Perception of emotion

Emotion perception includes the ability to accurately perceive emotion in one self and others through both verbal cues such as tone of voice and non-verbal cues such as facial expressions and body language (Farh & Tesluk, 2012; Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Salovey et al., 2008). Those with greater emotional perceptiveness are better able to discern emotional information from the environment and respond to this information more accurately and appropriately (Farh & Tesluk; 2012; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).
The ability to accurately perceive emotion is the most fundamental ability within the Salovey and Mayer model of emotional intelligence. Without this ability an individual would not be able to appropriately understand and respond to emotional information (Farh & Tesluk; 2012). For example; individuals with higher emotional perceptiveness would be aware of their impact on the emotional states of others by identifying emotional cues (Fiori & Antonakis, 2011) and be in a better position to respond with socially adaptive behaviours. Such individuals would be described as being empathetic and warm as opposed to oblivious and rude (Farh & Tesluk, 2012; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Facilitation of emotion

Facilitation (also referred to as assimilation) of emotion refers to the ability to generate, use and communicate emotional information appropriately (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Khalili, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014). The ability to facilitate emotion is dependent on an individual’s knowledge base of emotional experience over the lifetime (Mayer et al., 2004; Salovey et al., 2008). The resulting ability associated with an individual’s emotional experience allows for individuals to employ different emotional and cognitive states to prioritise thoughts and focus behaviours (Salovey et al., 2008; Farh & Tesluk, 2012).

An individual with high emotional intelligence, for example, would be able to perceive negative emotional states in the self and others and would be able to implement appropriate strategies to remedy the negative state. Strategies could include taking a break, listening to music or providing emotional support to others (Farh & Tesluk, 2012). The emotionally intelligent person is aware of the value of harnessing the appropriate emotional state in oneself and individuals to help focus and prioritise attention towards desired outcomes. He/she is aware that a positive emotional state is more beneficial to planning and creative thinking (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Khalili, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).
Understanding emotion

Understanding emotion refers to the ability to analyse emotions, trends, relationships between emotions, situations and outcomes so as to label and discriminate between feelings accurately and adaptively (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; MacCann, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014; Salovey et al., 2008). Examples include understanding how oneself and others may be feeling in a particular context, understanding the potential causes of the emotional states, and being able to explain the reasons behind the emotional states being experienced by the self and others (Khalili, 2012).

Individuals with high emotional intelligence are better able to understand and remember how to elicit certain moods or emotions in the self and in others (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012). This has the effect of terminating negative moods in the self and others through recreation of positive emotional states – useful for stimulating perseverance and motivation as well as creating favourable impressions in others (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Khalili, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014; Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Managing emotions

Accurately perceiving, assimilating and understanding emotion paves the way for effective emotion management (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Farh & Tesluk, 2012; MacCann, 2010; MacCann et al., 2014). Emotion management entails the management (or regulation) of emotion in one self and/or others (McCann et al., 2014; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotion management is viewed as the most sophisticated ability within the Salovey and Mayer model as it implies the strategic use of emotional information (MacCann et al., 2014).

An individual with high emotional intelligence would be better able to adjust one’s mood (Ravichandran, 2011). By harnessing the appropriate mood individuals with higher emotional intelligence would be better able to focus and prioritise their attention towards desired goals/outcomes and motivate themselves to persevere despite experienced difficulties through associated activities (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012 Farh & Tesluk, 2012; Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Salovey et al., 2008).
2.1.3.2 Trait approaches

As a trait, emotional intelligence is conceptualised more broadly with greater sets of non-cognitive abilities, competencies and skills concerned with how individuals understand and express themselves, understand and relate to others and cope with environmental demands (Jonker, 2009; Petrides, 2010; Pillay et al., 2013). Trait based emotional intelligence recognises the subjective nature of emotional life and experience and as such differs from the competence and ability based view of intelligence. Trait emotional intelligence is more closely aligned to personality or dispositional factors and principally measured via self-report measures (Andrei, Mancini, Trombini, Baldaro & Russo, 2014; Copestake, Gray, & Snowden, 2013; Davis & Humphrey, 2014; Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2014; Petrides, 2010). Applying self-report measures, individuals are asked to describe the view they have of themselves on the factors associated with trait-based emotional intelligence much the same as they would on measures of personality or disposition (Petrides, 2010).

Whilst popular, the greatest disadvantage associated with trait approaches to emotional intelligence is the weak relationship with emotional intelligence abilities as proposed by the ability based models of Salovey and Mayer (Brackett et al., 2004) and strong overlap with personality dimensions (Andrei et al., 2014). This has led to the criticism of trait emotional intelligence as being not clearly defined and undifferentiated from general intelligence and other psychological constructs such as personality (Andrei et al., 2014; Locke, 2005).

2.1.3.3 Mixed model approaches

The mixed model approach refers to emotional intelligence in broad terms including cognitive ability, competencies and behaviours and personality dispositions or traits (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Leary, Reilly, & William Brown, 2009; Mayer et al., 2008). Advocates of the mixed-model and trait approaches often combine well known traits such as optimism, motivation and well-being (Brackett et al., 2004).
According to Martins and Coetzee (2007) constructs included into mixed models of emotional intelligence include:

- emotional literacy;
- self-regard;
- self-management;
- self-motivation;
- change resilience;
- interpersonal relations;
- integration of head and heart.

Notable proponents of this approach include the models and measures of Goleman and Bar-On (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Jordan et al., 2010; Leary et al., 2009; Mayer et al., 2008). Despite Goleman and Bar-On’s approaches being viewed as mixed models of emotional intelligence each differs in both their relative conceptualisations and measurement of emotional intelligence.

_Goleman_

In his book “emotional intelligence” Goleman described four broad clusters of emotional intelligence: (1) Self-awareness; (2) self-management; (3) social awareness; and (4) social skills (Nel & De Villiers, 2004). The broad nature of Goleman’s conceptualisation of emotional intelligence lends itself to the various criticisms of emotional intelligence; that emotional intelligence definitions are too broad to be understood as a distinct form of intelligence and that the term intelligence has arbitrarily been attached to the construct emotional intelligence (Locke, 2005). Furthermore, Goleman’s definition of emotional intelligence was not based on scientific research (Salovey et al., 2008) and was not intended to be published as a scientific publication (Petrides, 2010). As a result Goleman’s approach has led to greater confusion around a definition of emotional intelligence as well as a multitude of overstated claims regarding emotional intelligence’s utility in organisational settings (Jordan et al., 2010).
Bar-On

Bar-On’s (2005) model of emotional intelligence, referred to as emotional-social intelligence (ESI) (Bar-On, 2005; Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006), is theoretically rooted in the Darwinian approach. In this approach emotional expression is viewed as a vital component for adapting and surviving in one’s environment (Ramesar et al., 2009). Key components of ESI include (1) the ability to recognise, understand and express emotions; (2) the ability to relate to and empathise with the emotions of others; (3) the ability to manage and control emotions; (4) the ability to use emotion to adapt to change and solve personal and interpersonal problems; and (5) the ability to improve mood and be self-motivated (Ramesar et al., 2009; Bar-On, 2010).

According to Bar-On (2005) two components of ESI exist: interpersonal (social) and intrapersonal (emotional) competencies. Intrapersonal competencies refer to the ability to understand one’s own emotional states and accurately expressing them. Interpersonal competencies refer to the ability to understand and relate to others. Bar-On’s measures of ESI – the EQ-i – include scales that measure abilities associated with inter- and intrapersonal skills, stress management, adaptability and mood regulation (Ramesar et al., 2009; Bar-On, 2010).

According to Petrides (2010), Bar-On’s model of ESI and its measurement is problematic. While the Bar-On model makes significant reference to competencies and skills associated with emotional intelligence it inaptly measures emotional intelligence through a self-report instrument (Petrides, Trait emotional intelligence, 2010).

2.1.4 Criticisms of emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence has been criticised for its identification as an intelligence insofar as emotional intelligence is not clearly differentiated from general intelligence and cannot be properly measured (Jordan et al., 2010; Locke, 2005). Further, measures of emotional intelligence have been widely criticised for their weak psychometric properties (Fiori & Antonakis, 2011; Jonker & Vosloo, 2008) and inability to provide stable results over time (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008). Given the strong overlap with trait and personality, many claims by
emotional intelligence researchers and authors regarding the utility of emotional intelligence cannot be substantiated (Badenhorst & Smith, 2007).

According to Dahl and Cilliers (2012) the utility of emotional intelligence is still in its infancy with much of the research findings available on emotional intelligence based on studies of young student populations. More research is required across a variety of populations and environments to understand the utility of emotional intelligence.

2.1.5 Conceptualisation of emotional intelligence adopted for this study

For the purposes of this study the Salovey and Mayer (1990) conceptualisation and definition of emotional intelligence has been adopted given the overwhelming support by researchers and institutions such as the American Psychological Association (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Jordan et al., 2010; MacCann et al., 2014). The relative shortcomings of the trait and mixed model approaches to emotional intelligence; namely the lack of differentiation from trait and personality constructs, the weak relationship with ability models of emotional intelligence, the lack of scientific evidence to support the claims of its proponents and measurement concerns (Andrei et al., 2014, Brackett et al., 2004; Jordan et al., 2010; Locke, 2005; Petrides, 2010; Salovey et al., 2008) further justified the adoption of the ability model of Salovey and Mayer for the purposes of this study.

In alignment with the Salovey and Mayer conceptualisation of emotional intelligence, the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS) was adopted for the purposes of this study. The SEIS and other recognised measures of emotional intelligence will each be discussed in the next section.

2.1.6 Measuring emotional intelligence

Only recently have the psychometric properties of measures of emotional intelligence been critically and scientifically explored (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008). The variety of approaches and models of emotional intelligence has given rise to a variety of measurement scales (Wolfe & Kim, 2013). Measures of emotional intelligence can be divided into two major types – self-report and ability measures. Ability measures seek to assess individuals’ actual ability to process and use emotional information, similar in approach to the cognitive abilities approach
to assessing ability (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2014). Self-report measures of emotional satisfaction focus on individuals perceived abilities to evaluate emotions and emotionally based situations (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2014).

2.1.6.1 Self-report measures of emotional intelligence

Self-report measures such as those of Bar-On (1997) and Schutte et al. (1998) consist of self-judgment items and cannot be viewed as accurate measures of a mental ability given that individuals may over or under assess their own ability (Crowne, 2013; Mayer et al., 2008). The low emotional intelligence ability of an individual may actually impede an individual’s accuracy in self-assessment given that the individuals’ emotional state may influence their responses (Mayer et al., 2008). Self-report measures of emotional intelligence have accordingly been shown to have weak correlations with ability based measures such as the MSCEIT (Di Fabio & Saklofske, 2014; Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Mayer et al., 2008; Mayer et al., 2004).

Further, the use of self-report measures to measure emotional intelligence frequently result in common method bias (Brunetto et al., 2012; Crowne, 2013; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Common method bias is understood as the variance in results of the measure, not because of the construct being measured, but rather as a result of the instrument itself which threatens the validity of any conclusions drawn (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Examples of sources of common method bias include the content of items (language), assessment methods (scale types and response format) and, importantly, response biases (social desirability of answers and halo effect) (Bagozzi & Yi, 1991; Foxcroft, 2011; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Given the above it is therefore imperative to investigate the reliability and validity of self-report measures of emotional intelligence such as the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (1998) and the Bar-On EQ-I (1997).

The Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS)

The SEIS is a popular self-report measure of emotional intelligence, based on the ability-based emotional intelligence conceptualisation of Salovey and Mayer, which aims to assess how effectively individuals’ identify, understand, harness and regulate emotions in
themselves and others (Bester, Jonker, & Nel, 2014; Jonker & Vosloo, 2008; Schutte & Malouff, 2011; Schutte et al., 1998). The SEIS and various other examples of emotional intelligence, such as the Bar-On EQ-I, rely on self-report questionnaires argued to be better suited at measuring traits (Crowne, 2013).

The SEIS consists of 33-items such as, “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others” and “I expect that I will do well on most things I try” on a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for each question (Schutte et al., 1998). A 41-item version of the SEIS was developed by Austin, Saklofske, Huang, and McKenney (2004) which sought to improve upon problems associated with the original version, specifically the lack of reversed scored items (Bester et al., 2014). The findings of Austin et al. (2004) found no advantage to using the 41-item over the 33-item version of the SEIS. The SEIS has been found to be a reliable measure in both international (Austin et al., 2004; Schutte & Malouff, 2011; Schutte et al., 1998) and national research (Bester et al., 2014; Jonker & Vosloo, 2008).

Studies applying the SEIS have shown to have inconsistent factor structures ranging from one factor to up to six factors (Austin et al., 2004; Bester et al., 2014; Jonker & Vosloo, 2008; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003). In developing the SEIS, Schutte et al. (1998) found a one factor model of emotional intelligence. In the most recent study applying the SEIS in the South African context, Bester et al. (2014) found a five factor model consisting of (1) emotion utilisation, (2) emotion management, (3) emotion awareness, (4) emotion perceiving and (5) emotion integration. According to the authors in this study; the different factors found in different studies may be attributed to the differing populations groups under investigation. For example, women have been found to perform better on measures of emotional intelligence than men (Bester et al., 2014; Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006; Palmer, Manocha, Gignac, & Stough, 2003; Pillay et al., 2013; Saklofske et al., 2003). Similarly older groups have been found to outperform younger groups (Bar-On, 2006; Mayer et al., 2004; Palmer et al., 2003). It is thus possible that factor structures, too, could differ between different sample groups under investigation (Bester et al., 2014).
The Bar-On EQ-i

The Bar-On EQ-i, like the SEIS, is a self-report measure of emotional intelligence used extensively in organisations around the world (Eckermans, Saklofske, Austin, & Stough, 2011; Pillay et al., 2013). The Bar-On EQ-i measures the following broad traits and competencies associated with emotional intelligence:

- intrapersonal skills;
- interpersonal skills;
- stress managements;
- adaptability; and
- general mood.

The EQ-i consists of 133 items applying a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very seldom or not true of me) to 5 (very often true of me or true of me). Responses are tallied to yield scores on 15 subscales, the above five composite scales and an overall emotional intelligence score. The reliability of the EQ-i has been confirmed as acceptable in various studies (Bar-On, 2006; Hemmati, Mills, & Kroner, 2004; Pillay et al., 2013).

In validating the factor structure of the EQ-I, Bar-On (2006) found support for both a 10 and 15 factor model of emotional-social intelligence in line with Bar-On’s (1997) model of emotional-social intelligence. In contrast to Bar-On, Palmer et al. (2003) found support for a six factor model of emotional intelligence applying the EQ-i. The inconsistent factor structures of the self-report emotional intelligence measures have provided support for development of ability-based measures emotional intelligence.

2.1.6.2 Ability measures of emotional intelligence

According to the ability based approach to emotional intelligence; emotional intelligence should be measured as an ability and should not rely in self-report measures (Salovey et al., 2008). The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, one of a very few available ability measures of emotional intelligence, has emerged as one of the most prominent (Copestake et al., 2013; Fiori & Antonakis, 2011).
The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT)

The MSCEIT is based on Salovey and Mayer’s ability based model of emotional intelligence (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Fiori & Antonakis, 2011; Mayer et al., 2004). The measure consists of 141 items across the four branches of the Salovey and Mayer mode. Each branch is assessed by two tasks (Brackett et al., 2004; Copestead et al., 2013; Salovey et al., 2008). Examples of tasks include identifying emotions by looking at pictures and faces to measure an individual’s ability to accurately perceive emotions (branch one) (Farh & Tesluk, 2012; Fiori & Antonakis, 2011).

According to Salovey et al. (2008), research on ability measures of emotional intelligence are still in their infancy and require more attention particularly given the over-reliance and commercialisation of self-report measures of emotional intelligence. According to Petrides (2010) many of the concepts associated with emotional intelligence are subjectively experienced making objective measurement difficult.

The MSCEIT has been shown to have limitations; in particular the MSCEIT has shown to have low discriminant validity overlapping considerably with general intelligence and personality (Fiori & Antonakis, 2011). Furthermore, the measure has been found to be weakly supportive of the four branch model of Salovey and Mayer on which it was developed (Roberts, Schulze, O'Brien, MacCan, Reid, & Maul, 2006).

Despite the various criticisms levelled against self-report measures of emotional intelligence; the SEIS self-report measure has been shown to be reliable. Furthermore the SEIS was developed on the ability model of Salovey and Mayer; unlike the Bar-On EQ-i. For these reasons the SEIS was adopted as the preferred measure of emotional intelligence for the purposes of this study.

2.2 JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction remains a popular construct for study within industrial organisational psychology due to its practicality (Loi et al., 2009; McFarlin & Rice, 1991; Strümpfer & de Bruin, 2009). Employee job satisfaction is important to individual and organisational success
and has been linked to increased employee productivity, creativity and commitment to an employer as well as employee turnover intention (De Witte, 2005; Harter et al., 2002; McFarlin & Rice, 1991; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Rothmann, 2002).

Job satisfaction is commonly defined as how much one likes or dislikes a given job or aspects thereof (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Rothmann, 2002; Yalabik et al., 2013). It results when employees’ internal needs are met and have positive implications for enhancing well-being and reducing employee turnover (Martins & Coetzee, 2007). Job satisfaction reflects an individual’s feelings and beliefs which develop as a result of cognitive and emotional processes (Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne, & Rayton, 2013). Job satisfaction is thus an emotional state based upon how individuals feel about their jobs and what they think about various aspects of their jobs (Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Yalabik et al., 2013).

Job satisfaction is widely recognised as a predictor of employee productivity, and performance as well as organisational financial and market performance (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Loi et al., 2009). It is thus important for organisations to enhance employee job satisfaction so as to enhance organisational outcomes, quality of outputs and performance levels (Robyn & du Preez, 2013). Employees with higher levels of job satisfaction experience greater well-being and are less likely to leave organisations (Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Sempane et al., 2002).

2.2.1 Conceptualising job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a complex construct with a number of associated antecedents (Locke, 1969; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Robyn & du Preez, 2013). It is defined as a subjective positive appraisal and emotional response of an employee in relation to their job influenced by a broad range of factors (Loi et al., 2009; Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Pienaar, Sieberhagen, & Mostert, 2007; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Sempane et al., 2002). Factors influencing employees’ job satisfaction include characteristics of the work itself, organisation practices and work environment, interpersonal and intrapersonal factors (Diestel, Wegge, & Schmidt, 2014; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008; Rothmann, 2002).
2.2.2 Approaches to job satisfaction

Traditionally, job satisfaction can be defined as either a global or multi-dimensional construct encompassing one’s level of contentment with aspects relating to work (Castro & Martins, 2010; Rothmann, 2002). As a global construct, job satisfaction refers to individuals’ overall satisfaction with their jobs (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Rothmann, 2002; Yalabik et al., 2013). As a multidimensional construct, job satisfaction refers to an individual’s satisfaction with pay, company policies and supervisory practices (Castro & Martins, 2010; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008; Rothmann, 2002). Job satisfaction is further understood in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. Intrinsic satisfaction refers to employees being satisfied with aspects of the job itself such as the tasks that constitute a job, whereas extrinsic satisfaction refers to employees being satisfied with their pay, work environment, co-workers and supervisors (Castro & Martins, 2010; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Rothmann, 2002).

According to Mafini and Pooe (2013) job satisfaction is influenced by a variety of factors such as recognition, communication, co-worker relations, working conditions, job characteristics, the nature of the organisation, systems, policies and procedures, compensation, security and supervision. Meeting employees’ needs remains in relation to the above factors is viewed as the primary strategy for enhancing job satisfaction of employees (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008).

2.2.2.1 Motivational theories of job satisfaction

Theoretical models of job satisfaction have been influenced widely by motivational theories and models as proposed by Herzberg (1959) (two factor theory), McClelland (1961) (achievement motivation), Vroom (1964) (expectancy theory and Hackman and Lawler (1976) (job characteristics model)) (Locke, 1969; Mayfield, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008).

Job satisfaction has traditionally been viewed as the result of the interaction between individuals and their environment and includes examples as reactions to supervisors’ behaviours, pay discrepancies, promotions and achievements/recognition (Locke, 1969; Rogelberg, Allen, Shanock, Scott, & Shuffler, 2010; Liu et al., 2011; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014). Where an individual’s needs are frustrated or the expectancy and valence of the
attainment of a need is high in relation to the relative achievement of the need – job dissatisfaction is likely to occur (Locke, 1969).

Each job and work context has unique characteristics – depending on the degree of autonomy, skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback – influences the level of motivation and consequent satisfaction of an employee (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2008; Mayfield, 2013). According to Mafini and Pooe (2013) job satisfaction is most influenced by environmental factors such as working conditions, autonomy, teamwork and opportunities for interesting and creative work.

2.2.2.2 Pleasure-displeasure approach

The pleasure-displeasure approach to job satisfaction describes the process by which and individual’s job satisfaction is influenced by either pleasure or displeasure with outcomes or facets of work (both intrinsic and extrinsic) against expected outcomes (Diestel et al., 2014; McFarlin & Rice, 1991; Rothmann, 2002). The greater the difference between the degree of a particular facet an individual expects or wants and what he she receives the greater the experienced satisfaction or dissatisfaction by the individual (Sempane et al., 2002). As such individuals subjectively appraise their experiences and the degree to which certain facet and expectations are met. The relative importance of the facet to the individual plays a moderating role when the facet is of relative importance the greater the experienced satisfaction/dissatisfaction (McFarlin & Rice, 1991; Rice, Gentile, & McFarlin, 1991; Sempane et al., 2002).

2.3 WORK ENGAGEMENT

The engagement of employees at work is a popular topic within organisations and amongst management consultants (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Halbesleben, 2011; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Simpson, 2009; Truss et al., 2013). According to Bakker et al. (2011), organisations are increasingly concerned with inspiring and enabling employees to apply their full capabilities at work. As such organisations are investing into activities and strategies so as to develop a more fully engaged workforce (Bakker et al., 2011; Truss et al., 2013). Various conceptualisations and competing definitions of engagement have emerged since the original
conceptualisation of personal engagement in 1990 (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Saks, 2006; Shuck, 2011; Sonnentag, 2011; Viljevac, Cooper-Thomas, & Saks, 2012; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). The various terms and labels include personal engagement (Kahn, 1990; May Gilson & Harter, 2004), work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), work engagement/burnout (Demerouti, Mostert, & Bakker, 2004), employee engagement (Harter et al., 2002).

Despite the varying conceptualisations, researchers agree that engaged employees display high levels of energy and identify strongly with their work-roles and, by enhancing work engagement within organisations, has the potential to enhance individual and organisational outcomes (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Bakker et al., 2008; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Truss et al., 2013; Shuck, 2011; Sonnentag, 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012). On the individual level, engaged employees display high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work and are immersed in the performance of their work and roles (Bakker et al., 2008). Such individuals see their work as fulfilling, personally rewarding and challenging as opposed to stressful and unrewarding (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006).

Higher levels of engagement leads to reduced turnover intention, enhanced job performance, productivity and commitment of employees (Bakker et al., 2011; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Halbesleben, 2011; Harter et al., 2002; Truss et al., 2013; Wollard & Shuck, 2011) as well as enhanced wellness and lower levels of burnout and stress related outcomes for individuals (Bakker et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2008). Engaged employees experience greater attachment to their work and are less likely to leave their organisations (Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Wollard & Shuck, 2011).

According to Bakker et al. (2008) and Bakker and Demerouti (2008) engaged employees perform better than their counterparts because:

- they experience more positive emotions such as happiness and joy towards their work;
- they experience greater psychological and physical health and well-being;
- they are more open to work opportunities and are more optimistic and confident;
- they foster the personal and job resources required to sustain their own engagement; and
- they transfer their engagement to others around them.
Similarly, from an organisational level, developing the work engagement of employees has the potential to enhance organisational performance (Shuck, 2011). When employees are engaged they save organisations money, identify and rectify problems, create new products and innovations and work collaboratively (Kahn, 1990). According to Saks (2006) popular discourse describes engagement as declining among employees thereby leading to significant losses in productivity and revenues for organisations.

Despite the popularity and extensive research on the topic, there is a lack of agreement on the definition of engagement, how it should be conceptualised and measured (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Bakker et al., 2011; Macey & Schneider, 2008; Truss et al., 2013). A review of the history of the engagement of employees at work is necessary to understand the various approaches in the research literature.

2.3.1 History of Work Engagement

The original term personal engagement has taken on a variety of forms over the course of its history depending on the approach of various researchers. Competing definitions of “engagement” have emerged since the original conceptualisation of personal engagement in 1990 (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Bakker et al., 2008; Saks, 2006; Shuck, 2011; Sonnentag, 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012; Wollard & Shuck, 2011) The various terms and labels include personal engagement (Kahn, 1990; May Gilson & Harter, 2004), work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), work engagement/burnout (Demerouti et al., 2004), and employee engagement (Harter et al., 2002).

While terms, approaches and definitions of engagement may differ, the development of the construct has been driven by the view that enhancing engagement of employees enhances the competitive advantage of organisations, as well as working conditions and well-being of employees (Truss et al., 2013; Rothmann, 2002). In order to understand the history of the construct the various approaches need to be differentiated.
2.3.2 Approaches to Engagement

The work of Kahn (1990) and Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) are largely credited with the establishment of dominant engagement theories. Four major approaches to engagement have since emerged (Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Simpson, 2009), which seek to account for and define engagement in the literature: (a) The need-satisfying approach (personal engagement) (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004), (b) the burnout-antithesis approach (work engagement/burnout) (Maslach & Leiter, 2008), (c) the Schaufeli approach (work engagement) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), and (d) The satisfaction-engagement approach (Harter et al., 2002) (employee engagement).

2.3.2.1 Personal engagement: The need satisfying approach

In his seminal writing on the psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Kahn (1990) sought to explain the phenomenon by which individuals apply varying degrees of themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally at work (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; May et al., 2004; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Truss et al., 2013). Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as the employment or expression of one’s self (physically, cognitively or emotionally) in the execution of tasks at work.

According to May et al. (2004) individuals seek self-expression and fulfilment at work. To thrive employees must be able to immerse themselves in their work, physically, cognitively and emotionally. Given the appropriate conditions, personal engagement occurs when an individual uses and expresses their preferred full selves in the performance of their work roles (Kahn, 1990; Kahn, 1992; May et al., 2004; Viljevac et al., 2012).

Central to Kahn’s conceptualisation is that personal engagement is an internal state of being influenced by external conditions, forces or contexts (Shuck, 2011). Kahn (1990) concluded in his findings that context and individual’s perceptions and experiences of the context would lead to either engagement or disengagement at work (May et al., 2004; Shuck, 2011). In this approach to work engagement, the greater the extent to which individuals’ identify with their roles the more likely the work role provides the opportunity for self-expression (May et al., 2004; van Zyl et al., 2010).
In the disengaged state Kahn (1990) argued that employees hide, withdraw and suppress their true selves in the performance of their roles, their true identity, thoughts and feelings in defence of themselves (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004). Such performances can be described as “robotic”, lethargic or emotionally disconnected (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004).

Kahn (1992) revised his model of personal engagement by including the construct of psychological presence as a precursor and psychological state preceding the manifest or behavioural outcome of engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008). That is, the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability influence the extent to which individuals experience psychological presence enabling them to employ more of themselves (personally engage) into role performances (Kahn, 1992). Kahn (1992) further recognised the role individual differences (self-perception, security, courage and adult development) play in the subconscious appraisal of the psychological conditions that lead to psychological presence and work engagement.

By understanding the presence and interactions of the various influencers of the psychological conditions of engagement in various work contexts, researchers and organisations can seek to understand and enhance levels of employee work engagement (May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007). According to Kahn (1992), the benefits and outcomes of work engagement include quantity and quality of performance, positive individual experiences and individual growth and development.

May et al. (2004) found evidence to support Kahn’s conceptualisation of work engagement. In their study job enrichment, work-role fit, co-worker relations, supervisor relations, co-worker norms, self-consciousness, resources and outside activities influenced the conditions of psychological meaningfulness, safety and availability and ultimately engagement (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007).

2.3.2.2 Work engagement/burnout: The burnout-antithesis approach

The burnout-antithesis approach to engagement is the most discussed and empirically researched form of engagement in the literature (Yalabik et al., 2013). The burnout-antithesis approach emerged as a result of research into the causes of employee burnout (Maslach et al., 2001; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Simpson, 2009). Within this approach, a lack of engagement
in one’s work is viewed as a negative consequence of burnout (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Shuck, 2011; Simpson, 2009). The burnout-antithesis approach views work engagement as a positive antithesis to burnout; by enhancing work engagement one can prevent burnout (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006; Shuck, 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012; Truss et al., 2013).

Conceptually, work engagement and burnout have come to be seen as separate psychological constructs and are presented on a bi-polar continuum (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011; Takawira et al., 2014). Burnout is characterised by the three factors of exhaustion, cynicism and inefficacy as a result of prolonged exposure and response to work stressors (Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Simpson, 2009; Truss et al., 2013). Diametrically opposed, work engagement is characterised by energy, involvement and efficacy (Bakker et al., 2008).

From this perspective, exhaustion refers to the feeling of being overextended or overwhelmed in one’s work with consequent feelings of low emotional and physical energy. Cynicism (or depersonalisation) refers to an individuals’ detachment from aspects of their job. Ineffectiveness refers to feelings of incompetence and a lack of achievement or productivity in one’s work (Maslach & Leiter, 2008).

A criticism of the burnout-antithesis approaches to engagement is the lack of the cognitive aspects of engagement as initially described by Kahn, focusing instead on the burnout continuum (Shuck, 2011). Work engagement construct overlaps with well-known constructs such as job involvement, job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Yalabik et al., 2013).

2.3.2.3 Work engagement: The Schaufeli approach

While rooted in the burnout-engagement antithesis approach, the work engagement approach of Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) emerged as a construct in its own right with its own measure; the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Bakker et al., 2008; Yalabik et al., 2013). Within this approach work engagement is defined as a positive and fulfilling state at work, characterised by high degrees of vigour, dedication and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Schaufeli et al., 2006; Takawira et al., 2014; Truss et al., 2013) which negatively
correlated with the burnout factors of exhaustion, cynicism and inefficacy (Bakker et al., 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Vigour is defined as a positive mental state characterised by high energy, mental resilience and persistence despite difficulties (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Takawira et al., 2014). Vigour is characterised as the willingness of employees to invest effort into their work (Bakker et al., 2011; Bothma & Rothmann, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

Dedication is demonstrated by deriving a sense of significance, enthusiasm, challenge, pride and inspiration in the performance of one’s work (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Bakker et al., 2011; Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

Absorption is defined as being fully focused and engrossed in one’s work (Bakker et al., 2008; Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Seppälä et al., 2009; Takawira et al., 2014). Absorption is characterised by an immersion in one’s work, characterised by focused attention, clear thoughts, distortion of time and effortless concentration in the performance of work (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Bakker et al., 2011; Takawira et al., 2014; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010).

According to Schaufeli and Salanova (2011) energy invested into one’s work as a result of work engagement may become exhausted if there is a lack of positive exchange with the organisation (such as recognition, acknowledgement, appreciation and benefits etc.). Energy may shift towards cynicism and eventually burn-out, thus explaining the relationship between work engagement and burnout (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2011).

2.3.2.4 Employee Engagement: The satisfaction-engagement approach

Rooted in the study of individual satisfaction at work and performance, Harter et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of employee engagement research conducted by the Gallup Organisation (Truss et al., 2013). The study conducted by Harter et al. (2002) encompassed the results of 199 research studies across 152 organisations and 955,905 employees across 169 different countries. The results of the study found numerous positive correlations between employee engagement and various business outcomes such as customer satisfaction, productivity, profitability, turnover, safety incidents, absenteeism and quality (Harter,
Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2009; Shuck, 2011). Harter et al. (2002) define engagement as an individual’s involvement, enthusiasm and satisfaction with his/her work.

The resulting engagement-profit linkage made by Harter et al. (2002) led to a rapid increase in interest in engagement within organisations (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA), also referred to as the “Q12”, emerged as a popular engagement measure as a result of the work of researchers aligned to the Gallup Organisation (The Gallup Organization, 2013; Harter et al., 2009).

2.3.3 Criticisms of the concept of work engagement

The popularity of work engagement within consulting practice, the lack of academic rigour on the topic, as well as the lack of an integrated definition of work engagement has led to a number of misconceptions about the construct (Truss et al., 2013). In practice the term “engagement” has emerged as a “catch-all” phrase loosely linked to a wide variety of constructs such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, leadership and involvement, drawing into question the construct validity of engagement (Truss et al., 2013).

The varied definitions and approaches to work engagement have led to confusion about the various types of engagement (cognitive, emotional, behavioural, trait, and state engagement) and inconsistency in understanding how each type of engagement manifests (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). The term “engagement” is loosely applied to incorporate all conceptualisations of work engagement and to generalise about the benefits (Simpson, 2009).

Organisations enamoured with the stated benefits of work engagement, and HR practitioners under pressure to enhance work engagement, are surveying their employees and developing strategies and interventions to enhance work engagement without a solid theoretical foundation and a lack of empirical evidence (Shuck & Wollard, 2010). George (2011) queries the prevailing view of work engagement as positive for both organisations and employees. While organisations benefit from higher levels of work performance and associated outcomes, employees may not necessarily benefit from fair reward (such as pay) for working harder and may make personal sacrifices in terms of diminished work-life balance (George, 2011; Halbesleben, 2011; Halbesleben, Harvey & Bolino, 2009; Truss et al., 2013).
According to Truss et al. (2013) there is a lack of research on how work engagement applies to individuals across different cultures. This is especially relevant given the increased globalisation of organisations in the South African context.

2.3.4 Conceptualisation of work engagement adopted for this study

For the purposes of this study the Kahn (1990) conceptualisation and definition of work engagement has been adopted given the emphasis on the individual’s personal engagement or disengagement (physically, cognitively or emotionally) in the execution of tasks at work. In alignment with the Kahn (1990) conceptualisation of work engagement, the Work Engagement Scale (WES) developed by May et al. (2004) was adopted for the purposes of this study. The WES and other recognised measures of work engagement will each be discussed in the next section.

2.3.5 Measuring work engagement

Given the various approaches to work engagement in academic literature, a large number of engagement instruments have emerged of which many are commercial and used in consulting practices (Viljevac et al., 2012; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). Two popular self-report measures have emerged within the scholarly research domain in alignment with the dominant approaches to engagement of Kahn (1990) and Maslach et al. (2001), namely the May et al. (2004) scale (“MES”) and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (“UWES”) (Viljevac et al., 2012). A third measure based on the research findings of Harter et al. (2002) and the Gallup organisation, the Gallup Workplace Audit (“GWA”), is also frequently cited in the literature. Each measure is discussed in the section that follows.

2.3.5.1 The May Engagement Scale (MES)

The MES, developed by May et al. (2004), is theoretically grounded in Kahn’s (1990) research and conceptualisation of work engagement. The scale consists of 17 items (e.g. “Performing my job is so absorbing that I forget about everything else” and “I really put my heart in my job”) and seeks to measure physical, cognitive and emotional engagement (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Rothmann & Hamukang’andu, 2013; van Zyl et al., 2010; Viljevac et al., 2012).
In their study of 139 New Zealand call centre employees, Viljevac et al. (2012) found the MES to have been moderately outperformed by the UWES although both the MES and the UWES were found to have problematic psychometric properties. Viljevac et al. (2012) found both the UWES and the MES to be inadequate measures of engagement, measuring overlapping but not identical constructs of engagement. The MES, however, has been applied in the South African context and found to be a reliable and valid measure of the May/Kahn conceptualisation of engagement (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010, van Zyl et al., 2010).

2.3.5.2 The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)

The UWES is a widely used self-report measure based on the work of Maslach et al. (2001) and Schaufeli et al. (2006). Multiple versions of the UWES exist varying in the number of items used. The original 17-item UWES measures the work engagement dimensions of vigour, absorption and dedication (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Seppälä et al., 2009; Viljevac et al., 2012). Items include statements such as “I am bursting with energy every day in my work”. The measure has been found to have suitable psychometric properties (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Rothmann, Jorgensen & Hill, 2011; Schaufeli et al., 2006) and is a popular instrument used widely in work engagement research (Bakker et al., 2011; Simpson, 2009).

In the South African context, psychological measuring instruments must meet specific requirements if they are to be employed across different race and cultural groups. While South African research has found the UWES to be a reliable instrument (Mendes & Stander, 2011; Rothmann et al., 2011, Rothmann & Malan, 2011; Stander & Rothmann, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010) it is not without criticism. Goliath-Yarde and Roodt (2011) found that different race groups performed significantly differently on the UWES within a South African organisation, concluding that the UWES should only be used on white South Africans. Storm and Rothmann (2003) recommend the content and items of the UWES be adapted for use in the South African context, given the emergence of problematic items. Similarly, de Bruin, Hill, Henn and Muller (2013) found applying a global score (applying a one factor model) to the UWES to be most appropriate given the strong correlations between the subscales.
Flowing from these criticisms, various short versions of the UWES have emerged. In particular the nine item version (UWES-9) has been found to be a particularly pragmatic and stable measure of work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Seppälä et al., 2009) validated in several countries (Bakker et al., 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012).

2.3.5.3 The Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA)

The Gallup Workplace Audit (GWA), also referred to as the “Q12”, offers 12 items focused primarily on supervisory and managerial practices that influence the engagement levels of employees and their overall satisfaction with their organisations (Harter et al., 2002; Harter et al., 2009). Example of items include “I know what is expected from me at work” and “I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right”. The GWA focuses on four antecedent variables: (1) clarity of expectations; (2) feelings of contribution to the organisation; (3) feelings of sense of belonging; and (4) feelings of perceived opportunities to develop and grow (Simpson, 2009).

The GWA is based on constructs related to work satisfaction, work motivation, supervisory practices and work group effectiveness (Harter et al., 2002). A central tenet of the Q12 is that the items measure actionable employment practices that explain why employees become satisfied and why they become engaged, the results of which may be difficult to act upon (The Gallup Organization, 2013; Harter et al., 2009).

2.4 TURNOVER INTENTION

Employee turnover refers to the permanent loss of employee from an organisation (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011). Employee turnover and the retention of employees is a major concern for organisations and is a negative measure of organisational effectiveness (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Brunetto et al., 2012; Roulin et al., 2014; Vandenbergh & Nelson, 1999; Yalabik et al., 2013). The costs associated with employee turnover are potentially high for organisations. Indirect costs include potential disruption, loss of performance, productivity and valuable intellectual property when employees leave. Direct costs include time and cost to recruit replacement employees, the availability of and cost of viable replacements, and the high costs
associated with induction, training and development of employees (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Ribeiro & Semedo, 2014; Takawira et al., 2014; Yalabik et al., 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011). Organisations have struggled to find effective strategies to lower employee turnover (Ng & Butts, 2009).

Understanding why employees intend to leave and developing strategies to better retain valuable employees can reduce the above costs and enhance an organisation's competitive advantage. This is particularly important in the context of rising skills scarcities and increased global competition (Roos & van Eeden, 2008; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010). The commonly held view is that unhappy/dissatisfied employees seek to leave organisations because the organisation or job fails to meet their personal expectations (Pienaar et al., 2007; Yalabik et al., 2013). Therefore, creating a healthy organisation is cited as a strategy to reduce employee turnover intention (Mendes & Stander, 2011). Turnover intention is defined as a conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organisation (Bothma & Roodt, 2012).

Turnover intention is understood to be a valid and reliable predictor of actual turnover associated with a number of costs and implications for organisations (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Rothmann et al., 2013). Leaving an organisation may not always be a viable option for employees, particularly in contexts of high unemployment or underemployment. Turnover intention is therefore a useful construct for understanding organisational implication associated with employees who wish to leave but are unable to do so (Bothma & Roodt, 2013).

As such, turnover intention is a useful construct for research within organisations in order to understand conditions that lead to thoughts of leaving (Ng & Butts, 2009; Rothmann et al., 2013). Turnover intention is characterised by thoughts of leaving the organisation (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010; Wöcke & Heyman, 2012; Yalabik et al., 2013). Of interest to organisations, employees with high turnover intention are not only more likely to leave the organisation but are likely to render poor service or work performance and negatively influence organisational culture and employee morale (Takawira et al., 2014).

### 2.4.1 Conceptualising turnover intention
Turnover intention (also referred to as intention to leave) is defined as the conscious and deliberate wilfulness of an employee to leave or plan to leave an organisation in the near future (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; Vandenbergh & Nelson, 1999). According to Mendes and Stander (2011), intention to leave consists of both thoughts and statements and can be viewed as a coping strategy used by employees to escape a perceived undesirable employment condition (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011).

Various antecedents have been proposed to explain turnover intention. Generally dissatisfaction with aspects of an organisation such as compensation, organisational policies and procedures, commitment to and perceived fit with the organisations goals, values and culture have been found to be a drivers of turnover intention (Vandenbergh & Nelson, 1999; Yalabik et al., 2013). Where employees feel cared for and supported by their organisations; intention to leave is reduced (Ng & Butts, 2009). According to Ribeiro and Semedo (2014), employees respond to positive organisation actions and human resource management (HRM) practices by continuing their participation in the organisation.

According to Ng and Butts (2009), organisational efforts such as information sharing, enhancing perceived job significance, providing opportunities for learning and development and the availability of rewards for performance enhance employees’ intention to stay. Generally the authors also observe the moderating role of locus of control of employees as they react to organisational retention practices. The implication of NG and Butts (2009) findings is the importance of both work environment features and individual differences in the retention of employees.

### 2.4.2 Factors leading to turnover intention

#### 2.4.2.1 Job demands-resources (JD-R) model

Proponents of the JD-R model link job demands in the context of a lack of resources to burnout and disengagement, and consequent turnover intention (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Botha & Mostert, 2014). While the availability of contextual and tangible resources has dominated the JD-R approach, intrapersonal resources such as psychological work engagement, empowerment, self-efficacy, optimism and resiliency have been presented as
potential resources to reduce employees’ intention to leave (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira et al., 2014).

The JD-R model posits that occupations have exclusive characteristics which can be divided into either job demands or job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006; Botha & Mostert, 2014). Job demands require sustained mental or physical efforts which bring to bear associated costs such as exhaustion or burnout. Job resources can be divided into three levels: organisational, social or task, and operate on reducing or counteracting job demands (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010) thereby assisting individuals to attain work related goals (Botha & Mostert, 2014). Applying the JD-R model, turnover intention of employees has been associated with work engagement of employees – an outcome of the availability of sufficient job resources. Job strain and turnover intention occurs when job demands exceed job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006).

2.4.2.2 Job satisfaction-dissatisfaction approach

The traditional model of employee turnover holds that job dissatisfaction precipitates thoughts about leaving and intention of searching for new work (Yalabik et al., 2013; Pienaar et al., 2007). The search for and comparison of available work options consequently gives rise to employees resigning and leaving their organisations (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Wöcke & Heyman, 2012). As such intention to leave is viewed as directly related to actual employee turnover and is a powerful leading indicator in predicting employee turnover behaviour (van Schalkwyk et al., 2010; Yalabik et al., 2013).

Job satisfaction measures correlate well with intention to leave measures (Yalabik et al., 2013). According to Rothmann et al. (2013) social exchanges in the workplace, specifically between managers/supervisors and employees, regulate the satisfaction of employees psychological needs. The more beneficial and reciprocal the social exchanges the more effort an employee is likely to the organisation and the less likely to consider leaving. Applying social exchange theory, negative social exchanges, such as perceived organisational injustice or contract violation, leads to increased intention to leave (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010).

Intention to leave is the final step in a series of cognitions prior to actual turnover and is highly associated with job satisfaction, organisational commitment and job search behaviours.
(Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). While turnover intention may lead to actual turnover – perceived or actual alternate employment opportunities ultimately give rise to employee turnover (Bothma & Roodt, 2012).

2.4.2.3 Push and pull factors

According to Wöcke and Heyman (2012), push and pull factors exist that influence employee turnover intention. Push factors include psychological factors, work-life situations, individual needs, perceptions and attitudes which “push employees” to consider alternative employment choices (Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). Pull factors are factors external to employees and include macro environmental factors including labour market conditions. In the South African context pull factors include skills scarcity, high demand for critical skills, knowledge and abilities as well as legal and political factors associated with employment equity and social transformation imperatives. Pull factors influence employees perceptions of employment and growth opportunities outside their current organisations (Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). According to Wöcke and Heyman (2012) this in most evident where skilled employees and those from designated groups (Africans, Indians, coloureds, females and disabled employees) are in high demand.

According to Vandenberg and Nelson (1999) not all employees are able to act on their intention to leave an organisation based on perceptions of available alternative employment opportunities. As such the relationship between intention and actual turnover is stronger in employees who have alternative employment opportunities, are highly mobile or whose skills are in high demand within the labour market.

2.4.3 Measuring turnover intention

According to Bothma and Roodt (2013), measures of turnover intention are lacking despite the popularity of the construct and the extensive research conducted. Many sources apply simple single item scales to measure turnover intention with unknown psychometric properties. Bothma and Roodt (2013) consequently developed the TI-6 which was found to be a reliable and valid measure of turnover intention as well as showing criterion related predictive validity for actual employee turnover.
2.5 RESEARCH FINDINGS RELEVANT TO THE CONSTRUCTS UNDER INVESTIGATION

2.5.1 Emotional Intelligence

Much of the existing literature on emotional intelligence has been “anecdotal” and lacking in empirical research (Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005; Klem & Schlechter, 2008). According to Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) much research on emotional intelligence has been based on “shabby science”. The measurement of emotional intelligence in research has taken one of three approaches (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2005; O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011):

1. applying the Salovey and Mayer (1990) ability-based model with an ability-based instrument such as the MSCEIT;
2. applying the Salovey and Mayer (1990) ability-based model with a peer or self-report instrument such as the Schutte emotional intelligence Scale (SEIS);
3. applying a mixed-model approach (such as Bar-On) with a peer or self-report instrument such as the Bar-On EQ-i.

According to Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) the first and second approaches should take precedence in emotional intelligence research given the proximity to the original and widely recognised original definition of emotional intelligence of Salovey and Mayer (1990).

Emotional intelligence may be a useful predictor of job performance (Golnaz, 2012; Mayer et al., 2004; O'Boyle et al., 2011; Palmer & Gignac, 2012). According to Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) any work that can be argued to require higher emotional intelligence for success should show positive relationships between emotional intelligence and job performance. Such work includes the social services (police), customer services (such as sales) and positions of leadership. In a study of 212 professionals across various industries, emotional ability-based emotional intelligence was found to enhance team work effectiveness under high work demand contexts (Farh & Tesluk, 2012). The researchers argued that individuals with high emotional intelligence were better able respond to the emotional cues within the workplace thereby leading to higher levels of performance.
In their meta-analysis of emotional intelligence and work performance research, O’Boyle et al. (2011) found sufficient support for emotional intelligence as a valid predictor of job performance. It is important to note that the meta-analysis spanned the three approachesstreams to emotional intelligence research.

Similarly, Clarke’s (2010) study of 80 MBA students provided some insight into the mechanisms through which emotional intelligence may enhance performance. Emotional awareness and emotion management were found to enhance critical reflection processes of problem analysis, theorising cause and effect relationships and action planning. Clarke (2010) also found that emotional intelligence enhanced social engagement, communication and conflict management. Based on the above it is evident that emotional intelligence assists individuals respond to work demands and work situations so as to achieve performance objectives.

In a study of 135 South African call-centre employees Nel and De Villiers (2004) found a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. The authors suggest that emotional intelligence leads to greater self-management (self-discipline, integrity and motivation) and self-confidence of employees thereby leading to enhanced perceived trustworthiness by customers and overall job performance.

Emotional intelligence has been claimed to be associated with higher self-regard, enhanced relationships, effective emotion management, problem-solving and optimism leading to more effective, productive and humane social systems (Bar-On, 2010). In his study of 3,571 North Americans; Bar-On (2005) found that emotional intelligence was significantly correlated with subjective well-being.

Emotional intelligence has also been found to be associated with improved levels of job satisfaction, stress tolerance and overall mental health (Ackerjordet & Severinsson, 2007; Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005; Schutte & Malouff, 2011). In the context of nursing, Ackerjordet and Severinsson (2007) argue that emotional intelligence assists in connecting emotions, thoughts and actions effectively, thereby assisting in decision making, empathising and communicating effectively with others and maintaining a positive state of mind. In their study of 125 university students Schutte and Malouff (2011) found emotional intelligence to be
positively associated with positive affect and satisfaction with life. As such emotional intelligence can be seen to enhance the performance and well-being of employees.

In a study of police officers in Australia, Brunetto et al. (2012) demonstrated that emotional intelligence was positively correlated with positive outcomes of job satisfaction and well-being. Their findings were positioned as important in relation to the “social occupations” wherein employees are expected to deal with people in service type conditions. In such occupations, such as policing, employees are required to regulate their emotions under demanding and stressful conditions.

South African research findings have followed similar trends to international research. In the South African context emotional intelligence has been linked to enhanced decision-making and negotiation outcomes, job performance, psychological well-being of employees as well as physical health (wellness outcomes) (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Mayer et al., 2008; Nel, Jonker, & Rabie, 2014; Ramesar et al., 2009). Applying the Bar-On model and measure of emotional intelligence, Ramesar et al. (2009) found stress management to be closely related to emotional intelligence. Dahl and Cilliers (2012) found emotional intelligence to reduce the occurrence of negative career thoughts thereby enhancing successful career navigation and decision-making.

Emotional intelligence has been associated with leadership potential and leadership behaviours (Daus & Ashkanasy, 2005; Martins & Coetzee, 2007; Pillay et al., 2013; Schlechter & Strauss, 2008). In their study Klem and Schlechter (2008) found moderate support for the idea that the emotional intelligence of leaders has the ability to influence the psychological climate of an organisation. Emotional intelligence has been found to be positively correlated with behaviours associated with transformational leadership style of leaders (Pillay et al., 2013; Schlechter & Strauss, 2008). The implication of the above research findings is that the emotional intelligence enhances the performance of leaders and their reports.

Emotional intelligence has been shown to improve with training and awareness (Jonker, 2009; Mayer et al., 2008) therefore justifying the inclusion of multiple emotional intelligence factors into organisational competency frameworks (Jonker, 2009; Nel & De Villiers, 2004). In a study seeking to determine the effectiveness of an emotional intelligence development
programme Jonker (2009) found that participants’ scores on a self-report measure of emotional intelligence (the Bar-On EQ-i) improved after completion of the development programme.

The implication of the above research findings is that emotional intelligence supports employees’ ability to perform through enhancing thinking processes and behaviours associated with optimal job performance. Researchers have emphasised the importance of emotional intelligence in high demand work environments and contexts involving high social interaction. Of significance to this study, very little national research could be found exploring the direct relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention in South Africa.

2.5.2 Job satisfaction

The links between job satisfaction with work engagement and turnover intention are well established in the research literature (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Brunetto et al., 2012; Han & Jekel, 2011; Harter et al., 2002; Liu et al., 2011; Roulin et al., 2014; Saks, 2006; Yalabik et al., 2013). Yalabik et al. (2013) demonstrated that job satisfaction was positively correlated with work engagement and negatively correlated with turnover intention. Work engagement was also found to act as a mediating variable between job satisfaction and turnover intention. Job satisfaction, thus, was found to influence engagement (Jenkins & Delbridge, 2013). Likewise, in their study of 1, 547 nurses in Switzerland, Roulin et al. (2014) found job satisfaction to be a significant predictor of turnover intention.

In their study of 227 students Alarcon and Edwards (2011) found job satisfaction to be an outcome of engagement. In their study of Australian police officers, Brunetto et al. (2012) were able to demonstrate that job satisfaction was positively correlated with emotional intelligence concluding that employees who are better able to appraise and regulate their emotions led to greater overall job satisfaction. In the same study, job satisfaction was found to be positively correlated with work engagement. In contrast to previous studies, Brunetto et al. (2012) found a non-significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention.

In support of international research, Delobelle et al. (2011), Pienaar et al. (2007) and Robyn and du Preez (2013) all found job satisfaction to be negatively correlated with turnover intention of employees. In their study of 189 academics in South Africa Higher Education Institutions, Robyn and du Preez (2013) also found job satisfaction to be significantly correlated with work engagement of employees.

The above research findings provide evidence of the relationship of job satisfaction with the constructs of emotional intelligence and work engagement, and outcomes such as turnover intention. Job satisfaction is predominantly viewed as an outcome of engagement and a generally reliable predictor of turnover intention. Employees with high levels of job satisfaction are, thus, less likely to experience turnover intention. Of significance to this study very little national research could be found exploring the relationships between job satisfaction and emotional intelligence in South Africa.

2.5.3 Work Engagement

Engagement research is flourishing within the sphere of industrial and organisational psychology (Bakker et al., 2011; Sonnentag, 2011; Truss et al., 2013). Engagement has positive consequences for organisations and employees (Bakker et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2008; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). Higher levels of engagement reduces turnover intention, enhances job performance, productivity and commitment of employees as well as higher profits and revenues for organisations (Bakker et al., 2011; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Halbesleben, 2011; Harter et al., 2002; Truss et al., 2013; Wollard & Shuck, 2011) as well as enhanced wellness and lower levels of burnout and stress related outcomes for individuals (Bakker et al., 2011; Bakker et al., 2008). Engaged employees experience greater attachment
to their work and organisations and are less likely leave their organisations (Robyn & du Preez, 2013).

Studies of engagement have explored the relationships between coping behaviours and work engagement (Rothmann et al., 2011), burnout and work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2010), work engagement and job performance (Bakker, Demerouti & ten Brummelhuis, 2011), job resources and work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008) and the measurement of work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; Seppälä et al., 2009).

Benefits of work engagement include increased productivity, higher profits, safer and healthier working conditions, lower employee turnover, decreased absenteeism, increased discretionary effort, increased customer satisfaction and overall business performance (Harter et al., 2002; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Viljevac et al., 2012).

In their study of clerical workers within a UK bank Yalabik et al. (2013) demonstrated that job satisfaction was positively correlated with work engagement and negatively correlated with turnover intention. Work engagement was also found to act as a mediating variable between job satisfaction and turnover intention. Similarly, in their study of 227 American students, Alarcon and Edwards (2011) found job satisfaction to be an outcome of work engagement. Work engagement was also found to predict the turnover intention of employees. These findings were supported by the research of Shuck (2011) of 102 American working students where work engagement was found to have positive correlations with job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intention.

In the South African context Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) and van Zyl et al. (2010) found empirical support for the role of psychological meaningfulness as a predictor of work engagement in support of the findings of May et al. (2004). Furthermore, Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) found psychological availability to predict work engagement. Van Zyl et al. (2010) found positive correlations between work role fit, calling orientations to work, psychological meaningfulness and work engagement. The above research implies the validity of the Kahn (1990) conceptualisation of engagement as well as offering antecedents to work engagement in the South African context.
In their study of employees in an electricity provider, professional nurses and police officers in South Africa, Rothmann et al. (2011) found that coping strategies such as problem-focused coping, low avoidance, seeking social support, and religion and low ventilation of emotions significantly predicted work engagement. In their study of 179 employees in a South African chemical organisation, Mendes and Stander (2011) found work engagement to be positively correlated with leader empowering behaviour, role clarity and psychological empowerment and negatively correlated with turnover intention of employees.

In support of international research findings, Robyn and du Preez (2013) found work engagement to be significantly correlated with job satisfaction and turnover intention. In a study of 169 employees in a South African petrochemical company work engagement was found to be positively correlated with leadership empowerment behaviour and significantly negatively correlated with turnover intention (van Schalkwyk et al., 2010). Bothma and Roodt (2012) and Takawira et al. (2014) found similar significant relationships between work engagement and turnover intention.

The above research findings confirm that a plethora of antecedents of work engagement exist in both international and national research. The research has, however, also concluded the relationship between work engagement and turnover intention of employees. That is, high work engagement of employees leads to reduced turnover intention.

Very little research exists on the relationship between engagement, job satisfaction and turnover intention (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010) particularly in the South African context. Of significance to this study no research finding could be found exploring the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention in South Africa.

2.5.4 Turnover intention

The retention of valuable employees is a significant concern for organisations (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Roulin et al., 2014). As such much international and national research has emerged on the topic of predicting turnover intention of employees.
Vandenberg and Nelson (1999), Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Brunetto et al. (2012), Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013) found correlations between job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees. The implications of these findings point to the benefits of enhancing employee well-being by enhancing job satisfaction and work engagement of employees so as to enhance organisational outcomes and reduce turnover intention.

In their study of 250 employees within the gold mining industry, Pienaar et al. (2007) found turnover intention of employees to be positively correlated with qualitative and quantitative role overload. As such social support of supervisors was found to be negatively correlated with turnover intention. This finding provides support for the role of positive social exchanges in reducing the turnover intention of employees particularly between employees and their supervisors (Rothmann et al., 2013).

Ribeiro and Semedo (2014) in their study of 462 employees across 26 organisations in Cape Verde found that positive employee perception of organisations HRM practices demonstrated lower intention to leave. These finding provide support for the positive effects of both job demands-resources as well as the dissatisfaction-satisfaction approach in reducing the turnover intention of employees. By developing strategies that enhance employees’ satisfaction with organisational factors and practices as well as enhancing the well-being of employees organisations are better able to curb turnover intention.

Various studies have confirmed the positive effects of job satisfaction and work engagement on the turnover intention of employees. The findings of Bothma and Roodt (2012), Takawira et al. (2014), Mendes and Stande (2011), Robyn and du Preez (2013), and Yalabik et al. (2013) all provide support for the benefits of enhancing employee well-being via the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement of employees so as to reduce turnover intention.

The international and national research findings provide support for the importance for organisations to develop strategies that enhance employee well-being (job satisfaction and work engagement) to reduce turnover intention of employees. The findings of Brunetto et al. (2012) provide support for the potential of emotional intelligence to assist employees adapt to occupational contexts and support such interventions or strategies.
2.6 THEORETICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, JOB SATISFACTION, WORK ENGAGEMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION

Various studies have been conducted with combinations of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention as constructs. The most significant research related to this particular study was that of Brunetto et al. (2012) which demonstrated that emotional intelligence was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction. In the same study Brunetto et al. (2012) demonstrated that job satisfaction was significantly positively correlated with work engagement. A direct relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction with turnover intention could not be demonstrated by these researchers.

From a national perspective no research could be found exploring the direct relationships between emotional intelligence with the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement. As an ability, emotional intelligence is purported to assist individuals understand and act upon emotional information in the workplace in useful and adaptive ways. Emotional intelligence may be beneficial to assisting employees cope with emotional responses associated with turbulence and change in the work context thereby maintaining or enhancing job satisfaction and engagement.

Links between the constructs of job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention, however, are well established in international and national research literature. International research findings of Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Brunetto et al. (2012), Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013) confirm the positive relationship between the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement. Internationally Alarcon and Edwards (2011), Simpson (2009) and Yalabik et al. (2013); and nationally Bothma and Roodt (2012), Mendes and Stander (2011), Robyn and du Preez (2013) and Takawira et al. (2014) have confirmed the positive relationship between work engagement and turnover intention of employees.

The constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention are interlinked within organisational psychology and well-being research literature. Work engagement and job satisfaction have been empirically linked to turnover intention in both international and national research. Emotional intelligence has been linked to general well-being, but has yet to be investigated in relation to the constructs of job satisfaction and
work engagement in the South African context. This seems relevant given that organisations are increasingly including emotional intelligence into their competency frameworks and investigating the benefits of emotional intelligence along with other positive psychological constructs (Jonker, 2009).

The benefits of emotional intelligence may include increased job satisfaction and well-being as a result of the increased success in navigating the emotionality of work-life. This, in turn, would lead to lower levels of turnover intention of employees.

Taking the above into account, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H₁: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the job satisfaction of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₂: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the work engagement of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₃: Emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement relates negatively to the turnover intention of employees within selected South African organisations.

H₄: Emotional intelligence mediates turnover intention of employees indirectly via work engagement and job satisfaction.

2.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Chapter 2 provided the theoretical framework of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention. Applicable definitions and psychological details of these constructs were provided. An integration of these constructs as well as the international and national research that has been conducted was discussed. Lastly the literature review was brought closer to the specific research aims of this study.
CHAPTER 3. ARTICLE

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, JOB SATISFACTION, WORK ENGAGEMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION OF EMPLOYEES IN SELECTED SOUTH AFRICAN ORGANISATIONS

Orientation: The researchers explored the relationships between the constructs of emotional intelligence, work engagement, job satisfaction and turnover intention of employees within five South African organisations situated in the Durban (KwaZulu-Natal) area.

Research purpose: The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees in a sample of South African organisations.

Motivation for the study: The retention of skilled employees is crucial for the success of South African organisations. An understanding of the influence and relationships of employees’ emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement on employee turnover intention is necessary.

Research design: A cross-sectional survey based correlational research design was employed. A convenient sample of employees (n = 274) was drawn from five volunteering organisations in South Africa: Two private higher education institutions (n = 56), a management consulting/outsourcing company (n = 9), an information technology company (n = 70) and a packaging company (n = 139). The Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale, the Job Satisfaction Scale, the Work Engagement Scale and the Turnover Intention Scale were each administered.

Main findings: The findings showed that emotional intelligence relates positively with work engagement. Work engagement relates positively with job satisfaction. Work engagement and job satisfaction relates negatively with turnover intentions.

Practical/managerial implications: Organisations and managers should investigate the complex relationships between employees’ turnover intentions, well-being factors as well as contextual issues in deriving strategies to reduce employee turnover.
Contribution/value add: This study contributes to the literature by exploring the relationships between the constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees.
INTRODUCTION
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Employee turnover is costly to organisations due to direct and indirect costs such as loss of productivity, loss of intellectual capital, recruitment and selection, and training and development costs for new employees (Cascio & Aguinis, 2011; Coetzee & Gunz, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira, Coetzee, & Schreuder, 2014). The difficulties associated with employee turnover are exacerbated by increased competition for limited talented pools and the increased mobility of skilled employees within the knowledge economy (Coetzee & Gunz, 2012; Mendes & Stander, 2011; Takawira et al., 2014). This is particularly true within the South African context due to the lack of skilled workers (Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Rothmann, Diedericks, & Swart, 2013; van Schalkwyk, du Toit, Bothma, & Rothmann, 2010; Wöcke & Heyman, 2012). Thus, understanding why employees intend to leave and developing strategies to better retain valuable employees can reduce the costs associated with turnover and enhance an organisation’s competitive advantage (Rothmann et al., 2013; van Schalkwyk et al., 2010). It is therefore imperative to investigate the attributing factors associated with actual staff turnover in order to mitigate the effect it has on an organisation’s bottom line (Mendes & Stander, 2011).

Because an employee’s turnover intention (thoughts associated with leaving an organisation) is regarded as a strong predictor for actual staff turnover (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Rothmann et al., 2013), it has become increasingly important to understand the attributing factors which affects an employee’s intention to leave (Mendes & Stander, 2011). Mendes and Stander (2011) argued that creating a healthy organisation is a useful strategy to address employees’ turnover intentions. Within the realm of organisational psychology, the role of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement within healthy organisations are possible constructs through which turnover intention can be explained, predicted and managed.

As such, the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention within selected South African organisations.
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE


In 1990, Salovey and Mayer first introduced their ability based conceptualisation of emotional intelligence as a form of social intelligence consisting of (a) the ability to monitor emotion in self and others, (b) to discriminate between emotions and (c) to use emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour (Jonker, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotions are viewed as motivational forces directing and focusing one’s attention, with individuals varying in their ability and skill to do so (Stuart & Paquet, 2001).

Emotional intelligence is defined as the ability to carry out accurate reasoning about emotions, recognise and manage emotions and to use emotions and emotional knowledge to enhance thinking (Brackett, Mayer, & Warner, 2004; Davis & Humphrey, 2014; Jonker, 2009; MacCann, Joseph, Newman & Roberts, 2014; Mayer, Roberts & Barsade, 2008; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004). Emotion represents a response to a situation eliciting categories of associated emotions – such as threat, fear and happiness. Emotional information elicits motivated or learned reactions based on experience and emotional knowledge (Mayer et al., 2004). From this perspective emotional intelligence is seen as the ability to understand and act upon this emotional information in useful and adaptive ways (Bar-On, 2005; Brunetto, Teo, Shacklock, & Farr-Wharton, 2012).

The Salovey and Mayer (1990) model of emotional intelligence takes the view that emotional intelligence is a useful set of abilities for processing emotional information and using it to guide thinking, solve problems and focus on required behaviours for success (Salovey, Mayer, Caruso, & Yoo, 2008). Mayer and Salovey (1997) divided the abilities associated
with emotional intelligence into four interdependent domains or branches: (1) The ability to perceive emotion; (2) the ability to use emotion to facilitate thought; (3) the ability to understand emotion and emotional information; and (4) the ability to manage emotion (Mayer et al., 2004; Jonker, 2009). According to Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), Salovey and Mayer’s model of emotional intelligence is the only scientifically defensible model of emotional intelligence.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

Job satisfaction is commonly defined as how much one likes or dislikes their job (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Rothmann, 2002; Yalabik, Popaitoon, Chowne & Rayton, 2013). Job satisfaction results when employees’ internal needs are met and have positive implications for enhancing well-being and reducing employee turnover (Martins & Coetzee, 2007). Job satisfaction reflects an individual’s feelings and beliefs which develop as a result of cognitive and emotional processes (Yalabik et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is thus an emotional state based upon how individuals feel about their job and what they think about various aspects of their job (Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Yalabik et al., 2013).

Job satisfaction is widely recognised as a predictor of employee productivity, and performance as well as organisational financial and market performance (Loi, Yang, & Diefendorff, 2009; Mafini & Pooe, 2013). Employees with higher levels of job satisfaction experience greater well-being and are less likely to leave organisations (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Sempane, Rieger, & Roodt, 2002; Robyn & du Preez, 2013). Where an individual’s needs are frustrated or the expectancy and valence of the attainment of a need is high in relation to the relative achievement of the need – job dissatisfaction is likely to occur (Locke, 1969). It is thus important for organisations to enhance employee job satisfaction so as to enhance organisational outcomes such as quality of outputs and performance levels (Robyn & du Preez, 2013).

Job satisfaction is influenced by a variety of factors such as recognition, communication, co-worker relations, working conditions, job characteristics, the nature of the organisation, systems, policies and procedures, compensation, security and supervisory practices (Locke, 1969; Liu et al., 2011; Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Rogelberg, Allen, Shanock, Scott, & Shuffler, 2010). Meeting employees’ needs in relation to the above factors is viewed as the primary
strategy for enhancing job satisfaction of employees (Mafini & Pooe, 2013; Roos & van Eeden, 2008).

**WORK ENGAGEMENT**

The term work engagement has taken a variety of forms over the course of its history depending on the approach taken by researchers and authors. Personal engagement and disengagement (Kahn, 1990), work engagement (Maslach & Leiter, 2008) and more recently employee engagement (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Simpson, 2009) are terms available in the engagement research literature. While terms, approaches and definitions of engagement may differ, the development of the construct has been driven by the view that enhancing the engagement of employees enhances the competitive advantage of organisations, working conditions and well-being of employees (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011; Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes & Delbridge, 2013; Rothmann, 2002; Wollard & Shuck, 2011; Yalabik et al., 2013).

According to Wollard and Shuck (2011) engagement literature suggests that engaged employees experience positive work outcomes, are unafraid to portray their true selves, and feel that they have the necessary resources to succeed. Organisations with higher levels of work engagement enjoy far higher rates of success (Harter et al., 2002; Viljevac, Cooper-Thomas, & Saks, 2012). The opposite of work engagement – disengagement and burnout – predicts such outcomes as lower performance and high employee turnover (Shuck & Wollard, 2010).

According to Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter and Taris (2008) and Bakker and Demerouti (2006) engaged employees perform better than their counterparts for the following reasons:

- They experience more positive emotions such as happiness and joy towards their work;
- They experience greater psychological and physical health and well-being;
- They are more open to work opportunities and are more optimistic and confident;
- They foster the personal and job resources required to sustain their own engagement; and
- They transfer their engagement to others around them.
Engaged employees display high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work and are immersed in the performance of their work and roles (Bakker et al., 2008). Such individuals see their work as fulfilling, personally rewarding and challenging as opposed to stressful and unrewarding (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006). Engaged employees are also more committed to their organisations, take greater personal initiative and are motivated to learn and develop (Botha & Mostert, 2014).

In his seminal writing on the psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work, Kahn (1990) sought to explain the phenomenon by which individuals apply varying degrees of themselves at work: (1) Physically; (2) cognitively; and (3) emotionally (Goliath-Yarde & Roodt, 2011; May, Gilson & Harter, 2004; Shuck & Wollard, 2010; Truss et al., 2013). Kahn (1990) defined personal engagement as the employment and expression of one’s preferred self in the execution of tasks at work. Given the appropriate conditions, work engagement occurs when an individual uses and expresses their preferred full selves in the performance of their work roles (Bakker et al., 2008; Kahn, 1990; Kahn, 1992; May et al., 2004; Viljevac et al., 2012).

Central to Kahn’s conceptualisation is that work engagement is an internal state of being influenced by external conditions, forces or contexts (Shuck, 2011). Kahn (1990) concluded in his findings that context and individual’s perceptions and experiences of the context would lead to either engagement or disengagement at work (May et al., 2004; Shuck, 2011; Viljevac et al., 2012). Kahn (1990) argued that three psychological conditions determined whether employees personally engaged or disengaged in their role performances. The three conditions include (1) psychological meaningfulness; (2) psychological safety; and (3) psychological availability (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Simpson, 2009).

According to Kahn (1990), perceived meaningfulness is influenced by task characteristics such as autonomy, variety and challenge; role characteristics such as role attractiveness, person-role fit, status and influence; and work interactions such as interpersonal interactions, promotion of dignity and self-appreciation.

Psychological safety refers to the perceived sense of safety experienced when employees are able to show and employ self in role without fear of consequences to self-image, status/career
(Macey & Schneider, 2008; May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007). Work environments that enshrine trust, security and predictability in outcomes lead to greater perceived psychological safety at work (Gruman & Saks, 2011; Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004). According to Kahn (1990) four influencers of psychological safety exist: (1) interpersonal relationships, (2) group and intergroup dynamics; (3) management style and process; and (4) organisational norms.

Psychological availability refers to an employee’s sense of possessing the necessary physical, emotional and psychological resources to fully express oneself in role (Gruman & Saks, 2011; Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; Simpson, 2009). Employees experience physical and emotional availability in terms of available physical and emotional energy; psychological availability in terms of levels of self-confidence and fit with role (Kahn, 1990; May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007). Outside life factors also play an important role in influencing psychological availability given that circumstances outside the work context (i.e. personal affairs) may distract employees focus away from their role performances depending on the nature of the issue (Kahn, 1990).

**TURNOVER INTENTION**

Turnover intention (also referred to as intention to leave) is defined as the conscious and deliberate wilfulness of an employee to leave or plan to leave an organisation in the near future (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). According to Mendes and Stander (2011) intention to leave consists of both thoughts and statements. Intention to stay refers to employees’ conscious and deliberate willingness to stay with the organisation (Cho, Johanson, & Guchait, 2009; Tett and Meyer, 1993).

Turnover intention is understood to be the final stage in an employee’s decision making short of actually leaving the organisation and can be viewed as a coping strategy used by employees to escape a perceived undesirable employment condition (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Mendes & Stander, 2011). The intentions to leave and organisation is influenced by a wide variety of motives and factors which can be lowered if sources of dissatisfaction are dealt with. According to Vandenberg and Nelson (1999) individual differences (psychological factors and resources) influence an individual’s control of their context and may influence

**EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, JOB SATISFACTION, WORK ENGAGEMENT AND TURNOVER INTENTION**

Various studies have been conducted with combinations of the constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention. The most significant research related to this study is the research findings of Brunetto et al. (2012). In their study of Australian police officers emotional intelligence was found to enhance the engagement and affective commitment of Australian police officers thereby leading to lower turnover intention.


From a national perspective no direct research could be found exploring the relationships between emotional intelligence with the constructs of job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention. As an ability, emotional intelligence is purported to assist individuals understand and act upon emotional information in the workplace in useful and adaptive ways. Emotional intelligence may be beneficial to assisting employees cope with emotional responses associated with turbulence and change in the work context thereby maintaining or enhancing job satisfaction and engagement.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES**
The main objective of this study is to determine the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees in selected South African organisations. The aim is to investigate whether emotional intelligence affects turnover intention indirectly through work engagement and job satisfaction. It is expected that emotional intelligence will impact employee work engagement, job satisfaction and, consequently, turnover intention.

Based on the analytical structure of the study, the following hypotheses were set:

H<sub>1</sub>: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the job satisfaction of employees within selected South African organisations.
H<sub>2</sub>: Emotional intelligence relates positively to the work engagement of employees within selected South African organisations.
H<sub>3</sub>: Job satisfaction and work engagement relates negatively to the turnover intention of employees within selected South African organisations.
H<sub>4</sub>: Emotional intelligence mediates turnover intentions of employees indirectly via work engagement and job satisfaction.

The hypothesised conceptual model of this study is graphically depicted in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1. The hypothesised structural model](image)

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

**RESEARCH APPROACH**
For the purposes of this study a quantitative research approach was applied consisting of a cross-sectional survey design. A cross-sectional design aims to measure all variables of interest at a given point in time (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010) and is appropriate in social research when exploring theoretical models within a population group (Roundy, 2003).

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS**

Five South African organisations volunteered their participation in the study, two private higher education institutions, a management consulting/outsourcing company, an information technology company and a packaging company. A total of 274 employees across the five companies were surveyed. The number of participants varied from nine in the smallest company to 139 in the largest participating company. The majority of the sample consisted of white (51.1%) English (63.1%) skilled (84.7%) educated (56.6%) males (47.1%) in non-managerial positions (48.5%). The characteristics of the research participants are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of the Participants (N = 274)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to NQF Level 4 - Grade 12 (Matric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to NQF Level 6 - Higher certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than NQF Level 7 - Diploma or first degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top/Senior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally Qualified Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Junior Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

For the purposes of this study the following measuring instruments were utilised:

The Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (SEIS) (Schutte et al., 1998) was used to measure emotional intelligence as conceptualised by Salovey and Mayer (1990). The SEIS measures one construct (emotional intelligence) and consists of 33-items (e.g. “I know when to speak about my personal problems to others” and “I expect that I will do well on most things I try”). Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for each question. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the SEIS in international research (Schutte et al., 1998) and national research (Jonker & Vosloo, 2008). In this study the authors found the reliability of the SEIS to be acceptable (rho = .91).

A job satisfaction scale (JSS) adapted from the Industrial Salesperson scale by Johlke and Duhan (2000) was used to measure job satisfaction. The JSS measures one construct (job satisfaction) and consists of five items (e.g. “I feel that my job is valuable” and “In my job, I feel that I am doing something worthwhile”). Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total job satisfaction score. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the instrument with reliabilities indices of up to .98 (Brunetto et al., 2012). In this study the authors found the reliability of the JSS to be acceptable (rho = .81).

The Work Engagement Scale (WES) (May et al., 2004) was used to measure Work Engagement as conceptualised by Kahn (1990). The WES measures the cognitive, emotional and physical conditions of engagement (May et al., 2004; Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; van Zyl et al., 2010). The instrument consists of 17 items (e.g. “Performing my job is so absorbing that I forget about everything else” and “I really put my heart in my job”). Responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total engagement score. Research has established acceptable psychometric properties for the instrument; with reliabilities indices of up to .77 (May et al., 2004) in international research and up to .93 (Olivier & Rothmann, 2007; van Zyl et al., 2010) in national research. In this study the authors found the reliability of the WES to be acceptable (rho = .91).
Turnover intention was measured by an adapted version of the turnover intention scale (TIS) (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). The TIS measures one construct (turnover intention) and consists of six items (e.g. “How often do you dream about getting another job that will suit your personal needs?” and “How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?”). The TIS was adapted by adding two items (“How often do you think about leaving your job” and “How likely are you to look for a new job within the next year”) formulated by van Schalkwyk et al. (2010). Responses range from 1 (rarely or never) to 5 (very often) for each question. Responses were then averaged to provide a total turnover intention score. National research has established the items of the TI-6 and the van Schalkwyk et al. (2010) scale to have satisfactory internal reliabilities of up to .81 (Bothma & Roodt, 2013) and .75 respectively (van Schalkwyk et al., 2010). In this study the authors found the reliability of the TIS to be acceptable (rho = .83).

**RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

The research project was evaluated and accepted by the Ethics Committee of UNISA. Written permission was obtained from heads of human resources to conduct the study within their organisations.

Participants were given a covering letter detailing the purpose of the project, roles and responsibilities of the role players and the rights to confidentiality of the participants. Participation was voluntary with each participant being provided an informed consent form to sign prior to completing the questionnaire. Participants were given the opportunity to raise any questions and to receive feedback on the results of the study.

A secure, online survey system (Limesurvey) was used for the purpose of generating and distributing the questionnaire. Employees within the participating organisations were sent a link allowing them to access and complete the questionnaire. The online questionnaire was made available to participants between May 2013 and July 2013. The data was collected and securely stored by the administrator via password controls. Once the raw data was collected it was coded and entered into an Mplus dataset format for statistical analysis.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

First, descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) and Pearson correlations were presented for each construct. Rothmann’s (2013) rho calculator was used to calculate the reliabilities of the scales. Reliabilities of scales were measured using a formula based on the sum of squares of standardized loadings and the sum of standardized variance of error terms, the rho coefficient ($\rho$). This was utilised instead of the traditional Cronbach’s alpha as it is not a dependable estimate of scale reliability when latent variable modelling is used (Diedericks & Rothmann, 2013; Wang & Wang, 2012).

The data was then analysed using Mplus version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012). Two structural equation modelling approaches were followed: Competing measurement models focused on confirming the factor structures of the scales and a structural model to determine the relationship between latent variables.

The items of the four questionnaires, the SEIS, JSS, WES and the TIS were defined as being continuous and used ML (maximum likelihood estimation) of the missing values. To assess model fit, the comparative fit index (CFI; > .90), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; > .90), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; < .08), and standardised root mean residual (SRMR < 1) were used. Further, Chi-square ($\chi^2$) differences were used to determine absolute fit.

Finally, indirect effects were tested between the latent variables so as to determine any mediating effects. Bootstrapping was applied with two-sided bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals – lower confidence intervals (LCIs) and upper confidence intervals (UCIs) were reported.

RESULTS

In order to test the hypotheses presented in this study both competing measurement models and the structural model were tested and will be reported.

First, competing measurement models were tested in order to determine the best possible model for further analysis. Secondly, the structural model was tested based on the best fitting
measurement model. Finally, the indirect effect of emotional intelligence on turnover intention through job satisfaction and work engagement was tested.

TESTING THE MEASUREMENT MODEL/CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSES

In order to determine the best fitting measurement model, a series of competing measurement models were used to assess the conformability of the factor structures (confirmatory factor analysis) through the use of structural equation modelling. Observed variables (measured items) were used as determinants for latent variables in the measurement models. Given the nature of the competing measurement models, item parcelling and correlations between error terms were permitted in order to avoid removing items (Wang & Wang, 2012).

The authors applied confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with Mplus to assess a four construct measurement model as well as four alternative competing models. The fit statistics for the test of the various models is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Fit Statistics of Competing Measurement Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>BIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>860.48**</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>15437.78</td>
<td>15456.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3882.40**</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>28838.27</td>
<td>28866.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3881.56**</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>28825.42</td>
<td>29441.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4092.57**</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>29032.44</td>
<td>29059.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4116.28**</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>29056.15</td>
<td>29082.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD, standard deviation; r, reliabilities; **$p < .01$

Model 1 consisted of four latent variables totalling nine factors:
1. Emotional intelligence (measured by four observed variables: Positive emotions, managing emotions, recognising emotions; and utilising emotions).
2. Job satisfaction (measured by one observed variable: Job satisfaction).
3. Work engagement (measured by three observed variables: Cognitive engagement, emotional engagement and physical engagement).
4. Turnover intention (measured by one observed variable: Turnover intention).

The factor structure of the competing nested measurement model is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Factor Structures of Competing Nested Measurement Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Latent Variables</th>
<th>Factor/s</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Turnover Intention</td>
<td>4 Factors</td>
<td>16 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>3 Factors</td>
<td>13 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>7 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>33 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>17 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>7 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Turnover Intention</td>
<td>5 Factors</td>
<td>20 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>17 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>5 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Turnover Intention</td>
<td>5 Factors</td>
<td>20 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>3 Factors</td>
<td>14 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>5 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, Turnover Intention</td>
<td>5 Factors</td>
<td>20 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>2 Factors</td>
<td>14 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1 Factor</td>
<td>5 Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the Chi-Square Test of Model Fit results model 1 achieved the best results with the lowest $\chi^2$ result (860.48; df = 575) and acceptable fits statistics across the four fit indices: TLI = .91, CFI = .91, RMSEA = .05 and SRMR = .07. Standardised coefficients from items to factors ranged from .47 to .90. Furthermore, the results indicated that the relationship
between each observed variable and its respective construct was statistically significant ($\rho < .01$).

Two further fit statistics were used to analyse the comparative fit; the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and Bayesian information criterion (BIC) (Hair et al., 2010). The AIC is used to determine the best fit of competing models; the BIC indicates the relative parsimony of the model. The model with the lowest AIC and BIC values indicates the best fitting model (Hair et al., 2010). Based on the results model 1 fitted the data best.

**TESTING THE STRUCTURAL MODEL**

The structural model was tested based on the measurement model. Table 4 reports the descriptive statistics, rho reliabilities ($\rho$) and correlations of the scales used in the study. The hypothesised relationships were tested using latent variable modelling as implemented by Mplus (Muthèn & Muthèn, 2012). The scales showed acceptable internal consistency with rho coefficients ranging from .81 to .92. Figure 3.2 and Table 5 present the standardised path coefficients for the proposed theoretical model.

**Hypothesis 1: The relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction.**

For the portion of the model predicting job satisfaction, the path coefficient of emotional intelligence ($\beta = -.04, \rho > .05$) was not statistically significant and did not have the expected sign. H1 is rejected.

**Hypothesis 2: The relationship between emotional intelligence and work engagement.**

For the portion of the model predicting work engagement, the path coefficient of emotional intelligence ($\beta = .49, \rho < .01$) was statistically significant and had the expected sign. The maximum likelihood estimated equation accounted for a significant portion of the variance ($R^2 = .25$). H2 is accepted.
Hypothesis 3: The relationship between job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention.

For the portion of the model predicting turnover intention, the path coefficients of job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.98, \rho < .01$) and work engagement ($\beta = -0.37, \rho > .05$) had the expected signs. The path coefficient of job satisfaction was statistically significant. However the path coefficient of work engagement was not statistically significant. The maximum likelihood estimated equation accounted for a significant portion of the variance ($R^2 = .46$). Since the level of significance of the path coefficient of work engagement was close to the cut-off ($\rho = .069$) H$_3$ is accepted.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities and Correlations of the Scales ($N = 274$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Managing</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognising</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Utilising</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cognitive</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotional</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Physical</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turnover</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M$, mean; $SD$, standard deviation; $\rho$, reliabilities; ** $\rho < .01$
Hypothesis 4: Indirect effects of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction and work engagement on turnover intention

It was hypothesised that emotional intelligence would affect the turnover intention of employees indirectly via job satisfaction and work engagement. To determine whether any relationships were indirectly affected by job satisfaction and work engagement, bootstrapping was used. Lower CIs (LCIs) and Upper CIs (UCIs) are reported in Table 6.

Based on the findings, no indirect affects between emotional intelligence and turnover intentions of employees were found. H4 is rejected.

Table 5
Standardised Regression Coefficients of the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Est/SE</th>
<th>$\rho$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $\rho < .01$
Table 6

Indirect Effects of Independent Variables on Turnover Intention via Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Est/SE</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.745</td>
<td>-0.607</td>
<td>0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 95% BC CI = 95% bias-corrected confidence interval; LLCI = lower limit of confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit of confidence interval; * p < .05; ** p < .01

Figure 3.2. The proposed structural model

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to determine the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and the turnover intention of employees applying structured equation modelling. Job satisfaction had the strongest effect on the turnover intention of employees followed by work engagement which had a non-significant effect. Work engagement had a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction and, in turn, was
significantly affected by emotional intelligence. Our findings indicate that while emotional intelligence may not have indirect effects on turnover intentions of employees – it does play a significant role in the experienced work engagement factors of cognitive, emotional and physical engagement of employees and consequently experienced job satisfaction. Increased job satisfaction, in turn, resulted in fewer thoughts and feelings about leaving the organisation.

The emotional intelligence factors of positive emotions, managing emotions, recognising emotions and utilising emotions had a significantly positive impact on the cognitive, emotional and physical engagement of employees. This indicates that employees who are able to elicit positive emotions in themselves and others are generally optimistic, understand their emotions and the reasons behind them, and are able to regulate their emotions by regulating their moods. Such employees were found to be more likely to experience work engagement.

Employees who experience higher levels of work engagement feel immersed and challenged, feel enthusiastic, and experience great energy in the process of work. Such employees were found to be more satisfied with their jobs. Increased job satisfaction implies that employees feel that their jobs are valuable and interesting – and would hardly feel enthusiastic or emotionally attached to their work if that were not the case. Given the strong relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction, and the similarities in the items each construct measures, it is not surprising that this relationship exists.

Predictably, increased job satisfaction was linked to lower turnover intention. Employees who feel that their jobs are interesting, worthwhile and valuable did not feel likely to change jobs in the near future. Work engagement, contrary to predictions, did not have a statistically significant influence on turnover intention. This implies that individuals may feel cognitively, emotionally and physically engaged in their work but may still wish to leave their current roles or organisations. Further exploration is necessary into contextual factors within organisations that may elicit this dynamic.

It is noted by the researchers that emotional intelligence showed no statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction of employees. This is contrary to research findings of Brunetto et al. (2012), Meisler (2014), Psilopanagioti, Anagnostopolous, Anagnostopolous, Mourtou, and
Niakas (2012) and Wolfe and Kim (2013). This may be a result of the sampling strategy applied (non-probability convenience sample) and the employees in the different organisations not sharing the same characteristics and working conditions.

**MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Managers and organisations may wish to focus their attention on the well-being of employees in relation to emotional intelligence and work engagement. Interventions aimed at raising awareness regarding these constructs and how to foster greater emotional intelligence and work engagement would lead to positive organisational outcomes. By implementing initiatives aimed at enhancing emotional intelligence and work engagement, employees may experience greater job satisfaction and fewer thoughts about leaving their organisations.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Future research should focus on using alternative instruments to measure the relationships between the constructs investigated in this study. Particularly instruments which are not self-report in nature (such as the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale), and which measure actual abilities of participants (such as the Bar-On EQ-i). Future research should also seek to make use of larger samples and employ a longitudinal design so as to gain insight into the constructs influence on turnover intention over time and on actual employee turnover rates.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Several limitations to the study exist. The study relied on a cross-sectional survey design thus the causal direction of the relationships between the variables cannot be ascertained. Future studies should focus on the relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention in a longitudinal design.

The use of self-reported questionnaires could influence the reliability and validity of the data and findings (Simons & Buitendach, 2013). Self-report data can lead to response biases; such as social desirability bias (Lelkes, Krosnick, Marx, Judd & Park, 2012). The sampling strategy used (non-probability convenience), the small size of the sample (274) and the relatively homogenous nature of the sample (predominantly white and English) would limit
the generalisability of the results to a larger population of South African employees (Kotze & Nel, 2013; Rothmann et al., 2013).

CONCLUSION

The overall findings of this study suggest that employees with higher levels of emotional intelligence experience greater work engagement. Work engagement and job satisfaction of employees were strongly linked with both leading to lower levels of turnover intention of employees. Organisations and managers may wish to further investigate the complex relationships between employees’ turnover intention, well-being factors and contextual issues. The findings in this study suggest that cultivating emotional intelligence and work engagement of employees may be a useful strategy to reduce the turnover intention of employees.
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CHAPTER 4. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 4 contains the conclusions, limitations and recommendations.

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate the relationships between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention of employees in a sample of South African organisations. A further aim was to establish whether emotional intelligence, mediated by the effects of job satisfaction and work engagement, is useful in predicting the turnover intentions of employees. Research conclusions from the literature review and the empirical study for each of the research aims as stated in 1.7 in chapter 1 will be formulated below.

The specific literature objective was to conceptualise emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention from the literature so as to establish the theoretical relationship between the concepts. This objective was achieved by means of the literature review.

Emotional intelligence is viewed to be one of a number of human intelligences including social, cultural, practical and personal intelligences (Crowne, 2013; Mayer et al., Caruso, 2004) and is conceptualised by a number of competing theories and approaches within the literature (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; MacCann et al., 2014; Martins & Coetzee, 2007; Nel & De Villiers, 2004). The Salovey and Mayer (1990) conceptualisation and definition of emotional intelligence has enjoyed the most support by researchers and institutions such as the American Psychological Association (Dahl & Cilliers, 2012; Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2006; Jordan et al., 2010; MacCann et al., 2014). According to the Salovey and Mayer (1990) model, emotional intelligence encompasses (a) the ability to monitor emotion in self and others, (b) to discriminate between emotions and (c) to use emotional information to guide thinking and behaviour (Jonker, 2009; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Emotions are viewed as motivational forces directing and focusing one’s attention, with individuals varying in their ability and skill to do so (Stuart & Paquet, 2001).
Job satisfaction remains a popular construct for study within industrial organisational psychology due to its practicality (Loi et al., 2009; McFarlin & Rice, 1991; Strümpfer & de Bruin, 2009). Job satisfaction is commonly defined as how much one likes or dislikes a given job or aspects thereof (Alarcon & Edwards, 2010; Rothmann, 2002; Yalabik et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is influenced by a variety of factors (Mafini & Pooe, 2013) and is generally understood in terms of intrinsic satisfaction with job tasks, and extrinsic satisfaction with work environmental factors (Castro & Martins, 2010; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014; Rothmann, 2002).

Each job and work context has unique characteristics that, depending on the degree of autonomy, skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback, influence the level of motivation and consequent satisfaction of an employee (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2008; Mayfield, 2013). According to Mafini and Pooe (2013) job satisfaction is most influenced by environmental factors and individual characteristics. The benefits of emotional intelligence may include increased job satisfaction as a result of the increased success in navigating the emotionality of work-life.

Organisations are increasingly concerned with inspiring and enabling employees to apply their full capabilities at work. As such organisations are investing into activities and strategies so as to develop a more fully engaged workforce (Bakker et al., 2011; Truss et al., 2013). While varying conceptualisations of work engagement exist, researchers agree that engaged employees display high levels of energy and identify strongly with their work-roles. Enhancing work engagement within organisations has the potential to enhance individual and organisational outcomes (Arrowsmith & Parker, 2013; Bakker et al., 2008; Bothma & Roodt, 2012; Shuck, 2011; Sonnentag, 2011; Truss et al., 2013; Viljevac et al., 2012).

Kahn (1990) originally conceptualised engagement at work as an internal state of being influenced by external conditions, forces or contexts and defined personal engagement as the employment or expression of one’s self (physically, cognitively or emotionally) in the execution of tasks at work (Shuck, 2011). Kahn (1990) concluded that context and individual’s perceptions and experiences of the context would lead to either engagement or disengagement at work (May et al., 2004; Shuck, 2011). Given the appropriate conditions, personal engagement occurs when an individual uses and expresses their preferred full selves.
in the performance of their work roles (Kahn, 1990; Kahn, 1992; May et al., 2004; Viljevac et al., 2012).

The retention of valuable employees is a significant concern for organisations (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Robyn & du Preez, 2013; Roulin et al., 2014). Employee turnover and the retention of employees is a major concern for organisations and is a negative measure of organisational effectiveness (Bothma & Roodt, 2013; Brunetto et al., 2012; Roulin et al., 2014; Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999; Yalabik et al., 2013). Organisations have struggled to find effective strategies to lower employee turnover (Ng & Butts, 2009). As such much international and national research has emerged on the topic of predicting turnover intention of employees.

Turnover intention is defined as the conscious and deliberate wilfulness of an employee to leave or plan to leave an organisation in the near future (Bothma & Roodt, 2012; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Takawira et al., 2014; Vandenberg & Nelson, 1999). Various studies have confirmed the positive effects of job satisfaction and work engagement on the turnover intention of employees. The findings of Bothma and Roodt (2012), Mendes and Stander (2011), Robyn and du Preez (2013), Takawira et al. (2014), and Yalabik et al. (2013) all provide support for the benefits of enhancing employee well-being via the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement of employees so as to reduce turnover intention.

The constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention are interlinked within organisational psychology and well-being research literature. Work engagement and job satisfaction have been empirically linked to turnover intention in both international and national research. Emotional intelligence has yet to be investigated in relation to the constructs of job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention in the South African context. This seems relevant given the interest shown by organisations and practitioners in investigating the value of emotional intelligence in organisational settings and intervention (Boyatzis, 2011; Golnaz, 2012; Jonker, 2009; Stoller et al., 2013).

Mendes and Stander (2011), Robyn and du Preez (2013) and Takawira et al. (2014) have confirmed the positive relationship between work engagement and turnover intention of employees.

The most significant research related to this particular study was that of Brunetto et al. (2012) which demonstrated that emotional intelligence was significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .21$) and well-being ($r = .38$). In the same study Brunetto et al. (2012) demonstrated that Job satisfaction was significantly positively correlated with employee engagement ($r=.40$). A direct relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction with turnover intention could not be demonstrated by Brunetto et al. (2012).

From a national perspective very little research could be found exploring the direct relationships between emotional intelligence with the constructs of job satisfaction and work engagement. As an ability, emotional intelligence is purported to assist individuals understand and act upon emotional information in the workplace in useful and adaptive ways. Emotional intelligence may be beneficial to assisting employees cope with emotional responses associated with turbulence and change in the work context thereby maintaining or enhancing job satisfaction and engagement. Based on the literature review presented in this research; the aim of conceptualising the constructs of emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention from the literature was achieved.

The empirical objective of this study was to determine whether emotional intelligence, work engagement, and job satisfaction affects turnover intention directly or indirectly through work engagement and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had the strongest significant effect on turnover intention of employees ($r = -.98$) while work engagement had a non-significant effect ($r = -.37$). Work engagement had a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction ($r = .91$) and, in turn, was significantly affected by emotional intelligence ($r = .49$).

The findings indicate that while emotional intelligence may not have direct effects on turnover intention of employees, it does play a significant role in the experienced work engagement factors of cognitive, emotional and physical engagement of employees and consequently experienced job satisfaction. Increased job satisfaction, in turn, resulted in fewer thoughts and feelings about leaving the organisation. A summary of the finding of the empirical study are presented in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1. The proposed structural model

The emotional intelligence factors of positive emotions, managing emotions, recognising emotions and utilising emotions had a significantly positive impact on the cognitive, emotional and physical engagement of employees \( (r = .49) \). This indicates that employees’ who are able to elicit positive emotions, are optimistic, understand their emotions, and are able to regulate their emotions are more likely to experience work engagement. It is possible thus that the emotional intelligence of employees may facilitate the appropriate conditions necessary for experienced work engagement as conceptualised by Kahn (1990) and May et al. (2004) by assisting employees better navigate the contextual factors at work that may undermine experienced work engagement.

Employees who experience higher levels of work engagement, feel immersed and challenged, feel enthusiastic, and experience great energy in the process of work are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs \( (r = .91) \). Increased job satisfaction implies that employees feel that their jobs are valuable and interesting.

Predictably, increased job satisfaction was linked to lower turnover intention \( (r = -.98) \). Employees who feel that their jobs are interesting, worthwhile and valuable do not easily
consider leaving or feel likely to change jobs in the near future. Work engagement, contrary to predictions, did not have a statistically significant influence on employee turnover intention ($r = -0.37$). This implies that individuals may feel cognitively, emotionally and physically engaged in their work but may still wish to leave their current roles or organisations. For these individuals other factors may influence their intention to leave such as working conditions, remuneration or better opportunities for continuous development. Further exploration is necessary into the many possible contextual factors within organisations that may elicit this dynamic.

In this research emotional intelligence showed no statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction of employees. This is contrary to the research findings of Brunetto et al. (2012), Meisler (2014), Psilopanagioti et al. (2012) and Wolfe and Kim (2013). One possible explanation for the difference in findings is the difference between samples used by the different studies. Further explanations may include differences in research methodology, conceptualisations and measuring instruments employed by the different studies. Further research should focus on exploring the relationship between the emotional intelligence and experienced job satisfaction of a more diverse sample of employees in the South African context.

The overall findings of this study suggest that employees with higher levels of emotional intelligence experience greater engagement at work. Work engagement and job satisfaction of employees were strongly linked with both being associated with lower levels of turnover intention of employees. Organisations and managers may wish to further investigate the complex relationships between employee turnover intention, well-being factors and contextual issues. The findings in this study suggest that cultivating emotional intelligence improves the work engagement of employees which may be a useful strategy to improve job satisfaction and reduce employee turnover intention. The empirical aims of the study were achieved.

### 4.2 LIMITATIONS

Several limitations to the study exist. In respect of the literature review; the study relied on literature published in the English language from predominately western perspectives of
industrial and organisational psychology. The results of the literature review, thus, cannot be regarded as being universal to all cultures and populations.

The study relied on a cross-sectional survey design thus the causal direction of the relationships between the variables cannot be ascertained. Future studies should focus on the relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, work engagement and turnover intention in a longitudinal design.

The use of self-reported questionnaires could influence the reliability and validity of the data and findings (Simons & Buitendach, 2013). Self-report methods of inquiry can lead to common method bias, variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent (Podsakoff et al., 2003, p. 879). According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), sources of common method bias include consistency motives (the desire of participants to appear to respond consistently), implicit theories and illusory correlations (rater assumptions regarding the corelations of subjects or items), and social desirability bias (the need for social approval and acceptance as a result of responses given).

Social desirability bias is particularly problematic given that respondents may intentionally provide self-reports that are inaccurate (Lelkes, Krosnick, Marx, Judd, & Park, 2012). According to Lelkes et al. (2012), researchers should not assume that the anonymity of participants will increase the accuracy of responses gathered. In this study, while anonymity was guaranteed, participants may have felt that it would be more desirable to answer in particular ways depending on what they thought their organisations might do with the results.

The sampling strategy used (non-probability convenience), the small size of the sample (274), and the relatively homogenous nature of the sample (predominantly white and English) would limit the generalisability of the results to a larger population of South African employees (Kotze & Nel, 2013; Rothmann et al., 2013). Future research should investigate a more diverse sample of employees in the South African context.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Managers and organisations may wish to focus their attention on the emotional intelligence, work engagement and job satisfaction as a means of influencing turnover intentions of
employees. Organisations may wish to identify practical and cost effective interventions aimed at developing greater emotional intelligence and work engagement. Research by Jonker (2009), for example, demonstrated the efficacy of an emotional intelligence development programme in enhancing the emotional intelligence of a sample of accountants within a South African organisation. Likewise, including reliable and valid measures of emotional intelligence into organisations’ selection batteries may enhance the emotional intelligence profile of new recruits and, in time, organisations as a whole.

Organisational psychologists may wish to focus on future research using alternative instruments and samples to measure the relationships between the constructs investigated in this study. Particular focus should be paid to instruments that are not self-report in nature (such as the Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale) and which purport to measure actual abilities of participants (such as the Bar-On EQ-I or the MSCEIT). Competing conceptualisations of emotional intelligence and work engagement should be evaluated by psychologists in the South African context given the broad range of approaches currently available in research.

Furthermore, psychologists may wish to investigate ethical consequences of enhanced emotional intelligence and work engagement for employees such as the potential exploitation of employees at work, incidence of fatigue and burnout, and any potential health consequences associated with being “more engaged”. Future research should further make use of larger samples and employ a longitudinal design so as to gain insight into the constructs influence on employees over time.

**4.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In chapter 4 the conclusions, limitations and recommendations were formulated. The results showed that employees with higher levels of emotional intelligence experienced greater work engagement. Work engagement and job satisfaction of employees were strongly linked with both leading to lower levels of turnover intention of employees.
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