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ABSTRACT

It is critical to retain skilled teachers to provide high quality education in schools. With the current shortage of experienced, talented teachers, turnover intentions have a negative impact on the competitive environment in which schools currently operate. The retention of teachers is possible through perceived organisational support which reduces turnover intentions and leads to greater competitiveness. To date, most researchers examining the retention of teachers, focus on reasons why people leave. The purpose of this study was to examine the retention of teachers and the impact of perceived organisational support and which of its constructs plays the largest role in retention. Perceptions of teachers concerning the contributing factors that led to their intent to stay was examined. The factors that were included in this study were examined to gain insight into which of the constructs of perceived organisational support had the greatest impact on teacher retention.

Quantitative methodologies were employed to gain data and to test the predetermined hypothesis regarding the strength of the relationship between the variables and retention. The survey instrument was distributed electronically to currently employed teachers. Participants in this study taught in government as well as independent schools, across all school levels. Surveys were used to measure respondent’s perceptions regarding retention and perceived organisational support within a cross-sectional timeframe. Factor analysis, multiple regression and analysis of variance were applied to determine whether a predictive relationship existed amongst the variables. The analysis of the quantitative data supported the relevance the literature on the role of perceived organisational support and its constructs in retention. However, the data showed a direct correlation with rewards and recognition as well as specific demographic variables in retention.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intent to stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Leader-member exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Perceived Organisational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Perceived Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Rewards and Recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1: Introduction to Research Problem

1.1 Introduction

Businesses and organisations have sought the solution to employee turnover for many years (Lee, Hom, Eberly & Li, 2017). The reasoning for the pursuit of this solution is to avoid the negative consequences of employee turnover. It has been consistently shown in the literature that high employee turnover rates are costly to businesses. These costs can be tangible or intangible and include costs such as labour shortages and the cost of replacing lost employees (Masibigiri & Nienaber, 2011; Ratna & Chawla, 2012). Other far-reaching consequences of employee turnover include the loss of valuable institutional knowledge, knowledge about the customer, and decreased staff morale (Ratna & Chawla, 2012). High employee turnover can negatively affect the overall performance of an organisation (Hancock, Allen, Bosco, McDaniel & Pierce, 2013). For example, in a meta-analysis conducted by Park and Shaw (2013), it was demonstrated that high turnover rates had a significant and negative impact on organisational performance, specifically, a reduction in workplace activity by 40% and a reduction in organisational financial performance by 26%.

The extensive research related to employee turnover has revealed a myriad of factors that can potentially impact retention and a variety of theories to explain the relatedness of those factors (Lee et al., 2017). The education system is not exempt from the consequences of employee turnover. When teachers leave schools, this turnover can be damaging to students in terms of morale and achievement (Ingersoll, Merrill & Stuckley, 2014). An investigation into the reasons why teachers leave have shown that the most influential factors of teacher attrition are student behaviour, working conditions, compensation, teaching experience, a safe working environment, supportive administration, teacher autonomy and burnout, school leadership, and involved parents among others (Ajayi & Olatunji, 2017; Akhtar, Hashmi, & Naqvi, 2010; Grissom, Viano & Selin, 2015; Shaw & Newton, 2014).

A factor influencing teacher attrition identified in the literature but not fully explored is the concept of perceived organisational support (POS). POS is defined as “employees’ beliefs concerning the extent to which the organisation values their contribution and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). In this current
study, the relationship between teacher retention and POS and the impact of its constructs on retention will be examined amongst teachers in South African schools. It is imperative that this research be conducted as data gathered from this study can aid in the development and implementation of teacher retention strategies. Teachers play a fundamental role in the quality of education that students receive; therefore, it is in the best interest of the South African school system to understand the underlying factors affecting teacher attrition and retention so that quality teachers can be retained, and students can be provided with the best quality education possible.

1.2 Research Motivation

The state of education in South Africa is of nationwide concern as the education system is in a crisis. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2015) has ranked South Africa 119th out of 188 African countries, in a ranking table of education achievements drawn up in 2015. There are many reasons why the education system in South Africa is struggling. Vally (2015) noted that unions have been selling teacher and principal posts, cronyism is rampant, and the infrastructure and facilities are deplorable. Research has shown that many teachers in South Africa do not have job satisfaction and over half want to leave the education profession (Vally, 2015). Education is the key element of human growth and development (UNDP, 2016) and is the pillar upon which advanced countries are fabricated. The retention of highly competent and effective teachers is of crucial importance to the effective performance of schools as well as to pupil’s academic success. (Gulosino, Franceschini, & Hardman, 2016)

As teachers play a pivotal role in providing quality education and a sustainable future to the youth, schools strive to employ the best qualified teachers to deliver superior education to its students. Research has shown that hiring quality teachers has a positive effect on student outcomes (Ingvarson & Rowley, 2017). However, these qualified teachers must be retained to deliver consistent high-quality education to students. The retention of quality experienced teachers is posing a problem globally (Ingersoll, Merrill, & Stuckey, 2014) as well as in South African schools (Steyn, 2013). Employees are the most critical element of organisational success. This is especially true of service-based organisations. Schools, as service industries, are dependent on their teachers for survival and competitive advantage as they make up approximately 80% of their workforce.
Due to lack of parent confidence in the current South African public schooling sector and that low-quality education is perceived as a poverty trap, there has been a rapid increase in privately-funded schools. As more and more private schools are opening, fierce competition is raging to secure the limited number of competent human resources in the form of quality qualified teachers.

South Africa is currently experiencing a shortage of experienced, trained and motivated teachers (Centre for Development and Enterprise, 2015) as schools are finding themselves operating in complex and challenging environments. The Human Sciences Research Council research (Cross, Seager, Wentzel, Mafukidze, Hoosen, & van Zul, 2009) has shown that in 2010 more teachers left the teaching profession than new recruits entered the profession.

The problem of teacher attrition has been vastly researched, with the main comparisons being between teacher attrition and the conditions of teaching. Research focused on teacher retention is relatively limited. This research study will shift the focus from teacher attrition to teacher retention by examining the impact of POS and its constructs on retention and identifying the most significant predictors of intention to stay, the primary indicator of retention (Lawrence, Celis, Kim, Lipson, & Tong, 2014; McGilton, Boscart, Brown, & Bowers, 2014; Mehta, Kurbetti, & Dhankhar, 2014; Zopiatis, Constanti, & Theocharous, 2014).

1.3 Research Purpose

The current demand for quality teachers surpasses the supply and, as more privately-funded schools are opening, teacher mobility is on the increase as they have more choices and can now compare organisations. Therefore, the current South African educational landscape requires that organisations take a strategic approach to evaluating their Human Resource (HR) retention policies to retain highly-qualified and effective teachers in South African schools. There needs to be a thorough examination of the motivations for teachers to remain in their positions so that schools can be properly staffed with qualified, effective teachers.
The purpose of this quantitative research study is to explore the various constructs of POS and to determine the extent to which the POS constructs impact directly the retention of teachers. The data provided by this quantitative study can inform the various educational entities of the potential motivators for teachers in South Africa with the intention of aiding in the development of policies and practices that will increase teacher retention. After the research data analysis, educational boards, human resource departments and students of education should be able to link the measures to be able to make human capital decisions that will enhance POS and thus improve retention. It is therefore essential for HR Departments to understand and analyse which aspects of POS will affect retention the most as a basic requirement for sustainability and competitiveness.

Over the past thirty years, a vast amount of educational research has been conducted to understand why teachers leave, primarily examining individual factors as opposed to organisational ones (Ingersoll, 2001; Joo, Hahn, & Peterson, 2015). Current research has focused more on entry level teacher’s attrition after five years of tenure. There are a limited number of research studies (especially in the South African school context) which have been conducted on examining the role of POS on retention of teachers in schools and which POS constructs are the most prominent. Current South African educational data and statistics are limited; therefore, this study will add to the available data and research as educational institutions endeavour to improve the state of schools in South Africa.

An improved understanding on the retention of teachers and which constructs of POS have the greatest impact can make a complimentary addition to human resource practices in terms of focused skills development, management support training and rewards and recognition. Exploring teacher’s perceptions of the organisational support will also provide valuable insight into the employee-organisation relationship. Management can use this insight into creating an environment which is conducive of support and increased retention.

Additionally, this study will thus contribute to the literature, provide current statistics relating to the constructs analysed in this study, and conceptualise teacher retention as it relates to schools in South Africa. This study will also inform current theory relating to
employee retention for the purpose of strengthening or revising theory both for application in the field of education and potential application in other fields.

1.4 Research Aims and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between teacher retention (dependent variable), perceived organisational support, leader member exchange, rewards and recognition, and procedural justice (independent variables).

The main objective of the research is as follows:

Objective 1: To determine the relationship between teacher retention and POS.
Objective 2: To determine which constructs of POS have the greatest impact on teacher retention.

1.5 Research Scope

The scope of the research falls within the boundaries of South African schools. Quantitative data on teacher retention, perceived organisational support, leader member exchange, rewards and recognition and procedural justice was collected from currently employed teachers in South Africa. The research data was based on the perceptions of the respondents and their interpretation of the various questions. Data was collected via electronic self-administered questionnaires.

1.6 Structure of the Research Report

The final research report will consist of seven chapters. Chapter 1 provided the introduction to the research problem. The problem to be studied is the high teacher turnover rates in South African public schools. The purpose of the research is to explore the various constructs of POS and to determine the extent to which the POS constructs impact the retention of teachers. The motivation for the research and the scope of the research were described.
Chapter 2 provides an understanding into the need for the research problem in terms of the literature reviewed. The literature review begins with a discussion of the construct of retention, including why employees leave and how retention in the educational setting differs from other fields. The review of the literature is focused on research related to POS and its components. It will also include a discussion of relevant theories that help to inform the development of theoretical foundation for the current study.

Chapter 3 defines the exact purpose of the report which was used to formulate the hypotheses. The hypotheses are aligned with the research objectives and correspond to the research methodology and design selected for the study.

Chapter 4 describes the research methodology used to research the hypothesis. This chapter details the procedures for conducting the study and the instruments used to collect data for this study. Chapter 4 also outlines the data analysis for the study as well as the study limitations.

Chapter 5 presents a sample and an in-depth analysis of the results of the research. This analysis includes both descriptive and inferential statistics as well as testing for assumptions related to the method of analysis.

Chapter 6 is the discussion of the results of the study, specific to the research objectives as articulated.

Finally, Chapter 7 provides an overview of the main findings, limitations of the research, recommendations from the findings on retention, implications for management, limitations, as well as recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
The literature review of published research on POS and retention provides a holistic explanation upon which a theoretical framework can be built for the research questions and hypothesis. As this research study will be conducted on retention of teachers in the educational field, it is important to include a review of literature relating to the retention of teachers. The constructs of retention and POS are then examined in terms of definitions, significance, measurement and causal relationships.

The field of education has consistently borrowed from other fields such as business, sociology, and psychology to provide the basis for policies, procedures, best practices and foundational philosophies (Ballantine & Hammack, 2012; Marion & Gonzales, 2014). As a result, this literature review will provide an overview of the general topic of employee retention to lay a foundation for understanding teacher retention in the field of education. The chapter concludes with an examination of the theoretical foundations for this study and identification of the research gap as it relates to teacher retention in South Africa and perceived organisational support.

2.2 Retention
2.2.1 Retention Defined
Armstrong’s Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice (2014) defines retention as “the methodical endeavour to create and promote an environment of policies and practices addressing the diverse employee needs, thereby encouraging them to willingly remain committed to the organisation.” Employee retention refers to the ability of an organisation to retain its employees. It involves putting policies and procedures in place to create an environment that enhances the employees work experience and encourage them to remain in the organisation for as long as possible. Efforts to maximise retention are associated with concern for employees and a desire to make the organisation as attractive as possible (Cardy & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). The main focuses of employee retention is to understand employees’ reasons for staying and encourage high levels of commitment to achieve organisational goals (Yamamoto, 2013). All organisations,
including non-profit, for-profit and government compete to acquire and retain talented employees. (Hunjra, Ali, Chani, Khan & Rehman 2010)

2.2.2 Development of Strategies for Retention

Organisations must endeavour to implement measures to prevent employees from resigning due to better employment opportunities. Creating retention strategies could ultimately cut costs related to employee turnover and furthermore improve employee retention. James and Mathews (2012) explored a conceptual model for Retention Strategies based on "Rewards and Recognition, Training and Development Opportunities, Mentoring / Coaching Sessions, Career Planning, Flexible Work Time, Employee Suggestion Plans, Stock Investment Opportunities, Annual Performance Appraisal, Financial Support, Contract Agreements, On-site Day Care Facilities". They found a strong correlation between the model and retention.

Lee, Hom, Eberly and Mitchell (2017) analysed literature related to employee turnover and retention and identified the major contributions to literature in this area. This research has encompassed an investigation of why people leave and why people stay. Why people stay, or retention, has been thought to be associated with concepts such as job embeddedness, which encompasses both on-the-job and off-the-job factors (Lee et al., 2017). The varying perspectives as to why employees leave, and stay have led to the varying implementation of retention strategies (Cloutier, Felusiak, Hill, & Pemberton-Jones, 2015).

2.2.3 Significance of Retention

Retaining employees has become one of critical issues for organisations as turnover rates increase (Ballinger, Craig, Cross, & Gray, 2011). According to Masibigiri and Nienaber (2011), labour shortages have become a major concern for organisations whilst they are forced to deal with the challenge of employee turnover and retention. Retention is important not only in terms of the cost incurred by an organisation, but also the need to retain talented employees especially from getting poached by other organisations. When good employees leave, the impact can be far reaching. They take with them valuable institutional knowledge about the organisation, customer and strategic information. as well as creating a reduction in morale among remaining staff (Ratna & Chawla, 2012).
Managing teacher retention is particularly critical in schools, because of the labour-intensiveness of the industry. Schools are no different to other organisations; teacher turnover rates reflect employee commitment and satisfaction (Grissom et al., 2015) and schools face high costs for teacher replacements. In terms of schools and competitive advantage, high turnover can have damaging effects on pupil progress as well as overall achievement (Ingersoll et al., 2014). When employees voluntarily leave an organisation, it can also have an unfavourable impact on the overall moral of the employees who stay (Agarwal, 2013).

A significant amount of current research focuses on retention of newly qualified teachers. Thereafter, research is lacking in terms of POS and retention rates of teachers in general. This lack of research would suggest that once after five years of teaching experience, retention is no longer a concern for organisations. This is not a sound conclusion. There is a gap in the research surrounding teacher retention in general, especially for these teachers with five or more years of experience.

2.2.4 The Cost of Turnover

A major constraint on organisations in terms of employee turnover is the cost implication. A high rate of turnover can come at a great financial cost to organisations affecting their profitability (Ratna & Chawla, 2012). These costs are related to recruitment, replacement and training. (Ratna & Chawla, 2012). The recruitment and training of new employees has a large financial implication. Costs are related to advertising and training, vacancy and temporary replacement, hiring, orientation and training and decreased productivity. (Duffield, Roche, Homer, Buchan, & Dimitrelis, 2014).

In schools, turnover costs include educational, financial, and organisational costs that can directly affect student learning and competitive advantage (Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2013). A high churn rate and continual influx of new teachers creates problems on numerous levels. Firstly, schools with high turnover rates affect the composition of the teaching staff. It will include many new teachers who are not as experienced nor effective (Ronfeldt et al., 2013). When students experience a high churn rate of teachers, it affects the quality of instruction they receive. Disruptions in teacher continuity results in compromised instructional programs for students which directly impacts their results.
(Ronfeldt et al., 2013; Ingersoll et al., 2014). High, continual turnover negatively affects the relationships built between teachers, students and parents. These relationships take time and are essential in the formation of trust and creating a sense of community. Sustained and stable relationships establish essential norms for the effective running of schools. According to Ingersoll et al. (2014), they are all positively correlated with student achievement. Ingersoll et al. (2014) suggested in his paper that turnover negatively affects trust amongst staff and the loss in institutional knowledge is critical to support student leaning. Schools with high teacher retention rates incur enormous costs due to recruitment, hiring, induction and develop of replacement teachers.

2.2.5 Why employees leave organisations

In past years, research related to employee turnover and retention have focused primarily on individual characteristics of the employee (Joo et al., 2015). Current research tends to suggest that organisational factors are the most important contributor to turnover; however, several personal factors have also been associated with employee turnover. Demographic characteristics and employees’ perception of the organisation have been shown to have a significant effect on intention to quit (Stewart, Volpone, Avery & McKay, 2011)

2.2.5.1 Influencing factors

There are many variables that have been shown to contribute to retention as well as to intention to quit. Research has shown that demographic variables are positively correlated with retention (Almalki, FitzGerald & Clark, 2012). Kabungaidze, Mahlatshana and Ngirande (2013) found in their research on “The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Some Demographic Variables on Employee Turnover Intentions”, that there was statistically a significant relationship between age and tenure.

Research has also shown that there is a myriad of organisational factors that can influence employee retention. The misalignment of organisational and personal values plays a key role in employee’s intention to quit (Zeitlin, Augsberger, Auerbach, & McGowan, 2014). Organisational policies and procedures can play a significant role on employee turnover. Research has shown that the level of fairness in organisational policies relating to the selection for promotion and employee compensation is important to workers (Johnco,
Salloum, Olson, & Edwards, 2014). Other factors include the perception of feeling undervalued or unappreciated, lack of supervisory support, and an appreciative learning and working climate (Zeitlin et al., 2014; Govaerts, Kyndt, Dochy, & Baert, 2011; Williams, Nichols, Kirk, & Wilson, 2011).

2.2.6 Factors influencing staff retention in organisations

In comparison to the literature and research on staff turnover, far less attention has been paid to factors influencing retention. One cannot safely assume that factors leading to employee turnover positively affect retention (Hausknecht & Trevor, 2011). They may influence staff retention; however according to Zeitlin (2014), there are different factors that are important for staff retention.

Sinha and Sinha (2012) emphasized certain factors to increase staff retention, namely, skills recognition, learning and working environments, job flexibility, training, benefits, career development, relations with supervisor, compensation, organisational commitment, communication and motivation. Further research on staff retention reiterated training, compensation and appraisal are influencing factors (Hong, Hoa, Kumar, Ramendran, & Kadiresan, 2012). George’s (2015) research identified two main levels that affect retention, namely organisational and job level. On the organisational level, factors include management, environment, social support and development and on a job level, autonomy, workload, pay decisions, opportunity and work-life balance.

A qualitative study done by Davis (2013) identified the following major themes in retention: “employee compensation, supportive working environment, recognition, opportunities for advancement, tools to perform job, friendly, supportive co-workers, rewarding work, caring employers, employee perception of management and Leadership traits”. Similarly, Ghapanchi and Aurum (2011) categorised retention factors into five main categories, namely individual attributes, job related factors, psychological factors, environmental factors and organisational factors. The organisational factors are those related to individuals’ perceptions of their organisation, which are of importance to this research. They are remuneration and benefit, organisational practices and human resource practices. Griffiths, Royse, Culver, Piescher, & Zhang (2017) found that workplace factors
such as workload, recognition, peer support, supervision, sense of accomplishment, and professional development opportunities do matter to retention of employees.

In reviewing the literature on employee retention, a common thread runs throughout. However, each body of work builds its own theoretical framework without categorising or condensing the elements. The literature lacks in formulating a holistic strategy as to what organisations can do in retaining employees once they are employed.

2.2.7 Teacher Retention

The current literature of teacher retention follows the same trend as retention literature in general in that is limited. The focus of research on teacher retention is based on attrition and the mediating factors. Studies have shown that the following variables have a significant influence on attrition: student behaviour (Grissom et al 2015), working conditions (Boyd, Grossman, Ing, Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2010), compensation, teaching experience, a safe working environment, supportive administration, and involved parents (Akhtar et al., 2010), feeling of belonging, supervisory support and relations with colleagues (Akhtar et al., 2010), teacher autonomy and burnout (Akhtar et al., 2010), school leadership (Shaw & Newton, 2014) relationship with senior staff and praise and recognition for their work (Newton, 2017), teacher characteristics, salaries and teacher workloads (Hughes, 2012).

Research done by Schaefer (2013), suggested that there are two main ways to conceptualise teacher attrition. The first is to understand the problem by focusing on the individual teacher. Age, gender, educational background, etc., are mediating factors. The second is to examine the organisational contexts in which the teacher’s works.

A recent survey on teachers and former teachers by Newton, (2017), showed that the most likely group to leave the profession are women aged 30 to 39 and teachers within their first 15 years of their career. Newton’s research also showed that 46% of teachers who intended to stay, stated that good relationships with senior staff and rewards and recognition played a key role.

In Harfitt’s (2015) research on “From attrition to retention of new teachers”, it was found that contextual factors, and support mechanisms play a vital role in retention. He also
found that the impact of teacher stress was nullified eliminated by the schools’ eagerness to manage these responsibilities through supervisor support.

The research done on “Teachers intention to stay in Teaching” Battle and Looney (2012), found that intrinsic-attainment value (i.e. enjoyment and importance) of the profession has the strongest association with intentions to remain in teaching. Phillips (2015) found that most teacher retention is driven by school conditions and that salary is not the main thing.

The teaching profession overall has a work belief that it is a calling. A calling implies that employees see their profession as socially valuable. Individuals with a calling orientation find that their work is inseparable from their life and that what they do professionally contributes to the greater good (Janik & Rothmann, 2015). According to Willemse and Deacon (2015), when teachers have a calling orientation, they perceive their work as meaningful and impact the greater good.

In summary, the review of the literature on retention has shown the apparent overlap across professions. The review of the literature also helped to differentiate the concepts of attrition and retention as it relates to influencing factors identified in research. However, despite the overlap in the professions, the literature review has shown that there are education-specific factors that can influence the retention of teachers; therefore, additional research in this field is warranted.

2.2.8 Intent to Stay

Intention to stay is an important construct that interest’s organisations, given its positive association with employee retention. Intention to stay refers to an employee’s tendency to continue working for an organisation. Cardy and Lengnick-Hall's (2011) research showed that several variable’s that affect an employee’s intention to stay. This has been supported by the literature review, which provides evidence that various factors have been shown to positively correlate with intention to stay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Lawrence et al (2014), Zopiatis et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression</td>
<td>Dabke &amp; Patole (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Rewards</td>
<td>Kwenin, Muathe, &amp; Nzulwa, (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Communication</td>
<td>Brown, Fraser, Wong, Muise, &amp; Cummins, (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Hussein, Moriarty, Stevens, Sharpe, &amp; Manthorpe, (2014), Lawrence et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane, &amp; Ferreira, (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Supervisor Support</td>
<td>Dabke &amp; Patole (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>McGilton et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Arnup &amp; Bowles (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>Anderson (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-family Balance</td>
<td>Butts, Casper, &amp; Yang, (2013), Kim (2014), Mehta et al. (2014),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Factors that positively correlate with intention to stay

2.2.9 Perceived Organisational Support (POS)

POS is defined as “employees’ beliefs concerning the extent to which the organisation values their contribution and cares about their well-being” (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson & Sowa, 1986). The research literature reviewed supports that POS is related to numerous positive outcomes for both the organisation and the individual including commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour, retention in the organisation, and job satisfaction (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003; Blackmore & Kuntz., 2011; Iqbal & Hashmi, 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). It is therefore essential that the level of employees POS be constantly reviewed.

Through POS, organisations acknowledge that they are aware of the employees’ contribution to the organisation, that they care about their well-being and that they value working with them. Research has shown that POS motivates employees and makes them feel obligated to reciprocate to the organisation. It plays an essential role in the employee’s overall well-being as it meets their intrinsic emotional needs of feeling respected, accepted, approved off and valued (Dursun, 2015). Employees who experience high levels of POS will be unlikely to look for employment elsewhere and will show loyalty to the organisation by remaining (Liu & Lui, 2016).
According to van Schalkwyk and Els (2011), POS is positively related to retention. It can therefore be assumed that POS is negatively associated with intentions to leave the organisation. POS has received a lot of attention by scholars and practitioners (Caesens, Marique, Hanin, & Stinglhamber, 2015) as numerous research studies are showing that it has positive results on both the employee as well as the organisation. However recent studies have focused on and found evidence of a significant relationship between POS and important work antecedents.

The bulk of the research done on POS is linked to organisational trust, organisational commitment, engagement and job satisfaction and has been done in the fields of psychology, business, health, tourism etc. The literature on POS relating to Human Resource practices is however lacking in evidence indicating how organisations should improve employee POS as a means of retention.

In the absence of direct rewards, specifically in schools, POS will allow organisations to implement measures to increase the level of POS thus increasing retention. Therefore, the determinants of POS should be constantly analysed to introduce measures to increase the level of POS. Table 1 below shows current research on POS in relation to various organisational outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Outcome</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Engagement</td>
<td>(Eisenberger, Malone &amp; Presson, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Zhong, Wayne &amp; Liden, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>(Kim, Eisenberger &amp; Baik, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Marique, Stinglhamber, Desmette, Caesens, &amp; De Zanet, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Work Outcomes</td>
<td>(Shen, Jackson, Ding, Yuan, Zhao, Dou &amp; Zhang, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Riggle, Edmondson &amp; Hansen, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>(Madden, Mathias &amp; Madden, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chen &amp; Eldridge, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Behaviour</td>
<td>(Caesens, Marique, Hanin &amp; Stinglhamber, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Wayne, Shore, Bommer, &amp; Tetrick, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>(Miao, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kurtessis et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>(Watt, &amp; Hargis, 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Features of Perceived Organisational Support

Rhoades and Eisenberger (2016) indicated that three general categories of favourable treatment received by employees are positively related to POS namely:

➢ Fairness of treatment (Procedural justice in performance appraisal, providing opportunity to voice concerns etc.)

➢ Supervisor support (Leader-Member Exchange, work-family culture, perceived supervisor support etc.)

➢ Rewards and Recognition (remuneration, growth opportunities etc.)

Supporting Rhoades and Eisenberger's research, Kumar (2014), in his study on factors influencing POS, supported their finding that POS fell into three broad categories namely: fairness, leader-member exchange and reward and job conditions. He further stated that organisational commitment, job satisfaction, task performance and intention to stay are consequences of POS.

2.4 Theories that support POS

2.4.1 Organisational Support Theory

According to Organisational Support Theory, employees develop a perception in terms of the degree to which the organisation appreciates their contribution and in concerned about their welfare. (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Wayne et al., 2002). POS is a fundamental idea within the Organisational Support Theory. It develops in employees as a result of specific strategies developed by the organisation, as well as the organisations attitude towards it employees. (Eisenberger et al., 1986)

2.4.2 Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory was first introduced in 1964 by Blau. Wayne et al. (2002) stated that the Social Exchange Theory “provides a basis for understanding the contribution that organisations and managers play in creating feelings of employee obligation and pro-organisational behaviours.” Social exchange relationships tend to involve the exchange
of socio-emotional benefits as opposed to economic (Wayne et al., 2002). Social Exchange relationships involve a series of relations between two people where one repays the good of the other in the form of resources. The extent of the exchange is strongly influenced by strength of the relationship between the two parties. (Cropanzano, Anthony, Daniels, & Hall, 2017). Social exchange relationships progress when employers “take care of employees,” which in turn will lead to beneficial consequences. (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005)

A Social Exchange relationship is associated with a personal emotional attachment; the relations are informal and transparent. When employees develop these social exchange relationships with their organisations and supervisors, their performance increases and their intent to leave reduces. (Wayne et al., 2002)

A key component of Social Exchange Theory that is central to the POS and LME literature is the “norm of reciprocity.” It suggests that employees who are treated favourably by others feel a sense of obligation to respond positively or return the favourable treatment in a positive manner. The social exchange relationship can exist between employee and organisations, employee and supervisor.

Social Exchange Theory supports the POS literature research findings by stating that employees who perceive that they are receiving a high level of organisational support feel obliged to reciprocate through positive attitudes and behaviours (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990) with the most essential behaviour being through continued participation. Employees who receive more support from the organisation would have less desire to leave the organisation.

2.4.3 Social Support Theory

Social support plays a critical role in assisting employees in coping with stressful work situations, resulting in improved employee outcomes. (Ng & Sorensen, 2008). Social Support Theory states that emotional support; tangible support; Informational support and appraisal support positively influence employee behaviour. Instrumental support is related to the exchange of resources and forms of tangible help and services, emotional support includes the encouragement of and personal care for others. Informational support relates
to the sharing of information, whereas appraisal support is important in terms of receiving feedback and affirmation. (Ng & Sorensen, 2008).

Celep and Yilmazturk’s (2012) research findings into social support theory, has supported the theory, in that it shows that employees receiving strong emotional support are more likely to display positive organisational behaviours. Studies have linked social support with increased job satisfaction, satisfaction with the organisation, reduced employee turnover, enhanced performance, and increased likelihood of achieving organisational goals (Jin, McDonald, & Park, 2016), (Meglich, Mihelic, & Zupan, 2016).

2.4.4 Equity Theory

Equity theory is concerned with people’s perceptions of the way that they are treated compared to others. Employees look for equity between their job-related input and the outcome they receive from it. A perception inequity leads to various actions which could include leaving the organisation, including intentions to quit (Chinyio, 2016).

Equity theory suggests that when employees feel that they are being unfairly rewarded, they shown signs of work related stress. This will result in negative behaviour and ultimately, they may quit. (Ramlall, 2004).

In conclusion, all the above theories suggest that the favourable behaviour of employees, the sense of belonging, feelings of obligation and welfare about the organisation are outcomes from providing POS. The on-the-job dynamic involves more than individual factors, but includes the relationships that are created and perpetuated through the organisation by leaders and co-workers. Therefore, it is imperative to research and understand how the constructs of POS influence the retention of teachers in the unique dynamic of the education organisation.
2.5 Proposed Theoretical Framework

Factors of POS that lead to increased retention of teachers

- Procedural justice (Equity Theory)
- Leader Member Exchange (Social Exchange Theory)
- Organisational Rewards and Job Conditions (Social Support Theory)

![Figure 1 Theoretical Framework](image)

2.5.1 Procedural Justice

The procedural justice theory was first introduced by Thibaut and Walker (1975) in their research on how individuals reacted to dispute resolution procedures. Procedural justice theory is concerned with judgements about a process or the way in which decisions about allocations are made. Their research focused mainly on legal procedures.

Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, (1980) broadened the concept of procedural justice to include non-legal contexts in organisations. By doing so, they expanded the list of determinants of procedural justice beyond the idea of process control. Their theory of procedural justice focused on six procedural criteria that need to be met, before that process can be deemed fair, namely:
I. Procedures should be applied consistently across time and people
II. Procedures must be free from bias
III. Ensure that accurate information is gathered and used in the decision-making process
IV. Have procedures in place to correct inaccurate decisions
V. Conform to personal standards of ethics
VI. Ensure that opinions of groups directly affected are considered

Colquitt and Rodell (2015) built on this concept by adding that the following procedural justice rules must apply to deem a procedure fair:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Control</td>
<td>Procedures provide opportunity for voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Control</td>
<td>Procedures provide influence over outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Procedures are consistent across persons and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Suppression</td>
<td>Procedures are neutral and unbiased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Procedures are based on accurate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctability</td>
<td>Procedures offer opportunities for appeal and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Procedures take into account concerns of subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethicality</td>
<td>Procedures uphold standards of morality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedural justice is concerned with the process of fairness that allocates resources and resolves organisational disputes. Colquitt, & Rodell, (2015) defined procedural justice as “the fairness of the decision-making process resulting in a particular outcome.” Eisenberger et al. (1990) suggested that positive discretionary activities by the organisation that benefitted the employee, would be perceived as evidence that the organisation cared about the employees wellbeing.

Employees are very sensitive to the perception of justice and injustice in the workplace and are inclined to express their reactions to it, in significant ways either positively and negatively. Perceptions of procedural injustice have been linked to intentions to quit. (Al-Salemi, 2013). Research has shown that employees will accept a negative outcome, if
they are of the belief that the process was fair, consistent, accurate and that they had a voice (Colquitt & Zipay, 2015). If employees believe that the process was unfair, they become dissatisfied with the outcome and perceive the entire system as unfair, which could lead to an intention to quit (Al-Salemi, 2013). Dailey and Kirk (1992) formulated that compared to those who believe that their organisations’ decision-making processes are unfair, those who perceive them to be fair, lower turnover intentions.

Procedural justice perceptions play a significant role in shaping the employees’ relationships with their employers and thus affect their attitudes (Jawad, Raja, Abraiz, & Mailk, 2012). Procedural justice has be shown to have significant positive influences on employees organisational commitment behaviour (Cheng, 2014; Nakra, 2014), citizenship behaviour (Ajala, 2016), and on job satisfaction (Xerri, 2014). Zhang et al., (2017) provided further evidence that an individual’s perception of procedural fairness has a distinct effect on their attitudes and behaviour. Pignata’s (2016) research on Predictors of Perceived Procedural Justice in Australian University Staff found that employees who are fairly treated, are more likely to engage in organisational citizen behaviour, have a good relationship with their supervisor and have high levels of affective commitment to their organisation.

In a study done by Al-kilani (2017), he found that in order to maintain a low rate of employees’ turnover, managers must enhance employees’ perceptions of all three elements of organisational justice (Procedural, Distributive, Interactional Justice), to improve employees’ retention. POS mediates perceptions of procedural justice and organisational citizenship behaviour. Eisenberger et al., (1986) proposed that POS is influenced by the different ways in which an employee is treated by the organisation, which in turn would influence the employees understanding of the organisational motives behind the treatment.

Since research has shown that procedural justice perceptions can shape the employee-employer relationship and in turn retention, it is important to focus on the employees’ perceptions of procedural justice in schools. By doing this, strategies can be implemented to address uncertainty in employees’ perceptions of procedural justice and improve retention.
2.5.2 Leader Member Exchange (LME)

LME theory has developed considerably over the past 40 years. LME measures the extent to which an employee perceives that they are being supported by their immediate supervisor rather than by the overall organisation. While POS refers to the overall support an employee feels from the organisation, LME reflects the quality of the relationship employees have with a supervisor with whom they have direct contact. The quality of LME relationship has a strong effect on POS. LME as well as POS are both based on social exchange theory.

LME is a more personal relationship than POS and is influenced directly by the supervisor’s behaviour, values and leadership style. The supervisor acts as agent for the organisation and is in control of discretionary rewards and is responsible for evaluating the employees’ contribution. The treatment the employee receives from his / her supervisor is key to POS as this contributes to the employee’s perception of support from the organisation. The relationship between the leader and employee affects performance as well as the relationship between employee and the organisation.

An employee’s immediate supervisor has a certain amount of control over the organisations resources. They play a significant role in determining salary increases, bonuses, training opportunities, promotions, career advice, emotional support and critical information. High quality leader-member exchanges have critical benefits. LME researchers have confirmed a positive correlation between supervisors and subordinates relationships on employee performance, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, employee retention, innovative behaviour and creativity. (Altunoğlu & Bulgurcu Gürel, 2015)

Research done by Eisenberger et al., (2010) on LME, identified a positive relationship between the employees behaviour and the reactions to LME. These included an increase in intrinsic motivation, reduced fatigue, and a most importantly for this research, a decrease in turnover. More recent studies have highlighted the importance of LME on several positive follower outcomes, namely job performance, commitment, job satisfaction and intention to stay (Dulebohn, Bommer, Liden, Brouer, & Ferris, 2012; Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, Epitropaki, 2016; Restubog, Bordia, Tang, & Krebs, 2010). Dabke & Patole (2014) research on professionals from a leading Indian ITES company
who were deployed at client site in the BFSI sector, found that LME was a very critical factor in determining Intention to Stay. In summary, the type of LME relationship can influence the subordinate’s perceptions of organisational support either positively or negatively.

2.5.3 Organisational Rewards and Recognition
Agarwal, (2013) defines rewards and recognition as "something that is given by an organisation to an employee in response to the employee’s actions, and is something which is desirable to the employee." The term reward is rarely defined in the literature; however, it seems to entail all the actions the organisation does to recognise an employee’s achievements and to further motivate them.

There are two types of rewards, namely intrinsic and extrinsic, which fulfil employee’s needs. Intrinsic rewards are directly related to the job, such as variety, challenge, self-sufficiency, working conditions, personal growth, skills development and promotion. Employees like to see the part they play within the organisation and how they are contributing to something larger than themselves. This is specifically relevant to employees that perceive their career as a calling. Extrinsic rewards consist of remuneration, in the form of wages and fringe benefits, promotion within the organisation, the social climate, and physical working conditions (Chiang & Birtch, 2012).

With the change in the economic climate, many organisations are forced to change the format of rewards and recognition. They can include: employee recognition, non-monetary incentives, and intrinsic rewards. Employee recognition is essential as employees have a need to be valued and respected. Recognition has shown to improve employee productivity, loyalty, satisfaction and retention (Danish & Usman, 2010).

According to Chiang and Birch (2012) recognition is a form of a non-financial reward. It develops self-worth as it is perceived as an intrinsic motivator. Praise and acknowledgement are also non-financial rewards and are examples of social recognition. (Handgraaf, Michel, Van Lidth de Jeude, & Appelt, 2013).

Ngobeni and Bezuidenhout’s (2011) research into "Retention in South African Higher Educational Institutions", found that insufficient employee recognition was linked to lower
employee engagement and higher turnover intentions. In support of the above, Imna and Hassan, (2015) found in their research that reward and compensation practices have significant and positive influences on employee retention

Extrinsic Rewards. According to Warburton, Moore and Clune (2014), extrinsic factors refer to factors that the organisation has direct control over. They can therefore be manipulated by management to enhance employee retention. The literature is very clear in that salary plays a key role in the retention of employees. It attracts and retains employees, especially high performing employees. (Warburton et al., 2014) (Poudel, 2016). Kwenin et al., (2013) found that the influence of employee rewards and human resource policies on employee retention in Vodafone Ghana Limited provided strong evidence of the relationship between employee rewards, job satisfaction and employee retention.

2.6 Conclusion

The purpose of this research study is to explore the various constructs of POS and to study which of these constructs has the greatest influence on the retention of teachers. An overview of factors influencing employee retention was provided, both in the broad organisational setting as well as specific to the educational setting. Additionally, an overview of the theory POS as well as the supporting theories of social exchange, social support, and equity theory were provided to demonstrate the complexity of the relationship dynamics within organisations; therefore, it is essential to look beyond individual factors and identify influencing factors controlled by the organisation. Finally, the proposed theoretical framework was discussed in which the concepts of procedural justice, leader-member exchange, and organisational rewards were presented.

Empirical research points towards a noteworthy relationship between POS and retention. Further research will provide more insight into the relationship, enabling organisations to retain scarce human capital resources. Organisations are dynamic and the school’s systems within the field of education are not different. As a result, conducting a study such as this in which the organisational dynamics are examined as it relates to teachers in South Africa is beneficial due to the scarcity of this type of research in the field of education as well as in this specific geographic location.
3 Chapter 3: Research Hypothesis

3.1 Introduction
The purpose of this research study is to explore the various constructs of POS and to study which of the POS constructs have the greatest influence on the retention of teachers in South Africa. To accomplish this research study, a predictive analysis was conducted using data gathered from surveys. The theories used to support this study are organisational support theory, social exchange theory, social support theory, and equity theory. The following research questions were used to guide this research:

RQ1: What is the relationship between teacher retention and perceived organisational support?

RQ2: Which constructs of POS have the greatest impact on teacher retention?

For RQ1, the predictor variable is POS and the outcome variable teacher retention. For RQ2, the predictor variables are the constructs that form POS: leader-member exchange, procedural justice, and organisational rewards and recognition. The outcome variable is teacher retention. Data was analysed using factor analysis, multiple regression and analysis of variance.

3.2 Hypotheses
Based on the research questions presented, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1:

- $H_01$: There is no relationship between POS and teacher retention.
- $H_{a1}$: There is a positive relationship between POS and teacher retention.

Hypothesis 2:

- $H_02$: There is no relationship between organisational rewards and recognition and teacher retention.
- $H_{a2}$: There is a positive relationship between organisational rewards and recognition and teacher retention.
Hypothesis 3:
- $H_0^3$: There is no relationship between procedural justice and teacher retention.
- $H_a^3$: There is a positive relationship between procedural justice and teacher retention.

Hypothesis 4:
- $H_0^4$: There is no relationship between leader-member exchange and teacher retention.
- $H_a^4$: There is a positive relationship between leader-member exchange and teacher retention.

Hypothesis 5:
- $H_0^5$: There is no relationship between demographic variables and teacher retention.
- $H_a^5$: There is a positive relationship between demographic variables and teacher retention.

3.3 Conclusion

The purpose of this research study is to explore the various constructs of POS and to study which of the POS constructs have the greatest influence on the retention of teachers in South Africa. In this chapter, the method of analysis and variables of analysis were identified. Additionally, hypotheses were presented which align with the research questions and guide the data analysis. The next chapter will describe the research methodology used to conduct this study.
4 Chapter 4: Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter included the discussion of the methodology used in this study. These included the discussion of the research philosophy, research design and type, population and sampling, the definition of the unit of analysis, sampling method and size, the research instrument, the details of how the data was collected and the process of data analysis. The limitation of the method was also specified.

4.2 Research Philosophy

The research proposal followed the Interpretivist philosophy. The interpretivist approach sees reality as subjective, based on meaning and understanding (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). In other words, it tries to understand the world as it is from a subjective individual’s perspective. Interpretivism is related to the study of social phenomena in a work organisation, which relates directly back to the research topic of the impact of POS on retention of teachers. Interpretivism is also a recommended approach in the field of Human Resource Management (Saunders & Lewis, 2012) which retention and POS falls into.

According to Dr Bhattacherjee, in his book Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, And Practices, he states that in interpretivism, “the constructs of interest need not be known in advance, but may emerge from the data as the research progresses” (Commons, 2012). As the goal of this research was to understand which attribute of POS has the strongest relationship in terms of retention, rather than making predictions, the interpretivist approach seems applicable.

4.3 Research Design and Type

A research design is defined as a procedural plan that will be implemented by the researcher to answer questions validly, objectively, accurately and economically (Kumar, 2014). The research design is always formulated by the research questions. A descriptive research design which was deductive in approach is deemed most appropriate.
Descriptive research, as defined as a “research designed to produce an accurate representations of persons events or situations” (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). The factors being considered in this research were events or situations

This research was also a correlational research, where a variance in one variable will show a variance in the other (Creswell, 2008). The research is trying to establish the correlation and variance between the POS factors and retention and to calculate which one could have the greatest effect.

Although we are looking for an explanation behind a particular occurrence, through the discovery of causal relationships between two variables (Saunders & Lewis, 2012), this research topic is not explanatory. This research topic is described as descriptive through *ex post-facto* analysis. This simply means that the event or social factors happened prior to the research analysis (Simon & Goes, 2013).

The study type was quantitative, based on deductive reasoning which tends to move from the general to the specific. A quantitative approach is concerned with measuring existing constructs (Creswell, 2008). This research used a quantitative research method as it is concerned with constructs or POS attributes that are defined in existing theory and are therefore measurable. The theoretical questions were tested. An advantage of quantitative research is that it can be applied to a large sample, producing results that can be generalised beyond the study.

The following five stages occurred: 1) Defining the research questions from current theory, 2) operationalizing the questions, 3) seeking answers to the questions in stage 1, 4) analysing the results to see if it supports the theory or if modified suggestions to the theory needs to be made, and 5) Confirm or modify the initial theory.

### 4.4 Population and Sampling

The definition of a research population is “the complete set of group members” (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). The target population that was used for this study is employed academic staff currently teaching at schools in South Africa. According to the Department of Education’s most current statistic, 450,000 teachers were employed in 2014 (DOE, 2016).
4.5 Unit of Analysis

This is one of the most important steps in the research design. The unit of analysis is defined as those who will you use to answer your quantitative research in this study. In other words, the people whose characteristics the researcher will observe, describe, or explain. On a micro-level, it will be the individual teachers currently employed at schools in South African and at a macro-level it will be the schools themselves (Neuman, 2014). The unit of analysis in this study was employed teachers who expressed their perceptions of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ.

4.6 Sampling Method and Size

The reason for selecting a sample is that it is not practical or possible to collect data from the entire population. The research sampling method followed the non-probability technique, which is where the respondents are selected based on selection by non-random means. The sampling technique used was snowballing sampling.

A snowballing sampling technique is defined as getting cases using referrals from one or a few cases, then referrals from those cases, and so forth (Neuman, 2014). This technique was used, as there was no easy access to the populations email addresses. It also facilitated attaining as much variation as possible within the sample (Creswell, 2012).

The main feature of snowballing is that each person relates to another through linkage. Snowball sampling is a multistage technique as it starts with one or two people and spreads out. This is a good technique to use in the academic world, as it is relatively interconnected, and teachers are altruistic in nature and will cooperate with the instructions given to assist the researcher. The advantages are the possibility to collect primary data in a cost-effective manner. The disadvantages are that it is usually impossible to determine the sampling error or make inferences about populations based on the obtained sample.

To avoid sampling error, all teachers currently employed were invited to participate in the study. To mitigate the sampling error, surveys were distributed electronically via online
teacher networks on LinkedIn and Facebook, as well as being emailed to gather data on a national level.

As a quantitative and deductive research approach, the sample size should be large to have a representative sample of the wider population (Creswell, 2008). A large sample size is important in this research to make inferences from the study. The required number of sample size for the study is determined by conducting a power analysis using the G*Power software. The sample size is calculated based on Cohen’s effect size, the level of significance (alpha level), and the power of the study, which is the likelihood of rejecting a false null hypothesis. A power of 0.80 is normally used in quantitative researches to provide valid statistical results (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2009). A medium effect size was used in the power analysis so that it was not be both strict and lenient. *A priori* power analysis was conducted considering the statistical test of linear regression analysis with four predictors (POS, LME, RR, and PJ), a statistical power of 0.8, a medium effect size of 0.15, and a level of significance of 0.05. The computed sample size requirement from the power analysis is 55 samples (See Appendix A). A minimum of 55 samples of employed academic staff currently teaching at schools in South Africa should be collected for this study. The final sample collected was 189 samples, which was more than the 55-minimum requirement.

4.7 Data Collection

The data is quantitative, making use of both categorical and numerical data. Categorical data is defined as data that has been grouped into a descriptive set or put in rank order making use of ordinal and nominal data (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

The research time dimension was cross-sectional research. This approach has been selected due to the nature and time constraints of the MBA dissertation. In a cross-sectional research design, data is collected as a once off in a certain period of time, commonly known as a snapshot (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). A cross-sectional study is used as an opinion poll by means of a survey strategy, producing quantitative results. This approach is suitable to the study as a quantitative, descriptive approach is being taken, making use of a self-administered questionnaire (Creswell, 2008). Cross-sectional studies
are also commonly used when explaining the relationship between certain variables. In this research, the variables would be POS and its constructs and retention.

The category questions are descriptive and were coded. A Likert-type scale was used for the questions that make use of ordinal data, where respondents are asked questions to explain the likelihood of a phenomenon. It featured five possible anchors, including strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). The numerical data questions made use of discrete and continuous data.

A structured self-administered survey questionnaire was created using Survey Monkey. It is a web-based survey tool that enables the collection of online responses. The link was emailed to teachers, and made accessible via online teacher forums where teachers could access the survey immediately and complete it online.

Surveys are recommended tools for measuring a range of unobservable data. This could include people’s preferences, traits, attitudes, perceptions, behaviours or information. Since we are measuring individual’s perceptions, this technique is suitable. The survey format of gathering data is a popular instrument used in business and management research (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). Surveys are thought to be quick, easy to distribute and to understand. They are flexible; cost effective and an efficient and accurate means of collecting data.

For this research, the ability to respond at one’s convenience whilst remaining anonymous, questionnaire surveys were the most convenient for the respondents, namely teachers. They have busy schedules, so they could complete it in their own time. The survey questionnaire allowed access to a greater sample size as it was forwarded to many respondents via email and social media using the snowballing effect across multiple geographic areas of the country.

Informed consent was obtained from the individual respondents at the start of the survey. This ensured their full cooperation in the study. The privacy and confidentiality of the individuals who participate in the study was protected. Obtaining informed consent was conducted before the participants administer the survey. An informed consent form was presented in the online link before the survey questionnaire.
Specific techniques were used to increase the response rate. Prior to sending out the questionnaire, social media platforms and word of mouth was used to introduce the research topic. LinkedIn was used to network with numerous teachers’ months before the survey was distributed.

The survey was designed to identify which antecedents of POS influenced (positively or negatively) the retention of teachers (Appendix B). The survey included population demographics, the 8 item scale developed by Eisenberger et Al. (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986), and additional questions consisting of three parts: Organisational rewards and conditions, leader-member exchange, and Fairness in procedural justice. The questions included are of a reflective measure. The scales of measurement were nominal, ordinal and interval. The last section contained items related to retention. Attitudinal scales were used to find out the attitude of respondents towards an issue. A 5-point Likert scales was used to respond to each of the survey questions.

Variables of interest. The variables of interest for this research are as follows:

➢ Demographic variables: gender, age, marital status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure.
➢ Perception of the supervisor-employee relationship / Leader-member exchange (LME).
➢ Perceived Organisational support (POS)
➢ Procedural Justice (PJ)
➢ Retention/Intent to stay (ITS)
➢ Rewards and Recognition (RR)

4.8 Data Coding

Once the data had been cleaned, the data was coded. Numerical symbols were assigned to categorical questions to allow for the transfer to statistical software. The demographic variables of gender, marital status, age, length of tenure, qualification, and type of school were coded as nominal-scale categorical data. Likert scales were used to record responses for retention, perceived organisational support, leader-member exchange, rewards and recognition, and procedural justice. Then, composite scores for each of the
study variables were obtained by getting the average scores of each of the responses on each question items measuring a particular study variable, making these study variables as interval data. Some items of the POS (POS2, POS3, and POS7) were first reverse coded before creating the composite scores. The specific codebook of each study variables is shown in Appendix D.

4.9 Measurement Instrument

4.9.1 Demographic Variables

These were used as control variables in the multiple regression analysis. The demographic variables included gender, marital status, age, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. They were selected based on previous research which indicated their importance in the retention of employees (Agyeman & Ponniah, 2014; Kurtessis et al., 2015).

4.9.2 Intent to Stay Scale

Retention, the dependent variable, was measured using the four-item Intention to Stay Scale developed by Mitchel (1981). The reliability of this scale was reported at a Cronbach's alpha of 0.75, which showed acceptable internal consistency reliability. The scales were measured using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

4.9.3 8-item Survey of Perceived Organisational Support

Perceived organisational support, an independent variable, was measured by using the 8-item survey of POS by Eisenberger et al (1986). Sample items are “My organisation really cares about my well-being” and “Help is available from my organisation when I have a problem.” Eisenberger and Sowa (1986) report a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.93, which showed very good internal consistency reliability. The scales were measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).
4.9.4 Leader-Member Exchange Version 7 (LME-7) Questionnaire

The perception of the quality of the relationship of the employee with their direct supervisor as perceived by the employee, an independent variable, was measured using the Leader-Member Exchange Version 7 (LME-7) instrument (Wayne et al., 2002). The scales of LME-8 were based on a 5-point Likert scale with different scaling for each of the seven questions. The total scores of each LME-7 question must be summed. The total indicates the quality of the relationship: 30-35 = very high; 25-29 = high; 20-24 = moderate; 15-19 = low; and 7-14 = very low. The LME-7 has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.92 which showed very good internal consistency reliability.

4.9.5 Scale of Procedural Justice

Questions related to procedural justice, an independent variable, were taken from the study by Al-zu’bi, (2010), developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this scale in Western studies was 0.90 which also showed very good internal consistency reliability. The scales of procedural justice were based on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

4.9.6 Rewards and Recognition

Rewards and recognition, an independent variable, was measured with a 10-item scale. The scales were based on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Questions were based on De Beer (1987), selecting the following categories of reward and recognition: Payment (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.86), promotion (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.84), recognition (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.90), and working conditions (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77). The different Cronbach’s alpha all showed very good internal consistency reliabilities for all categories.

4.10 Data Analysis

Quantitative research produces a large amount of responses which will need to be analysed before any conclusions can be drawn (Zikmund, Babin, Carr, & Griffin, 2010). It needed to be converted into an appropriate format to conduct an analysis. The data
extracted from Survey Monkey was exported in an excel format, which is compatible with statistical software packages. SPSS software was used to analyse the data as it is widely available and a powerful statistical package. There were 189 responses exported.

Inferential statistical tests were run to access the significance of the individual research questions. The dependent variable is retention and the independent variables are perceived organisational support, leader-member exchange, rewards and recognition, and procedural justice.

4.10.1 Standard Deviation Analysis

The first step in the data analysis was to calculate the standard deviation among the responses in each survey item and to remove data that did not have a standard deviation of more than 30%. This would indicate if identical answers were selected.

4.10.2 Missing Value Analysis

A missing value analysis helps address several concerns caused by incomplete data as the results can be misleading. According to Hair et al. (2010), anything above 10% has poor data integrity. Respondents missing more than 10% of their responses were eliminated from the results.

4.10.3 Outlier Investigation

The next step was to identify and remove any possible outliers. According to Hair et al., (2010), “responses with characteristics identifiable as distinctly different from the other observations are outliers”. Univariate outlier detection examined if cases had observations at the outer ranges of the distribution. For sample sizes larger than 80, the threshold value of standardised score is 4.0 (Hair et al., 2010). This study has a sample size of over 100 (189) and thus this threshold was adopted. Multiple regression analysis is sensitive to outliers. Outliers were identified in the research and removed as previously mentioned.
4.10.4 Sample Demographics

Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to summarise the data of the demographic variables of gender, age, marital status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. Since all the demographic variables were categorically measured, they were represented using frequency and percentage summaries. Graphical summaries using bar graphs and pie charts of the demographic variables were also created.

4.10.5 Construct Validity and Reliability Investigation

The next step in the data analysis was to test the validity and reliability of the constructs. A principle component factor analysis and internal consistency reliability analysis were conducted to test the construct validity and reliability of the different instruments measuring the study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ.

First, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted using principal components as the means of extraction and Varimax as the method of orthogonal rotation. Factor analysis provided the tools for analysing correlations among many items and by defining sets of items (factors) that were highly correlated (Hair et al., 2010), while orthogonal rotation was used to simplify the rows and columns of a factor matrix to facilitate interpretation. The Varimax orthogonal rotational method has proven successful as an analytic approach in obtaining a rotation of factors (Hair et al., 2010). In interpreting the factors, only a loading of 0.40 or greater on the factor have been considered and included as scales of the study variable. After dropping those items with loading of less than 0.40, a stable solution emerged. Another statistic created in the exploratory factor analysis is a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test which is a measure of how suited your data is for Factor Analysis. The test measures sampling adequacy for each variable in the model as well as for the complete model. KMO values between 0.8 and 1 indicate the sampling is adequate.

Next, the internal consistency reliability of all survey questionnaires measuring the different study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were investigated. A Cronbach’s Alpha statistic was used to determine the internal consistency reliability. A Cronbach’s Alpha score of 0.70 to 1 is reflective of acceptable internal consistency reliability (Zikmund et al., 2010).
4.10.6 Descriptive Statistics Analysis of Study Variables

Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarise the scores of the different study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ. Since all of these study variables were measured using continuous scales, the central tendency measures of mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values were used to summarise the various constructs.

4.10.7 Test of Difference of Required Assumption of Parametric Statistical Analysis

Before conducting the different parametric statistical analysis of independent sample t-test, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis, the different required assumptions of these tests should be first satisfied. First, the variables should be measured at the continuous level (interval or ordinal variables). Second, the data of the different study variables should be normally distributed. Skewness and kurtosis statistics and histogram plots should be investigated to assess normality of the dataset of the dependent variable. To determine whether the data follows normal distribution, skewness statistics greater than three indicate strong non-normality and kurtosis statistics between 10 and 20 also indicate non-normality (Kline, 2005). Third, there needs to be a linear relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. A scatterplot was created to show the graph of independent variable versus dependent variable. There should be a linear pattern (positive or negative) to exhibit linearity. Fourth, assumption is homoscedasticity. This was tested using Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance. The p-value of the Levene’s test should be greater than the level of significance value of 0.05 to show homoscedasticity meaning that the variance of the dependent variable should be equal or homogenous across the different independent variables. Last assumption is that the different independent variables should not be multicollinear in predicting the dependent variables. The collinearity statistics of tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) were created to test multicollinearity. VIF values below 10 and tolerance values well above 0.2 would show that there is no collinearity within the data (Field, 2005).

4.10.8 Test of Difference of Study Variables by Demographic Variables

Different tests of difference were conducted to determine whether the different study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the
differences of demographic variables of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. First, an independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether the scores of the study variables were significantly across differences of gender. An independent sample t-test is a statistical analysis used to compare the means between two unrelated population means in the case of two samples. A t-test was conducted to measure the magnitude of the statistically significant differences in the scores in each of the study variable between two gender groups of male and female. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the independent sample t-test. There is a significant difference in the scores if the p-value of the t-statistic is less than or equal to the level of significance value. Mean comparison was conducted if there were significant differences observed.

Second, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether the scores of the study variables were significantly across differences of age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. An ANOVA is used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of two or more independent (unrelated) groups. The dependent variables were scores of retention, POS, LME, RR, and PJ. The independent variables were the demographics of age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure which have more than three categories. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. There is a significant difference in the scores if the p-value of the F-statistic of the ANOVA is less than or equal to the level of significance value.

4.10.9 Multiple Regression Analysis

Next, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to address the research question of the study determine the impact of the different independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ on the dependent variable of teacher retention. The effects of the demographic characteristics of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure were controlled in the regression analysis. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was specifically conducted to determine the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable while controlling the effect of the control variables. In a hierarchical multiple regression analysis, step 1 involved regressing the different demographic variables on the dependent variable because the demographic variables of
the participants cannot be changed. Thus, each of the demographic variables was treated as control variables. In Step 2, all of the independent variables were included in the regression model. If the regressions are significant, then each variable was examined to determine if that variable significantly predict the dependent variable. Then, the beta coefficients of the regression were investigated to determine the magnitude of the impacts of the independent variables on the dependent variable. A positive regression coefficient means a positive effect or relationship indicating that the dependent variable will increase if the independent variable will increase. A negative regression coefficient means a negative effect or relationship indicating that the dependent variable will decrease if the independent variable will increase. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the multiple regression analysis. There is a significant impact by the independent variable on the dependent variable if the p-value is less than or equal to the level of significance value. The null hypothesis is rejected if the p-value is significant. This would mean that the independent variables are statistically related with the dependent variable.

4.11 Limitations

The research limitations are as follows:

- The research is done in a South African social context
- The population consists of employed teachers and does not consider those that have already left the profession or organisation.
- The snowballing effect of data collection could exclude a large representative demographic of the teaching population.
- As the study is cross sectional, this only measured the effect of previously experience POS and not the lasting effect of it.
- A "snapshot" view of teachers within a limited period,
- Because of the small sample size, the findings of this study are not generalisable to the general population,
- The objectivity and influence of the researcher could be a possible limitation. The researcher is a qualified teacher, who has recently resigned due to lack of perceived organisational support.
4.12 Conclusion

Chapter 3 discussed the research methodology that was used, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis method that were used in the proposed study. This study used a quantitative, descriptive, correlational research study with the objective of exploring the various constructs of POS and to study which of the POS constructs have the greatest influence on the retention of teachers in South Africa. The dependent variable in the study was retention. The independent variables were POS, LME, RR, and PJ. The different demographic variables of gender, age, marital status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure were considered as control variables. Surveys were used to measure of each stated study variables and were administered online using Survey Monkey. Data analysis included using factor analysis, internal consistency reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis to address the research question of the study. Chapter 5 will show the findings of the data analysis and specifically expose the data’s results.
5 Chapter 5: Results

5.1 Introduction

The following chapter details the results from the various analyses, which were conducted on the sample collected to test the hypotheses in chapter 3. This chapter follows the outline of the research methodology in chapter 3. The purpose of this study was to access the hypothesised relationship between retention and POS and its constructs. The results of each research question are presented. The dependent variable was retention and the independent variables were POS, LME, RR and PJ. A more detailed analysis was conducted and presented to determine any possible relationships, using a regression analysis between the dependent and independent variables. This chapter of the study presents the summaries of the data analysis using factor analysis, Cronbach’s alpha, descriptive statistics, reliability testing, independent sample t-test, ANOVA, and multiple linear regression. SPSS Statistics was utilized to conduct the data analysis.

5.2 Standard Deviation and Missing Value Analysis

The sample frame is discussed in terms of total population included in the sample. The online survey had 189 responses of which 18 were excluded. Exclusion was determined using standard deviation and missing value analysis. First, a standard deviation was calculated among the responses to determine the exclusion. Respondents were excluded if they had a standard deviation of more than 30% as this would indicate that they did not complete the survey or simply entered the same answer for every question. None of the respondents had a standard deviation of more than 30% so all respondents were kept.

Next, a missing value analysis was conducted. Respondents missing more than 10% of their responses were eliminated from the results. According to Hair et Al (2010), anything above 10% is deemed unacceptable. There were 18 samples that have more than 10% of their responses that were missing. Thus, these 18 samples were removed.

5.3 Outlier Investigation

The next step was to identify and remove any possible outliers. As stated, univariate outlier detection examined if cases had observations at the outer ranges of the distribution.
sample sizes larger than 80, the threshold value of standardised score is 4.0 (Hair et al., 2010). The z-scores of the 171 samples did not show any extreme abnormalities in the data since the z-scores of all dataset did not exceed 4. In addition, looking at Table 7, the range of values for the composite scores of the study variables of retention (1.63 to 5), POS (1 to 5), leader-member exchange (1 to 5), rewards and recognition (1 to 5), and procedural justice (1 to 5) of the 171 samples were within the range of possible scores of 1 to 5. Thus, there were no outliers present in the dataset.

5.4 Sample Demographics

The final samples consisted of a total of 171 samples of academic staff currently teaching at schools in South Africa. The tabular summaries of the demographic information of the samples are summarized in Table 4 and the graphical summaries are shown in Figures 2 to 7. For gender, females accounted for 81,13% of the 171 respondents and males accounted for 18.70% of the respondents. For marital status, there were more than half or 112 (65.5%) of the 171 respondents were married. There were also a significant number that were single, never married (48; 28.1%). For age, the spread was relatively even from 21 years old to 56 years old and older. However, the largest proportion was aged 31 to 35 years old (17.5%) and the lowest was ages 46 to 50 years old (16; 9.4%). For qualification, more than half (52.63%) of the 171 samples have a Bachelor’s Degree and there were 28.7% holding Honour’s degrees. For type of school, the sample was relatively evenly spread, with 38% of the respondents working at independent schools (for profit), 32.7% of the respondents working at independent schools (not for profit), and 29.2% of the respondents working at government school. For length of tenure at current school, almost half (49.1%) of the 171 samples have been with their current school for less than five years and there were 26.3% that have a length of tenure of 5-10 years.
Table 4 Summary of Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 and older</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently studying</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government School</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent School (For profit)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent School (Not for profit)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2 Gender Distribution

- 18.7% Male
- 81.3% Female

Figure 3 Marital Status Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4 Age Distribution

Figure 5 Qualification Distribution
5.5 Reverse Scoring

Prior to computing the scores of the different study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR and PJ. Some of the items are first reverse coded. This is the process of reversing the scores of an item phrased in the negative while retaining its distribution characteristics (Hair et al., 2010), to align their correlations with other items measuring the same variable.
Only the three items of the POS which include POS2, POS3, and POS7 are first reversed coded before scoring the variable.

5.6 Check for Construct Validity and Reliability

The next step in the data analysis was to test the validity and reliability of the constructs. A principle component factor analysis and internal consistency reliability analysis were conducted.

5.6.1 Principal Component Factor Analysis

An exploratory principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed on all multiple-scale items to determine reliability. A principle component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted to validate the basic structure of each of the study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ. In interpreting the factors, only a loading of 0.40 or greater on the factor have been considered. After dropping those items with loading of less than 0.40, a stable solution emerged. Results of the final principal component factor analysis are reflected in Tables 5 and 6. The KMO and Barlett’s test showed that the KMO measure shows that the use of PCA is appropriate and the items are factorable since the value of 0.91 is within the acceptable range of 0.8 to 1. The Bartlett test of sphericity was also found to be significant ($X^2 (276) =2,424.96; p < 0.001$). This indicated that the rotation is appropriate.

Looking at Table 6, the factor analysis showed that the scores of POS should include eight measures (POS1, POS2, POS3, POS4, POS5, POS6, POS7, POS8), retention should include four measures (ITS1, ITS2, ITS3, ITS4), LME should include three measures (LME1, LME2, LME3), RR should include four measures (RR1, RR2, RR7, RR8), and PJ should include five measures (PJ2, PJ3, PJ4, PJ5, PJ6). There were some items that were excluded in the scoring of the variables. These include the four measures (LME4, LME5, LME6, LM7) of LME, six measures of RR (RR3, RR4, RR5, RR6, RR9, and RR10) and one measure (PJ1) of PJ. After dropping the stated questions, composite variables were created with the remaining items. Average scores for each study variables were used to create the composite scores.
Table 5 Results of KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>2,424.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 Results of Rotated Component Matrix of Principal Component Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS6</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ4</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.
5.6.2 Internal Consistency Reliability Analysis

A Cronbach’s Alpha was then used to determine the internal consistency reliability of the responses obtained from the different survey questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alpha value should exceed the minimum acceptable value of 0.70 to show acceptable reliability. The Cronbach’s alpha values for each of the survey questionnaire are summarised in Table 7. The Cronbach’s values of the measure of ITS (0.87), POS (0.91), LME (0.86), RR (0.72), and PJ (0.88) all have acceptable internal consistency reliabilities. This was because all the Cronbach’s alpha values were greater than the minimum acceptable value of 0.70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

The descriptive statistics of the composite scores of the study variables of retention, POS, LME, RR and PJ were obtained to summarise the scores. The descriptive statistics included the central tendency measures of mean and standard deviation. These are summarised in Table 8. For the dependent variable of retention, the mean score ($M = 2.77; SD = 0.97$) was between the agree (2) and neutral (3) scores indicating that the 171 samples have above average levels of ITS with current employer. For the independent variable of POS, the mean score ($M = 3.65; SD = 0.75$) was between the neutral (3) and disagree (4) scores indicating that the 171 samples have above low levels of perceived organisational support. For the independent variable of LME, the mean score ($M = 3.65; SD = 0.98$) was between a fair amount/sometimes/moderately (3) and quite a bit / fairly often / mostly (4) scores indicating that the 171 samples have above average frequency of LME. For the independent variable of RR, the mean score ($M = 2.68; SD = 0.86$) was between the disagree (2) and neither agree/disagree (3) scores indicating that the 171 samples have below average levels RR. For the independent variable of PJ, the mean
score ($M = 3.20; \text{SD} = 0.90$) was between the neutral (3) and agree (4) scores indicating that the 171 samples have above average levels of PJ.

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics Summaries of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 Testing of Required Assumption of Parametric Statistical Analysis

5.8.1 Normality Testing of Study Variables

Prior to conducting the different inferential statistics of independent sample t-test, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis to address the objectives of the study, the assumption of normally distribution of the different study variable should be first tested. This is a required assumption of the different parametric statistical analysis to be conducted. Normality testing was conducted by investigation of the skewness and kurtosis statistics and histogram to check the distribution of data of the ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ.

Table 9 summarised the skewness and kurtosis statistics for the data of the different study variables. As can be seen in Table 9, the skewness statistic values (-0.63 to 0.20) were not greater than three and kurtosis statistic values (-0.56 to -0.01) were not in the range of 10 to 20 for non-normality. In addition, the different histograms shown in Figure 8 showed a bell-shaped curve representing a normal distribution were exhibited in the different plots for ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ. Although the bell-shaped curves represented were not perfect. With these results, the data of all study variables did not violate the normality assumption. Thus, the different parametric tests of independent sample t-test, ANOVA, and multiple regression analysis can be conducted.
Table 9 Skewness and Kurtosis Statistics of Dataset of Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Kurtosis Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 Histogram Distribution of Study Variables
5.8.2 Linearity

The second required assumption to be tested is that there needs to be a linear relationship between the independent variable and dependent variables. This means that there should be a linear relationship between the independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ with the dependent variable of ITS. Scatterplots between the independent variable and dependent variable were created to test whether a linear relationship exists between the two variables. The scatter plots are presented in Figure 9. All four scatterplots showed a positive linear relationship between the POS and ITS; LME and ITS; RR and ITS; and PJ and ITS. Positive linear relationships were observed in the scatterplots since there were increasing patterns exhibited in the graphs. Thus, the assumption that there needs to be a linear relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable was not violated.

![Figure 9 Linear Plots of Independent Variables Versus Dependent Variable](image)
5.8.3 Homogeneity of Variance

The third assumption tested is that the data needs to show homoscedasticity which means that the variance of the dependent variable of ITS should be homogenous across the four independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ. A Levene’s test of equality of variance was conducted to test this assumption. The result is presented in Table 10 and showed that the variance of the composite score of the dependent variable of ITS was homogenous across the four independent variables. There was homoscedasticity because the p-value \( F(168, 2) = 0.55, p = 0.83 \) of the F statistics was greater than the level of significance of 0.05.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>df1</td>
<td>df2</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + POS + LME + PJ + RR
b. Dependent Variable: ITS

5.8.4 Multicollinearity

The final assumption tested is that the different independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ should not exhibit multicollinearity in predicting the dependent variable of ITS. This is a required assumption of the parametric statistical analysis of multiple regression analysis. The collinearity statistics of tolerance and variance inflation factors (VIF) were used in the assessment. These are presented in Table 11. Subsequent tests confirmed the presence of no collinearity since the VIF values (1.08 to 2.05) and tolerance (0.49 to 0.93) values were within the acceptable ranges.
Table 11 Assessment of Regression Model Collinearity of Different Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 Test of Differences of Study Variables Across Differences of Demographics

5.9.1 Difference by Gender

Independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of gender. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the independent sample t-test. The results of the independent sample t-test are shown in Table 12. It showed that only the composite scores of ITS ($t(64.41) = 2.42, p = 0.02$) were significantly different between male and female samples. This was the only t-test result with p-value less than the level of significance value. Mean difference showed that male samples ($M = 2.47; SD = 0.70$) have greater levels of intent to stay with current employer than the female samples ($M = 2.83; SD = 1.01$) by a mean difference of 0.37. This was because lower score for retention indicates greater levels of intention levels of intent to stay with current employer.
Table 12 Independent Sample t-test Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at level of significance of 0.05
5.9.2 Difference by Age

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of age. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 13. It showed that only the composite scores of ITS \((F(7, 163) = 2.04, p = 0.05)\) were significantly different across differences of age of the samples. This was the only ANOVA result with \(p\)-value equal to the level of significance value.

Table 13 ANOVA Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>93.13</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.53</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>145.17</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157.91</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>153.14</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.74</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>129.69</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137.88</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>121.08</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126.13</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at level of significance of 0.05
5.9.3 Difference by Marital Status

ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of marital status. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 14. It showed that only the composite scores of ITS ($F(4, 166) = 2.96, p = 0.01$) were significantly different across differences of marital status of the samples. This was the only ANOVA result with p-value less than the level of significance value.

| Table 14 ANOVA Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Marital Status |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|
|                                  | Sum of Squares      | df     | Mean Square | F      | Sig.  |
| POS                              | Between Groups      | 2.05   | 4           | 0.51   | 0.92  | 0.46  |
|                                  | Within Groups       | 92.54  | 166         | 0.56   |       |       |
|                                  | Total               | 94.59  | 170         |        |       |       |
| ITS                              | Between Groups      | 11.85  | 4           | 2.96   | 3.31  | 0.01* |
|                                  | Within Groups       | 148.79 | 166         | 0.90   |       |       |
|                                  | Total               | 160.64 | 170         |        |       |       |
| LME                              | Between Groups      | 1.64   | 4           | 0.41   | 0.43  | 0.79  |
|                                  | Within Groups       | 160.09 | 166         | 0.96   |       |       |
|                                  | Total               | 161.74 | 170         |        |       |       |
| PJ                               | Between Groups      | 1.50   | 4           | 0.37   | 0.46  | 0.77  |
|                                  | Within Groups       | 136.39 | 166         | 0.82   |       |       |
|                                  | Total               | 137.89 | 170         |        |       |       |
| RR                               | Between Groups      | 2.79   | 4           | 0.70   | 0.93  | 0.45  |
|                                  | Within Groups       | 124.07 | 166         | 0.75   |       |       |
|                                  | Total               | 126.86 | 170         |        |       |       |

*Significant difference at level of significance of 0.05
5.9.4 Difference by Qualification

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of qualification. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 15. It showed that only the composite scores of POS \((F(3, 167) = 2.61, p = 0.05)\) were significantly different across differences of qualification of the samples. This was the only ANOVA result with p-value less than the level of significance value.

Table 15 ANOVA Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>89.17</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>156.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>153.46</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>130.15</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>120.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at level of significance of 0.05
5.9.5 Difference by Type of School

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LME, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of type of school. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 16. It showed that only the composite scores of ITS ($F(2, 168) = 5.03, p = 0.01$), POS ($F(2, 168) = 3.12, p = 0.05$), and LME ($F(2, 168) = 4.21, p = 0.02$) were significantly different across differences of type of schools of the samples. These were because the p-values of these ANOVA results were less than or equal to the level of significance value.

Table 16 ANOVA Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Type of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91.20</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>151.57</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160.64</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>154.02</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.74</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>134.70</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137.89</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>124.34</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126.86</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant difference at level of significance of 0.05
5.9.6 Difference by Length of Tenure

An ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the composite scores of the different study variables of ITS, POS, LMX, RR, and PJ were significantly different across the differences of length of tenure. A level of significance of 0.05 was used in the ANOVA. The ANOVA results are shown in Table 16. It showed that all the composite scores of ITS ($F(6, 164) = 1.69$, $p = 0.13$), POS ($F(6, 164) = 1.21$, $p = 0.31$), LMX ($F(6, 164) = 0.54$, $p = 0.78$), RR ($F(6, 164) = 0.89$, $p = 0.50$), and PJ ($F(6, 164) = 0.60$, $p = 0.74$) were not significantly different across differences of length of tenure of the samples. These were because all ANOVA results have $p$-values greater than the level of significance value.

Table 17 ANOVA Results of Difference of Composite Scores of Study Variables by Length of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.59</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>151.31</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160.64</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>158.62</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161.74</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>133.52</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137.89</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>124.14</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126.86</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.10 Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to address research questions one and two of the study to determine the impact of the different independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ on the dependent variable of teacher ITS. The effects of the demographic characteristics of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure were controlled in the regression analysis. A level of
significance of 0.05 was used in the multiple regression analysis. The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 18.

The regression results showed that the model fit of the regression model \((F(10, 157) = 13.49, p < 0.001)\) generated was significant indicating that the regression model has an acceptable model fit. The \(r\)-square value of the regression model was 0.46, which indicates a moderate effect size and that the independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ captured 46% of the variance in predicting the dependent variable of teacher ITS while controlling the effects of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure.

Looking at model 1 of the regression model, these statistics determined whether the different demographic variables have a significant impact on teacher ITS. The investigation of the individual impacts that all demographic variables of gender \((t(167) = -1.30, p = 0.20)\), age \((t(167) = 1.34, p = 0.18)\), relationship status \((t(167) = -1.83, p = 0.07)\), qualification \((t(167) = -1.33, p = 0.18)\), type of school \((t(167) = 0.36, p = 0.72)\), and length of tenure \((t(167) = 0.81, p = 0.42)\) did not have any significant impact on teacher ITS. This was because all the \(p\)-values were greater than the level of significance value. With these results, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 5 that “There is no relationship between demographic variables and teacher retention” was not rejected.

Looking at model 2, these statistics determined whether the different independent variables of POS, LME, RR, and PJ have a significant impact on the of teacher ITS while controlling the effects of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. Investigation of the individual impacts showed that only POS \((t(167) = 5.25, p < 0.001)\) and rewards and recognition \((t(167) = 3.06, p < 0.001)\) significantly impacted teacher retention. These were the only \(p\)-values less than the level of significance value. Investigation of the unstandardized beta coefficient value showed that POS \((0.56)\) and rewards and recognition \((0.23)\) positively impacts teacher retention. A one score increase in composite score of POS will result to a 0.56 increase in the composite score of teacher retention. A one score increase in composite score of reward and recognition will result to a 0.23 increase in the composite score of teacher retention. This means that the higher the POS and RR, the higher the intent to stay with current employer by the teachers. With these results, the null hypotheses for hypothesis 1 that “There is no relationship between POS and teacher retention” and hypothesis 2 that “There is no relationship between organisational rewards and recognition and teacher retention” were rejected. The regression results supported the alternative hypotheses
for hypothesis 1 that “There is a positive relationship between POS and teacher ITS” and hypothesis 2 that “There is a positive relationship between organisational RR and teacher ITS”. On the other hand, LME ($t(167) = 1.20, p = 0.23$) and PJ ($t(167) = 0.42, p = 0.68$) did not have any significant impact on teacher ITS while controlling the effects of gender, age, relationship status, qualification, type of school, and length of tenure. With these results, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 3 that “There is no relationship between PJ and teacher ITS”, and hypothesis 4 that “There is no relationship between LME and teacher ITS” were not rejected.

Table 18: Multiple Regression Results of Impacts of Perceived Organisational Support, Leader-Member Exchange, Rewards and Recognition, and Procedural Justice on Teacher Retention Controlling the Effects of Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of School</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LME</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RR</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $F(10, 157) = 13.49, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.46, N = 167$

a. Dependent Variable: ITS
b. Predictors: (Constant), Tenure, Type of School, Qualification, Relationship Status, Gender, Age, RR, LME, POS, PJ

*Significant at level of significance of 0.05
5.11 Conclusion

The purpose of this quantitative study was to access the hypothesised relationship between retention and POS and its constructs. Results of the independent sample t-test showed that composite scores of ITS were significantly different between male and female samples. On the other hand, ANOVA results showed that composite scores of ITS were significantly different across differences of age, marital status, and qualification of the samples. ANOVA results showed that composite scores of POS were significantly different across differences of qualification and type of schools of the samples. ANOVA results showed that composite scores of LME were significantly different across differences of type of schools of the samples. Multiple regression results showed that there is a positive relationship between POS and teacher ITS and between organisational RR and teacher retention. On the other hand, multiple regression results also showed that there is no relationship between LME and teacher ITS, between PJ and teacher ITS, and between demographic variables and teacher ITS. Chapter 6 includes further discussion of the results presented in this chapter. Each of the results of the different statistical analysis will be reviewed and the potential implications for each of the results of the analysis will be discussed in the succeeding chapter.
Chapter 6: Discussion of Results

6.1 Introduction
In Chapter 6, the research findings are discussed in depth and analysed against the literature review in chapter 2. This research study aimed to determine the nature of the relationship between retention (dependent variable) and the constructs of POS (independent variable) and which factors play the most significant role in retention. An overview of the demographic variables and constructs is provided below, followed by a discussion of the results in relation to the research question.

The objectives of the study were to establish:
- To determine the relationship between teacher retention and POS.
- To determine which constructs of POS, have the greatest impact on teacher retention.

6.2 Overview of Demographic Variables

The demographic variables examined in this study were gender, age, marital status, qualifications, type of school, and length of tenure. The composition of the gender demographic variable is a slightly skewed statistic, with 81.3% female and 18.7% males. According to the latest statistics released, (Department of Education, 2014), the ratio of employed South African teachers is 69% female to 31% male. Over half of the 171 respondents were married and the age range of respondents was from 21 years old to 56 years and older. More than half of the respondents had bachelor’s degrees and almost a third of the respondents had Honour’s degrees. The respondents were divided almost evenly regarding type of school; 38% worked at independent schools, 33% worked at not-for-profit independent schools, and 29% of the respondents worked for a government school. Finally, almost half of the respondents had been at their current school for less than five years and about 26% of the respondents had worked at their school for five to ten years.

6.3 Overview of the constructs

6.3.1 Retention

For this study, the construct of retention was defined as an employee’s intent to stay. Literature has shown that intent to stay has a significant and positive association with
employee retention and is affected by numerous factors which also positively correlate with intent to stay (Brown et al., 2013; Dabke & Patole, 2014; Hussein et al., 2014; Kurtessis et al., 2015; Lawrence et al., 2014). Intent to stay was measured using the four-item Intent to Stay Scale developed by Mitchel (1981). This construct was measured as a continuous variable.

6.3.2 Perceived Organisational Support

The construct POS was defined as the extent to which an organisation values an employee’s contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Prior literature has shown that POS is positively associated with a variety of positive individual and organisational outcomes, including commitment, organisation citizenship behaviour, and job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2003; Blackmore & Kuntz., 2011; Iqbal & Hashmi, 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Additionally, it has been demonstrated in the literature that there is a positive association between POS and employee retention (Allen et al., 2003; Blackmore & Kuntz., 2011; Caesens et al., 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In regard to organisational outcome, POS has been positively linked to employee engagement (Eisenberger et al., 2016), employee commitment (Kim et al., 2016; Marique et al., 2013), employee work outcomes, (Riggle et al., 2009; Shen et al., 2014), proactive behaviour (Caesens et al., 2016; Wayne et al., 2002), job satisfaction (Kurtessis et al., 2015; Miao, 2011), and job performance (Watt & Hargis, 2010). POS has also been negatively associated with turnover intentions (Chen & Eldridge, 2011; Madden et al., 2015).

POS was measured using Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) 8-item survey, Perceived Organisational Support. This construct was measured as a continuous variable. Due to the fact that literature has consistently shown POS to be negatively associated with turnover intentions (Caesens et al., 2015; Madden et al., 2015), meaning the higher the perceived organisational support, the lower the likelihood that an employee would intend to leave, it was expected for this study that there would be a positive relationship between POS and teacher retention.
6.3.3 LME

The construct of LME describes the extent to which an employee feels supported by their immediate supervisor. LME is articulated as a component of POS because, unlike POS which describes the overall quality of support that an employee feels from the overall organisation, LME refers specifically to the relationship that an employee has with their direct supervisor. LME reflects the personal relationship that an employee has with their supervisor and is dependent upon the supervisor’s behaviour and leadership style. Prior literature has shown that there is a positive association between LME and employee outcomes such as performance, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, innovative behaviour, and creativity. Researchers have shown that the relationships between employees and their supervisors are positively related to employee retention (Altunoglu & Bulgurcu Gurel, 2015; Dulebohn et al., 2012; Martin et al., 2016; Restubog et al., 2010).

For this study, LME was measured using the Leader-Member Exchange Version 7 (LME-7) instrument. This variable was measured as a continuous variable. It was expected that there would be a positive association between LME and employee retention in accordance with the literature included in this study. Therefore, this was articulated through hypothesis 4.

6.3.4 Procedural Justice

The construct of PJ describes the extent to which an employee believes processes at work are fair and result in outcomes that benefit the employee (Jason et al., 2015). Procedural justice is especially applicable in dispute resolution (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). According to Colquitt and Rodell (2015), there are several rules that make procedures fair which include process control, decision control, consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. Additionally, the criteria for procedural fairness include the consistent application of procedures across time and people, procedures that are free from bias, the gathering and use of accurate information in the decision-making process, the presence of procedures for correcting inaccurate decisions, conforming to personal standards of ethics, and ensuring that the opinions of directly affected groups are considered (Levethal et al., 1985).

This construct was measured using a section of a scale developed by Neihoff and Moorman (1993) and used in a study conducted by Al-zu’bi (2010). This variable was
measured as a continuous variable. It was expected that procedural justice would be positively related to employee retention because in the literature, procedural justice, both as an individual construct and as a component of POS, has been shown to have a positive effect on employee outcomes.

6.3.5 Rewards and Recognition

Rewards and recognition refer to the things that are given to an employee by an organisation in response to the employee’s actions. These things are considered to be desirable by the employee and are a means of recognizing an employee’s achievements as well as serves as motivation for them (Agarwal, 2013). Research has linked both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to employee retention (Danish & Usman, 2010; Kwenin et al., 2013). Intrinsic rewards can include job variety, working conditions, personal growth, skills development, and promotion. These rewards are often non-monetary in nature. Research has shown intrinsic rewards to be positively associated with employee productivity, loyalty, satisfaction, and retention (Danish & Usman, 2010). In contrast, extrinsic rewards are rewards that organisations and employers have more direct control over. Extrinsic rewards include compensation and other tangible and monetary rewards. Extrinsic rewards have been linked to the increased attraction and retention of employees as well as job satisfaction (Kwenin et al., 2013; Warburton et al., 2014)

Rewards and recognition was measured using a 10-item scale based on De Beer’s (1987) survey. This variable was measured as a continuous variable. It was expected that organisational rewards and recognition would be positively associated with teacher retention based on previous studies. This expectation was reflected in hypothesis 2.

6.4 Hypothesis 1

- $H_0$: There is no relationship between POS and teacher retention.
- $H_a$: There is a positive relationship between POS and teacher retention.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to test hypothesis 1 to determine if there was a relationship between POS and teacher retention and, if so, whether the relationship was positive. The regression model demonstrated that there was a significant relationship between POS and teacher retention, as the $p$-value was less than the level of significance value. This relationship was positive because the beta coefficient value for POS was .56 which means that a one score increase in the
composite score of POS would result in a .56 increase in the score for teacher retention. Consequently, based on these results, the null hypothesis which stated that there was no relationship between POS and teacher retention can be rejected. Additionally, the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a positive relationship between POS and teacher retention is supported.

6.5 Hypothesis 2

- $H_0^2$: There is no relationship between organisational RR and teacher ITS.
- $H_a^2$: There is a positive relationship between organisational RR and teacher ITS.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a relationship between organisational RR and teacher ITS. The regression model revealed that there was a significant and positive relationship between RR and teacher ITS. The beta coefficient for RR was .23 which means that a one score increase in the composite score of RR would result in a .23 increase in the composite score of teacher retention. Based on these results, the null hypothesis which states that there is no relationship between organisational RR and teacher ITS is rejected. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a positive relationship between organisational RR and teacher retention was supported.

6.6 Hypothesis 3

- $H_0^3$: There is no relationship between PJ and teacher ITS.
- $H_a^3$: There is a positive relationship between PJ and teacher ITS.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to determine whether or not there was a relationship between PJ and teacher ITS and, if so, the nature of that relationship. The regression model showed that there was not a significant relationship between PJ and teacher ITS because the significance value was not below the stated level of significance. Consequently, based on these results, the null hypothesis in which it was stated that there was no relationship between PJ and teacher ITS could not be rejected and the alternative hypothesis in which it was stated that there would be a positive relationship between PJ and teacher ITS was rejected.
6.7 Hypothesis 4

- \( H_0^4 \): There is no relationship between LME and teacher ITS.
- \( H_a^4 \): There is a positive relationship between LME and teacher ITS.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to test hypothesis 4 and determine whether there was a relationship between LME exchange and teacher ITS and, if so, the nature of that relationship. The regression model showed that there was not a significant relationship between LME and teacher ITS because the significance value was not below the stated level of significance. Consequently, based on these results, the null hypothesis in which it was stated that there was no relationship between LME and teacher ITS could not be rejected.

6.8 Hypothesis 5

- \( H_0^5 \): There is no relationship between demographic variables and teacher ITS.
- \( H_a^5 \): There is a positive relationship between demographic variables and teacher ITS.

The demographic variables analysed in this study were gender, age, marital status, qualification, type of school, and tenure. In order to determine if there were any differences in the composite scores based on gender, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The only significant result was that males had a slightly higher level of intention to stay with their current employer than females. This does not support the research done by Newton (2017) who found that females demonstrate a stronger intent to stay. However, the result of this research could be country specific. Due to the implementation Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) in South Africa, men, specifically white men, are very reluctant to leave their jobs for fear of not finding a replacement.

To determine if there were any differences in composite scores based on age, an ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA showed that composite scores for retention differed across the various age groups of the respondents. There were no significant differences based on age for any of the other variables. These findings do support the literature review in that age is a significant variable contributing to ITS. (Almalki, 2012; Stewart et al; Kabungaidze, 2013)
To determine if there were any differences in composite scores based on marital status, an ANOVA was conducted. Such as in the case of age, there were significant differences in composite scores for retention based on marital status. There were no significant differences for any of the other variables based on marital status. These findings support the literature review in the marital status is a significant variable contributing to ITS. (Almalki, 2012; Stewart et al)

ANOVA was conducted in order to determine if there were any differences in composite scores based on qualification. The results of the ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference in POS based on qualification. There were no differences among any of the other variables based on qualification. This result does not support the literature review as Almaki (2012), who reported in his findings that marital status has a direct influence on ITS. In the literature review on POS, not correlation has been reported between qualification and POS.

An ANOVA was conducted in order to determine if there were any differences in the composite scores of any of the variables based on type of school. The results of the ANOVA showed that there were differences in ITS, POS, and LME based on type of school. This is an interesting result since type of school and POS have not been included in previous research.

An ANOVA was conducted in order to determine if there were any differences in the composite scores of any of the variables based on length of tenure. The ANOVA revealed that there were no differences among any of the variables based on tenure. This result does not support the findings by Kabungaidze (2013), in that he found that length of tenure has a strong correlation to ITS.

Additionally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether these demographic variables had an impact on teacher ITS. Based on the regression results, none of the demographic variables had a significant impact on teacher ITS. Consequently, the null hypothesis in which it was stated that there was no relationship between demographic variables and teacher ITS was not rejected.
6.9 Research Question 1

RQ1: What is the relationship between teacher ITS and POS?

6.9.1 Interpretation of Results

To address this research question, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. The regression model had an $r$-square value of .45 which indicated a moderate effect size and had a significance of $p < 0.001$. POS had a significant positive impact on teacher ITS. This result is in alignment with previous literature (Dursun, 2015). Studies have shown that, not only is POS vital to employee well-being, but it is positively related to employee retention (Schalkwyk & Els, 2011). These congruent results demonstrate that, like in other organisations, teachers in South Africa are more likely to stay if they perceive their organisations to be supportive.

6.10 Research Question 2

RQ2: Which constructs of POS have the greatest impact on teacher retention?

6.10.1 Interpretation of Results

The multiple regression analysis that was conducted revealed the impact of the individual constructs of POS in relation to teacher retention. These individual constructs were PJ, organisational RR, and LME. The analysis demonstrated that, even though POS as a construct had a significant and positive impact on teacher ITS, the only individual construct of POS that was significant was organisational RR. This finding is in accordance with previous literature in which there was a positive correlation between reward and compensation practices and employee retention (Imna & Hassan, 2015; Kwenin et al., 2013; Warburton et al., 2014). However, this result is not in alignment with other research that indicated a positive association between LME and PJ with employee retention (Al-kilani, 2017; Al-Salemi, 2013; Colquitt & Zipay, 2015; Dabke & Patole, 2014).
7 Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the various constructs of POS and to determine the extent to which the POS constructs impact the retention of teachers. The main objectives were to determine the relationship between teacher ITS and POS and to determine which constructs of POS have the greatest impact on teacher ITS. A multiple regression analysis was used to address the research problem.

This chapter will present the major findings from this study as revealed through the research and data analysis. This chapter will also present the implications the results have for management in conjunction with specific recommendations for the South African education system. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the limitations of this research, recommendations for further research, and a brief conclusion.

7.2 Major findings

The first major finding from this study is that there is a positive association between POS and ITS among teachers in South Africa. This finding is important for several reasons. First, this demonstrates that employees within the field of education are similar to employees in other organisations. Much of the research conducted relating to POS and employee retention has been conducted in industries other than education (Caesens et al., 2015; Liu & Lui, 2016). As a result, other findings in literature relating to POS and employee retention can be considered for application in the field of education in order to potentially identify solutions to problems with teacher retention. This finding is also important because it suggests that retention of teachers in South Africa is a problem that can be addressed by means of changes within the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2016; Madden et al., 2015; Zhong et al., 2015). For example, had the results revealed that demographic characteristic were the most significant influences of teacher retention, school systems in South Africa would have limited recourse in how to address teacher retention issues. On the other hand, POS is a factor that can be improved by the school system thus positively influencing teacher retention.

The second major finding from this study is that two of the three major constructs of POS, PJ and LME were not significant predictors of teacher retention in South Africa. This finding is important because it challenges the theoretical framework for this study in which all three constructs were depicted as influencing teacher retention. For teachers
in South Africa, only the construct of organisational RR was a significant predictor of retention. This finding could suggest that either the components of POS are not accurately articulated through this framework or that POS as articulated through this framework are not applicable in all circumstances such as those that vary by field or demographics (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Celep & Yilmazturk, 2012; Chinyio, 2016; Jin et al., 2016).

7.3 Implications for Management

This research has several implications for management of school systems in South Africa. First, teacher retention is within the control of management. Employers have the ability to positively or negatively influence POS (Marique et al., 2013; Shen et al., 2014). Demographics are not necessarily a determining factor as to whether a teacher will remain with the organisation or leave; consequently, employers can focus their efforts on retention practices for current employees. Additionally, this research shows that in order to retain employees, organisations must meet the needs of employees as they articulate their needs. Even though it was predicted in this study that PJ and LME would be significant influences of teacher retention, they were not. Likewise, employers should not assume what the needs are of their employees, but instead inquire so they can address the needs that their employees articulate.

7.4 Recommendations to South African Employers

Based on the results of the study, there are several recommendations that can be made to South African employers of teachers in the educational system. First, the study has revealed that POS in the form of organisational RR influences these teachers to remain with their organisations. It is recommended that these employers examine their practices regarding RR and revise them to be robust and effective in meeting their teachers’ needs. Secondly, this study has revealed that teachers can provide information as to what makes them stay with the organisation if they are asked. As a result, it is recommended that these employers inquire of their teachers what they would like in order to remain with the organisation. Then the employers can use this information to adjust their practices and policies.
7.5 Limitations to the research

There are limitations to this research that must be recognised. First, this research was based on a proposed theoretical framework that was supported through prior literature. However, this limited the research to interpretation only through this framework with the omission of other possible solutions to the teacher retention problem that may exist. Secondly, this research was limited by the sample that was attained. It was not proportionately reflective of the study population based on demographics; therefore, this could have possibly skewed the results of the study. Also, this study was limited in that it measured intent to stay instead of actual retention. Although these constructs are closely related, they are not the same. An employee who intends to stay may ultimately leave and organisation and an employee who intends to leave an organisation may ultimately stay. Lastly, this research was limited by the use of a quantitative methodology. A quantitative methodology can reveal the objective data yielded from the study but does not provide the why of the results.

7.6 Recommendations for Future Research

It is recommended that this study be repeated in other education organisations. This replication would help to validate the current study results as well as to determine if the results of this study are unique, perhaps due to location, or if other education organisations yield similar results. It is recommended that, if possible, research is conducted that measures actual turnover and retention rather than intention. This study could yield more accurate results relating to teacher turnover. It is also recommended that a qualitative study related to this study problem be conducted in order to understand the challenges and potential solutions to teacher retention in South Africa from the teachers’ perspectives.

7.7 Conclusions

This study was able to yield major findings that are immediately applicable to the education system in South Africa. It was determined that there is a positive association between POS and retention among teachers in South Africa. Additionally, it was determined that PJ and LME were not significant predictors of teacher retention in South Africa. Education employers in South Africa can focus on their policies and procedures related to organisational RR in order to increase the retention of teachers in South Africa.
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Appendix A: G*Power Sample Size Computation Results

Test family: t tests
Statistical test: Linear multiple regression: Fixed model, single regression coefficient
Type of power analysis: A priori: Compute required sample size - given α, power, and effect size

Input parameters:
- Tail(s): Two
- Effect size f²: 0.15
- α err prob: 0.05
- Power (1-β err prob): 0.8
- Number of predictors: 4

Output parameters:
- Noncentrality parameter δ: 2.8722813
- Critical t: 2.0085591
- Df: 50
- Total sample size: 55
- Actual power: 0.8042089
Appendix B: Informed Consent and Questionnaire

Appendices should be numbered and titled. Each appendix should be presented both in numerical order and in the order in which it is referred to in the text of the project. Examples of what should be included in appendices are a copy of a questionnaire (if used), interview guideline, data bases, list of respondents, etc. Qualitative reports should include a list of codes used.

The Relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Retention

The Role of Perceived Organisational Support in Teacher Retention

Introduction: Target Audience: Qualified Teachers

Online Survey

Your participation in this study is very important to us. Your participation is voluntary and you may also withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. No names are required so your answers are completely anonymous. Data will be stored and represented on an aggregated level to ensure anonymity. All data will be kept confidential.

Please answer the questions in the attached questionnaire as completely and honestly as possible. This should not take more than 15 minutes of your time. The results of the study will be used for academic purposes only and may be published in an academic journal. We will provide you with a summary of our findings on request.

You are invited to participate in an academic research study conducted by Renee Shields, a Masters student from GBS. The purpose of the study is to investigate Retention of Teachers and Perceived Organisational Support.

By completing the survey, you indicate that you voluntarily participate in this research. Should you have any concerns, please feel free to contact my supervisor or myself.

Researchers Name: Renee Shields
Email: 87744717@mygbs.co.za
Phone: 083 280 6464

Research Supervisors Name: Prof Abot Wocke
Email: wocke@ibs.co.za
Phone: 011 771 4000
The Relationship between Perceived Organisational Support and Retention

SECTION 1: Demographical Characteristics:

1. What is your gender? 
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your age? 
   - Below 21
   - 21-25
   - 26-30
   - 31-35
   - 36-40
   - 41-45
   - 46-50
   - 51-56
   - 56 and older

3. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status? 
   - Married
   - Widowed
   - Divorced
   - Separated
   - Single, never married

4. What is your highest qualification achieved? 
   - Currently studying
   - Bachelors Degree
   - Honours Degree
   - Masters Degree
   - Doctorate

5. What type of school do you currently work in? 
   - Government School
   - Independent School (Not for profit)
   - Independent School (For profit)
6. What is the length of tenure with your current school?

- 1-5 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- 26-30 years
- above 30 years

SECTION 2: Perceived Organisational Support:

Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have about working at your organisation. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking the block below that best represents your point of view.

7. The school values my contribution to its well-being.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

8. The school fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
9. The school would ignore any complaint from me. (R)
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

10. The school really cares about my well-being.
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree

11. Even if I did the best job possible, the school would fail to notice. (R)
    - Strongly agree
    - Agree
    - Neutral
    - Disagree
    - Strongly disagree
12. The school cares about my general satisfaction at work.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. The school shows very little concern for me. (R)

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. The school takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

SECTION 3: Intent to stay with current employer:

15. I would turn down a job offer from another school if it came tomorrow.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. As far as I can see, I intend to stay with my current school.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
17. It is very important for me to spend the rest of my career in this school.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. I will stay at this company even if other companies offer me higher pay and position.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

4 / 7 57%

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX-7) Instrument

Please respond to each statement with regard to the relationship between you and your immediate supervisor (Subject Head / Learning Area Head / Deputy Head etc).

19. How well does your immediate supervisor understand your job problems and needs?

- Not at all
- A little
- A Fair Amount
- Quite a Bit
- A Great Deal

20. Do you know where you stand with your immediate supervisor...do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?

- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Fairly Often
- Very Often
21. How well does your immediate supervisor recognise your potential? 
- Not at All
- A Little
- Moderately
- Mostly
- Fully

22. Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances your immediate supervisor would be inclined to use his/her available power to help you solve problems at work? 
- None
- Small
- Moderate
- High
- Very High

23. Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, what are the chances your immediate supervisor would “bail you out” at his/her expense if you really needed it? 
- None
- Small
- Moderate
- High
- Very High

24. I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor's decisions that I would defend and justify his/her decisions even if he or she were not present to do so. 
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
25. How would you characterise your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?

- Extremely Ineffective
- Worse than Average
- Average
- Better than Average
- Extremely Effective

5 / 7 71%

Section 5: Procedural Justice

The questions below refer to the procedures your organisation uses to make decisions about pay, rewards, evaluations, promotions, assignments, etc. To what extent do you agree?

26. Job decisions are made by my supervisor in a biased manner.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- Neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree

27. My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before Job decisions are made.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- Neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree
28. To make job decisions, my supervisor collects accurate and complete information.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree

29. My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree

30. All job-related decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree

31. Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their supervisors.

- strongly disagree
- disagree
- neither agree / disagree
- agree
- strongly agree
Section 6: Rewards and Recognition

32. My salary is satisfactory in relation to what I do.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - Neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

33. I earn the same as or more than other people in a similar job.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

34. I am praised regularly for my work.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

35. I receive constructive criticism about my work.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

36. I get credit for what I do.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree
37. I am told that I am making progress.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

38. My working hours are reasonable.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

39. I am never overworked.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

40. My pension benefits are good.
   - strongly disagree
   - disagree
   - neither agree / disagree
   - agree
   - strongly agree

41. My medical scheme is satisfactory
# Appendix C: Code Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>CODING</th>
<th>REVERSE QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D1 What is your gender?</td>
<td>Female = 1, Male = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D2 What is your age?</td>
<td>Below 21 = 1, 21 - 25 = 2, 26 - 30 = 3, 31 - 35 = 4, 36 - 40 = 5, 41 - 45 = 6, 46 - 50 = 7, 51 - 55 = 8, 56 and older = 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D3 Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?</td>
<td>Married = 1, Widowed = 2, Divorced = 3, Separated = 4, Single b=never married = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D4 What is your highest qualification achieved?</td>
<td>Studying = 1, Bachelors = 2, Honours = 3, Masters = 4, Doctorate = 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D5 What type of school do you currently work in?</td>
<td>Government = 1, Independent (not for Profit) = 2, Independent (for Profit) = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D6 What is the length of tenure with your current school?</td>
<td>1 - 5 = 1, 6 - 10 = 2, 11 - 15 = 3, 16 - 20 = 4, 21 - 25 = 5, 26 - 30 = 6, above 30 = 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PERCEIVED ORGANISATIONAL SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>POS1 The school values my contribution to its well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>POS2 The school fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>POS3 The school would ignore any complaint from me. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>POS4 The school really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>POS5 Even if I did the best job possible, the school would fail to notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>POS6 The school cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>POS7 The school shows very little concern for me. (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>POS8 The school takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INTENT TO STAY WITH CURRENT EMPLOYER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ITS1 I would turn down a job offer from another school if it came tomorrow.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ITS2 As far as I can see, I intend to stay with my current school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ITS3 It is very important for me to spend the rest of my career in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ITS4 I will stay at this company even if other companies offer me higher pay and position.</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LEADER MEMBER EXCHANGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LME1 How well does your immediate supervisor understand your job problems and needs?</td>
<td>Not a bit = 1, A little = 2, A fair amount = 3, Quite a bit = 4, A great deal = 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LME2 Do you know where you stand with your immediate supervisor…do you usually know how satisfied your immediate supervisor is with what you do?</td>
<td>Rarely = 1, Occasionally = 2, Sometimes = 3, Fairly often = 4, Very often = 5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LME3</td>
<td>How well does your immediate supervisor recognise your potential?</td>
<td>Not at all = 1, A little = 2, Moderately = 3, Mostly = 4, Fully = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>LME4</td>
<td>Regardless of how much formal authority he/she has built into his/her position, what are the chances your immediate supervisor would be inclined to use his/her available power to help you solve problems at work?</td>
<td>None = 1, Small = 2, Moderate = 3, High = 4, Very High = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>LME5</td>
<td>Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your immediate supervisor has, what are the chances your immediate supervisor would “bail you out” at his/her expense if you really needed it?</td>
<td>None = 1, Small = 2, Moderate = 3, High = 4, Very High = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>LME6</td>
<td>I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor’s decisions that I would defend and justify his/her decisions even if he or she were not present to do so.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LME7</td>
<td>How would you characterise your working relationship with your immediate supervisor?</td>
<td>Extremely Ineffective = 1, Worse than average = 2, Average = 3, Better than average = 4, Extremely Effective = 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PJ1</th>
<th>Job decisions are made by my supervisor in a biased manner.</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PJ2</td>
<td>My supervisor makes sure that all employee concerns are heard before Job decisions are made.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PJ3</td>
<td>To make job decisions, my supervisor collects accurate and complete information.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PJ4</td>
<td>My supervisor clarifies decisions and provides additional information when requested by employees.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PJ5</td>
<td>All job-related decisions are applied consistently to all affected employees.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>PJ6</td>
<td>Employees are allowed to challenge or appeal job decisions made by their supervisors.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REWARDS AND RECOGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RR1</th>
<th>My salary is satisfactory in relation to what I do.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neither agree / disagree = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>RR2</td>
<td>I earn the same as or more than other people in a similar job.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>RR3</td>
<td>I am praised regularly for my work.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>RR4</td>
<td>I receive constructive criticism about my work.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>RR5</td>
<td>I get credit for what I do.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>RR6</td>
<td>I am told that I am making progress.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>RR7</td>
<td>My working hours are reasonable.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>RR8</td>
<td>I am never overworked.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>RR9</td>
<td>My pension benefits are good.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>RR10</td>
<td>My medical scheme is satisfactory</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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