International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations ISSN 2348-7585 (Online)
Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp: (1787-1799), Month: April - September 2018, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Is Supervisor Leadership Style Related to Employee Turnover Intentions?

Dr. David Augustine Bull, DBA, Ph.D., MBA., M.Sc.

American InterContinental University, School of Business

9999 Richmond Avenue

Houston, TX 77042

Email: dbull@aiuniv.edu

Abstract: **The relationship between leadership style and turnover intentions was investigated among 48 supervisors and 192 subordinates, men and women between ages 18 to 65, randomly selected from four randomly selected hospitals with the southern region of the United States. A descriptive correlational research methodology guided by a positivist paradigm was deployed in this investigation. Instrumentation for the study included the Leadership Effectiveness Adaptability Descriptors (LEAD–Self and LEAD–Other), Jackofsky and Slocum's 1987 Turnover Intent scale, and demographic questionnaire. Statistical analysis using SPSS 24 software included Pearson correlation, and descriptive statistics. Results indicated that the most frequently used leadership style was selling/coaching, followed by participating as perceived by both staff and supervisors. In addition, both supervisors and staff had similar perceptions in relation to supervisors' leadership adaptability. The Pearson correlation matrix revealed significant negative relationship between leadership styles L, SL, PL, and turnover intentions (TI), and significant positive relationship between TL, and DL, and TI. Results of the linear regression revealed that DL and TL significantly positively predicted TI, while L, SL, and PL significantly negatively predicted TI.**

Keywords: **Turnover intentions, Leadership style, Leadership adaptability, Employee.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Employee turnover is one of the most persistent and frustrating problems organizations face and has been a focus of investigations related to organizational phenomena by many disciplines for many years [15]. In recent years, the turnover rate in the healthcare industry has been on the increase. According to [14], a third of healthcare recruiters in the United States rank employee turnover as their top staffing concerns. As the national unemployment rate continues to drop slowly, turnover rates are rising up. The average total turnover rate reported for healthcare employers in 2015 is 19.2 percent [15]. The average voluntary turnover rate also increased and was at 14.4 percent in 2015, up from 13.1 percent the previous year [15]. [20] Also reported that the local healthcare industry turnover among clinical staff tops 20.4%, its highest level in a decade, in the St. Louis area. Specifically, according to the U.S. Labor Statistics Review [1], as of April, 2018, there were 3.4 million quits and 1.7 million layoffs and discharge in the overall labor market. [11] reported that high healthcare CEO turnover rates continued through 2016 at 18% down from 20% in 2013.

To help alleviate the problem of turnover in hospitals, it is vital to identify the factors that promote high turnover among employees. However, most experts who study turnover issues pay more attention to employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, commitment, and compensation, as determinants of turnover, shying away from leadership behavior. It should be noted that such turnover statistics only represent substantial recruiting, training, and orientation costs, which, directly involves management or effective leadership decision making. This study targeted clinical employees: nurses, nurse's aide, and patient care assistants; and nonclinical employees: administrators, housekeepers, and social workers/case workers, managers, and executives in order to get a clear perspective into what factors facilitates employee turnover

relating to leadership behavior. Leadership effectiveness has been one of the key factors in alleviating some of the healthcare related problems including employee turnover [2].

The goal of this study was to identify those leadership variables that lead to effective leadership style relative to clinical and nonclinical employee turnover intentions in healthcare organizations, specifically hospitals. Although numerous literature exists on the subject, it has not been clearly established as to which leadership style is most effective. More specifically, a study examining the relationship between supervisor leadership style and employee turnover intent has not been conducted among employees in hospitals in the Houston metropolitan area, even though these hospitals constantly have a high employee turnover issue.

A. Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

The overall research question, therefore, was "What is the relationship between situational leadership style (L) and turnover intention (TI) among hospital employees?" This overall question was expanded further to examine the various leadership variables of situational leadership style, that is, S1–S4 represented by telling leadership (S1: L), selling/coaching leadership (S2: SL), participating/supporting leadership (S3: PL), and delegating (S4: DL), respectively. The expanded research questions are

Research Question 1

What is the relationship between telling/directing leadership style (TL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees?

Hypothesis 1

H1a: There is statistical significance between telling/directing leadership style (TL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

H1o: There is no statistical significance between telling/directing leadership style (TL) and subordinate turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

Research Question 2

What is the relationship between selling/coaching leadership style (SL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees?

Hypothesis 2

H2a: There is statistical significance between selling/coaching leadership style (SL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

H2o: There is no statistical significance between selling/coaching leadership style (SL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between participating leadership style (PL) and subordinate turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees?

Hypothesis 3

H3a: There is statistical significance between participating/supporting (PL) leadership style and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

H3o: There is no statistical significance between participating/supporting leadership style (PL) and subordinate turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between delegating leadership style (DL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees?

Hypothesis 4

H4a: There is statistical significance between delegating leadership (DL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

H4o: There is no statistical significance between delegating leadership (DL) and turnover intent (TI) among hospital employees.

Research Question 5

Are leadership styles (L) significantly related to turnover intentions among hospital employees?

Hypothesis 5

H5a: There is statistical significance between leadership styles (L) and turnover intentions (TI) among hospital employees.

H5o: There is no statistical significance between leadership styles (L) and turnover intentions (TI) among hospital employees.

Research Question 6

Are there significant differences between the four variables of situational leadership style, namely, TL, SL, PL, and DL in their relationship to turnover intentions (TI) among hospitals employees?

Hypothesis 6

H6a: There is significant difference between the four variables of situational leadership (TL, SL, PL, and DL) in their relation to turnover intentions (TI) among hospital employees.

H6o: There is no significant difference between the four variables of situational leadership (TL, SL, PL, and DL) in their relation to subordinate turnover intentions (TI) among hospital employees.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Conceptual Framework

The researcher deployed the Situational Leadership® model of Paul Hersey and Blanchard [21].

A. Situational Leadership® Model (SLM)

Situational Leadership® contends that there is no one best way to influence people and that the most effective leadership style depends upon the performance readiness of the subordinates or followers. The SLM describes four leadership dimensions (S1 – S4) with their associated follower readiness levels:

1. Telling Leadership (S1): A leadership style in which the leader demonstrates high directive behavior and little supportive behavior.
2. Selling Leadership (S2): A leadership style in which is the leader shows high directive behavior and high supportive behavior.
3. Participating Leadership: A leadership style in which the leader exhibits little directive behavior and high supportive behavior.
4. Delegating Leadership: A leadership style in which the leader demonstrates little directive behavior and little supportive behavior.

The corresponding readiness levels of the follower is represented by (R1 – R4). Hersey argued that the matching of the appropriate leadership style to the appropriate readiness level of the follower may yield effective results, including employee productive and performance.

The appropriate leader-follower match includes:

1. Telling leadership style (R1:S1) – For followers at Performance Readiness Level 1, the appropriate leadership style is telling. This style consists of above average amounts of task behavior and below average amounts of relationship behavior.

2. Selling leadership style (R2:S2) – For followers at Performance Readiness Level 2, the appropriate leadership style is selling. In this style, the leader uses above average amounts of both task and relationship behavior. The task behavior is to provide direction for the lack of skill, and the relationship behavior is to reinforce the individual for trying.

3. Participating leadership style (R3:S3) – The appropriate style for Performance Readiness Level 3 is called participating, which incorporates above average amounts of relationship behavior with below average amounts of task behavior. People at R3 not only know what, when, how, and where to do things, but also why they need to be doing those things; they just lack either confidence or willingness to go ahead and do them. The high relationship behavior is designed to encourage them to develop that willingness or confidence to perform on their own.

4. Delegating leadership style (R4:S4) – The appropriate style for Performance Readiness Level 4 is called delegating, which uses below average amounts of both relationship and task behavior. These individuals know what, how, where, and when to do their jobs, and have the willingness and confidence to accomplish the tasks.

B. Leadership and Turnover studies

Many studies have been conducted with the application of the Hersey and Blanchard SLT in many disciplines including, leadership, healthcare, education, manufacturing, and religious studies. Some of these studies are linked with turnover and its variables such as turnover intent and thoughts of quitting. [16] reported that many employees decide to leave their jobs because they are not in good terms with their bosses. This means that employees do not quit working for companies; they quit working for their bosses. An understanding of the turnover process is very important in dealing with turnover issues in any organization. There have been shortages and high turnover rates among healthcare workers, and this trend has increased dramatically over the last decade across the United States. The result of this is the increasing need for workers in the healthcare industry, especially in long-term care. [17] noted that the turnover rate ranged from 55 percent to 75 percent for nurses and aides and sometimes over 100 percent for aides alone [17]. This is a crucial problem for the long-term care industry especially when the Baby Boomers are aging and the focus of many providers are shifting or integrating long-term care services into their provider portfolio. Healthcare managers have implemented numerous initiatives to address some of the problems presented by turnover, recognizing that employee turnover directly impacts financial results. As a result, we have seen a proliferation of strategies or models to address the issue of employee turnover. [22] produced one of the earliest literatures that related turnover to subordinate commitment. They were able to show that reduced turnover has a very strong correlation with organization commitment. The researchers also reported that there exist an indirect relationship between commitment and turnover because of the involvement of other factors or variables such as the desire to stay, the intention to search for a different job. [23] demonstrated a kind of path analysis model relating to voluntary turnover, job performance, and leadership. The developed a turnover scale, which measures the individual's thought of quitting and intent to leave. In another model, [24] dealt with socioeconomic and psychosocial issues relating to employee turnover. The model yielded five antecedents, namely, (a) satisfaction with job, (b) salary issues, (c) integration into the workforce within an organization, (d) communication within the structure, and (e) centralization of roles within the system. It could, therefore, be concluded that all these models are indirectly linked the role of leadership.

Turnover intentions can be for several reasons, namely, low salaries, work overload, relocation, layoff, and job dissatisfaction [17]. However, according to [18], one of the overriding reason employees work out of hospitals and other industries and are not tempted back even with increased wages is poor leadership. Researchers are now concerned about the direct role leadership plays in employee turnover. To reduce the effect of this organizational malaise, [19] suggested that a solution to poor leadership is to identify the kind of skills needed by managers and to put in place opportunities for leadership training to develop those skills. Bean suggested putting in place strategies that promote sustainable employee engagement by focusing on leadership development. Some of these strategies may include training managers in effective communicate expectations to high, solid and low performers, and meet with HR business partners to develop individual leadership development plans. Many healthcare institutions have encouraged a method of continuous learning to help employees grow into their roles at the hospital. Because of the vital role leadership plays in employee turnover, Bean reported that employee turnover has created the need for effective human resource management.

While many leaders have recommended the use of transformational leadership style as a turnover mitigating strategy [13], others ([9[, [10], [12]) stress on keeping the employee satisfaction as a strategic tool to retain the employee. When managers pay more attention to the causes of turnover among employees, and try to mitigate those causes, keeping them

at least to the minimum, the problem of turnover may not become overwhelming among healthcare organizations [6]. [7], and [8].

Vast literature is available on the direct or indirect role of leadership in relation to employee intention to stay or turnover. Stakeholders may hold management responsible for the failure of their investments. Therefore, the role of leadership in employee turnover cannot be overlooked [5]. In trying to understand the reason why many workers leave one employment for another, the concept of leadership in relation to the employee must be explored. Therefore, the problem is, the need to examine the relationship between leadership style and employee turnover intentions. Hence, while several studies have been conducted on leadership styles, there has not been much literature on how individual leadership factors, especially those related to situational leadership, affect employee turnover. A need still exists to examine the relationship between leadership styles and employee turnover intentions in hospitals and other healthcare organizations. Many researchers have confirmed this need suggesting there is little evidence regarding how specific supervisor leadership styles contribute to employee retention or turnover.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Procedure

The sampling process targeted supervisors (N=60) and subordinates (N=320) randomly selected from four randomly selected hospitals within the southern region of the United States. The sample size selected was done by G* Power analysis. Out of the supervisors (N= 60) and subordinate (N=320), a total of supervisors (N= 48) and subordinates (N=192) were accepted for analysis with a questionnaire return rate of 63.2%. Participation was voluntary and all responses were treated with anonymity.

Three types of instruments were used in the study: The Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD-Self) questionnaire, which measured supervisor's perception of their leadership style and subordinate's perception of supervisor's leadership style, (b) The Jackosky and Slocum (1985) Turnover Intent Scale which measure turnover intentions of employees, and (c) Demographic questionnaires designed by the researcher used to collect demographic information. Supervisors received both the LEAD – Self-questionnaires and the demographic questionnaires, and subordinates receives the LEAD – Other questionnaires to measure their perception of their supervisor's leadership style, and demographic questionnaires. The LEAD instrument described 12 situations in which the leaders would identify from among four options their behaviour in a given scenario. The results obtained from calculations put the leader into one of the four quadrants S1 – S4, identifying the leadership style exhibited by the leader. The primary leadership style was calculated by the creation of a composite score for each of the four leadership styles and adding the number of responses in each category. Evidently, the style with the most responses or scores is considered to be the participant's primary leadership style. The researcher designed the demographic survey questionnaire to solicit demographic information such as age, educational level, years of experience, and gender, which was used for descriptive purposes, and to provide a better insight into the research question.

The survey was administered in a paper and pencil format to willing participants after consultations with the Human resources department and managers supervising participants in the four hospitals. Multiple visits were made to these facilities to secure approval for the study and informed consent from participants. The researcher made sure all ethical considerations were covered and addressed all concerns of the participants. Surveys, with a self-addressed return, envelops were distributed to participants via the human resources department. Participants were asked to return completed surveys directly via post or via the human resources offices of their respective hospitals. Participants were given two weeks to complete surveys.

B. Data Analysis

Two types of analysis were done: Descriptive analysis and hypothesis testing.

i) Descriptive Statistics*:* The descriptive analysis was performed to provide more insight into the study, and it yielded the following results: TABLE 1 shows the distribution of demographic characteristics of participants starting with age distribution. The age group (20 – 30) had 61 participants 61/240 (25.4%), (31 – 41) had more participants 96/240 (40%), (42 – 52) years 64/240 (26.7%), (53 – 63) had 15/240 participants (15%), and (64 –74) having the least number of participants 4/240 (1.7%) compared to all other age groups.

The next demographic variable was gender. There were more female respondents 142/240 (59.2%) than males 98/240 (40.8%). With regard to the educational level, 100/240 (41.7%) of the participants had high school diplomas and 90/240 (37.5%) had earned an Associate Degree. Out of the 20.7% remaining, 17.1% had a bachelor degree, 3.3% had a master degree, and 0.4% had a doctorate degree. With regard to experience on the job, 77.9% had at least 10 years of experience on the job, 19.2% had at least 11 years on the job, and 2.5% had at least 25 years on the job. These results are available on TABLE 1 below.

TABLE 1. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF PARTICIPANTS

Demographics characteristics	n	%
Age		
20 – 30	61	25.4
31 – 41	96	40.0
42 – 52	64	26.7
53 – 63	15	6.2
64 – 74	4	1.7
Gender		
Male	98	40.8
Female	142	59.2
Educational level		
High school	100	41.7
Associates	90	37.5
Bachelors	41	17.1
Masters	8	3.3
Doctorate	1	0.4
Experience in years		
1 – 5	105	42.5
6 – 10	85	35.4
11 – 15	35	14.5
16 – 20	11	4.6
21 – 25	7	2.9

Table 2 presents a distribution for supervisor self-perceived leadership style. The predominant leadership style used by supervisors was selling leadership style (31/48, 64.6%), followed by participating leadership (10/48, 20.8%). In addition, only 5/48 (18.8%) of supervisors indicated they practiced telling leadership style, while 2/48 (4.2%) indicated they practiced delegating leadership styles.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERVISORS SELP-PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLES

Supervisor leadership style	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Telling	5	10.4	10.4	10.4
Selling	31	64.6	64.6	75.0
Participating	10	20.8	20.8	95.8
Delegating	2	4.2	4.2	100.0
Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 presents a distribution of staff member's perceived supervisor leadership style. The point to note here is staff member's perceived supervisor leadership style was no different from the way the supervisors perceived their own leadership styles. Both Staff and supervisors share similar perceptions in terms of supervisor's leadership style adaptability. From Table 30, it is clear that 118/192 (61.5%) of staff members perceived their supervisor's leadership style to be selling/coaching, followed by 57/192 (29.7%) who perceived their supervisors' leadership style to be participating.

On the other hand, 5/192 (2.6%) of staff members perceived their supervisors' leadership style to be telling, while 12/192 (6.2%) perceived it to be delegating.

TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF MEMBER PERCEIVED SUPERVISOR LEADERSHIP STYLE

Supervisor leadership style	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
Telling	5	2.6	2.6	2.6
Selling	118	60.5	60.5	64.1
Participating	57	29.7	29.7	93.8
Delegating	12	6.2	6.2	100.0
Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 presents a distribution of supervisors' self-perceived adaptability level. Out of the 48 supervisors, 11/48 (22.9%) perceived themselves as having high adaptability level, 29/49 (60.4%) considered themselves as having moderate adaptability level, while 8/48 (16.6%) perceived they had low adaptability level.

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERVISORS SELF-PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP ADAPTABILITY LEVELS

Adaptability level	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
High	11	22.9	22.9	22.9
Moderate	29	60.4	60.4	83.3
Low	8	16.6	16.6	100.0
Total	48	100.0	100.0	

Table 5 presents a distribution of staff-member perceived supervisor's leadership adaptability level. The distribution was similar to that for supervisor self-perceived adaptability level. From the table, it is clear that 154/192 (80.2%) of staff perceived their supervisors as having moderate adaptability, 24/192 (12.5%) perceived them as having low adaptability, and 14/192 (7.3%) perceived them as having high adaptability level. It is important to note that both supervisors and staff have similar perceptions in terms of supervisors' leadership style adaptability.

TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF MEMBER PERCEIVES SUPERVISOR ADAPTABILITY LEVEL

Adaptability level	*f*	%	Valid %	Cumulative %
High	14	7.3	7.3	7.3
Moderate	154	80.2	80.2	87.5
Low	24	12.5	12.5	100.0
Total	192	100.0	100.0	

Note. Adaptability levels denotes the following: High = 30–36, Moderate = 24–29, Low = less than 24.

Table 6 presents a distribution of leadership styles and average turnover intent scores of employees. It is clear that the telling 10/240 (4.2%), and delegating 14/240 (5.8%) leadership styles have the highest average turnover intention scores of 28 and 27, respectively, compared to selling (116/240) and participating leadership styles (37/116) with turnover scores of 16 and 17, respectively.

TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF OVERALL LEADERSHIP STYLE PERCEPTIONS AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS

Supervisor leadership style	*f*	%	Average turnover intent
Telling	10	4.2	28
Selling	149	66.2	16
Participating	67	94.2	17
Delegating	14	5.8	27
Total	240	100.0	

ii) Hypothesis Testing

The researcher conducted exploratory data analysis which consisted of three tests: test for reliability, test for outliers, and test for normality. The reliability analysis test of the LEAD instrument resulted in a Cronbach's alpha (α) of 0.87, a value

above the acceptable level of $\alpha \geq .70$. The test of Outliers was evaluated by the use of boxplots to get rid of any undue influence on the results in hypothesis testing [3], but the records were retained because of lack of significant differences in the data. The researcher evaluated the distribution of variables for normality using the Kolmogoroff-Smirnov (K-S) test. The results showed that the *p*-value is less than .05, which meant that the variables were normally distributed. For the Turnover Intent Scale, the researcher relied on the original validity of the scale, which is, employment turnover intentions score of $\alpha = 0.83$ for thoughts of quitting questions and $\alpha = 0.73$ for the intent to leave questions. The minimum standard for reliability is $\alpha = 0.70$, so both reliability scores exceeded minimum standard.

IV. RESULTS

Using the refined scores, the hypothesis testing was done as follows. (1) A Pearson correlation matrix to address Research Questions 1–6, with their corresponding hypotheses, (2) a regression analysis to provide a clear insight into which leadership style(s) significantly predicted turnover intentions. Table 7 shows the correlation between TL, SL, PL, DL, L, and TI for all employees who participated in the survey.

TABLE 7. PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX FOR TL, SL, PL, DL, AND TI

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
TI	-	.591**	–.340**	–.246**	.686**	–.792**
TL	.591**	-	–.266**	–.128*	–.051	–.554**
SL	–.340**	–.266**	-	–.789**	–.317**	.363**
PL	–.246**	–.128*	–.789**	-	–.152*	.253**
DL	.686**	–.051	–.317**	–.152*	-	–.625**
L	–.792**	–.554**	.363**	.253**	–.625**	-

Note. TI = Turnover intent score, TL = telling leadership, SL = selling leadership, PL = Participating leadership, DL = delegating leadership, and L = overall leadership style score.

*Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at .01 level.

1. To test Hypothesis 1, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between telling leadership style score and turnover intention scores among the employees. There was a significantly positive correlation between the two variables, $r = .591$, $n = 240$, $p = .000$. This means that there is sufficient evidence to show that statistical significance exists between telling leadership and employee turnover intentions. That is, increase application of telling leadership strategies only, may result to increase in turnover intentions among employees. Therefore, H1o was rejected. There was sufficient evidence to show that there statistical significance between telling leadership style and employee turnover intentions.

2. To test Hypothesis 2, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed as shown in the previous matrix, to assess the relationship between selling leadership style and turnover intentions among the employees. There was a significantly negative correlation between the two variables, $r = –.340$, $n = 240$, $p = .000$. This means that there was sufficient evidence to show that there is statistical significance between selling leadership and employee turnover intentions. Increase in the implementation of selling leadership strategies may result to decrease in turnover intention score among employees. Therefore, H_2o was rejected. That is, selling leadership style is significantly negatively related to turnover intentions among employees.

3. To test Hypothesis 3, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between participating leadership style and turnover intentions among the employees. There was a significantly negative correlation between the two variables, $r = –.246$, $n = 240$, $p = .000$. This means that there is statistical significance between participating leadership and employee turnover intentions. Increase in the implementation of participating

leadership strategies may result to decrease in turnover intentions among employees. Therefore, H3o was rejected. That is, participating leadership style is significantly negatively related to turnover intentions among employees.

4. To Hypothesis 4, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between delegating leadership style and turnover intentions among the employees. There was a significantly positive correlation between the two variables, r = .686, n = 240, p = .000. This means that there is statistical significance between delegating leadership and employee turnover intentions. Increase in delegating leadership may result to increase in turnover intentions among employees. Therefore, H4o was rejected. That is, delegating leadership style is significantly positively related to turnover intentions among employees.

5. To test Hypothesis 5, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between leadership style (L) and turnover intentions (TI) among the employees. There was a significantly negative correlation between the two variables, r = .792, n = 240, p = .000. This means there was sufficient evidence to show that statistical significance exists between leadership style and employee turnover intentions. Increase in leadership style scores results in decrease in turnover intentions among employees. Therefore, H5o was rejected. That is, leadership style is significantly negatively related to employee turnover intentions.

6. To test Hypothesis 6, a Pearson product–moment correlation was computed to assess the relationship between the four leadership styles (TL, SL, PL, and DL) in their relation to turnover intentions among the employees. There were significant correlations between the four leadership styles at confidence level of 99%. A significantly positive correlation was found for telling leadership and employee turnover intentions [TL – TI (r = .591), p = .000] and delegating leadership and employee turnover intentions [DL – TI (r = .686), p = .000]. Furthermore, significant negative correlations were found for selling leadership and employee turnover intentions [SL – TI (r = –.340), p = .000], and participating leadership and employee turnover intentions [PL – TI (r = –.246), p = .000]. Therefore, H6o was rejected. That is, there are statistical significant differences between the dimensions or variables of situational leadership style in their relation to turnover intentions of employees. In addition, delegating leadership had the strongest positive correlation with employee turnover intention, followed by telling leadership style. Selling leadership had the strongest negative correlation with turnover intentions among the four variables. However, on the whole, leadership style had the strongest negative correlation in relation to employee turnover intentions.

Further analysis was done to address any differences in turnover intent mean scores among employees by employment category. Table 8 presents one-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare turnover intentions scores employees by employment category. There was no sufficient evidence to show that any significant differences existed between clinical and nonclinical employees in terms of their turnover intention [F(1, 238) = 1.02, p = .311]. Therefore, a post hoc test was not done.

TABLE 8. ANOVA OF TURNOVER INTENTION SCORES BY EMPLYMENT CATEGORY

Group	Sum of mean squares	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	22.82	1	22.82	1.02	.311
Within Groups	5276.37	238	22.17		
Total	5299.18	239			

**Significant at .05.

However, when turnover intention scores was analyzed by leadership style, results of the ANOVA showed sufficient evidence that significant differences existed among employees [F(3, 236) = 540.1, p = .000]. Results of the ANOVA are presented in table 9. As a result, a post hoc test was done.

Table 9. ANOVA OF TURNOVER INTENTION SCORES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE

Group	Sum of mean squares	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	4625.48	3	1541.82	540.11	.000**
Within Groups	673.69	236	2.85		
Total	5299.18	239			

**Significant at α = .05.

The statistics of the post hoc test is presented in Table 10, and the post hoc test in Table 11. Table 40 presents results of the Tukey HSD post hoc multiple comparison test for employee turnover intent scores by leadership style. Results of the post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean turnover score for telling leadership (M = 31.10, s = 1.19) was significantly different from that of selling leadership (M = 16.42, s = 1.61), and participating leadership (M = 15.79, s = 1.93). However, the mean turnover score for telling leadership did not significantly differ from delegating leadership (M = 30.64, s = 1.49). Taken together, the result suggests that leadership styles do have effect on turnover intentions specifically selling and participating leadership styles.

TABLE 10. STATISTICS FOR POST HOC TEST OF EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENT SCORES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership style	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*	Lower boundary	Upper boundary	Min.	Max.
Telling	10	31.10	1.19	.37	30.24	31.95	29	32
Selling	149	16.42	1.61	.13	16.16	16.69	12	19
Participating	67	15.79	1.93	.23	15.31	16.26	12	19
Delegating	14	30.64	1.49	.40	29.77	31.50	29	34
Overall leadership	240	17.69	4.70	.30	17.09	18.29	12	34

TABLE 11. RESULTS OF POST HOC TEST FOR EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENT SCORES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE

		Mean difference			95% confidence interval	
I	J	(I – J)[1]	*SE*	Sig.	Lower	Upper
Telling						
	Selling	14.67*	.55	.000	13.24	16.09
	Participating	15.30*	.57	.000	13.82	16.79
	Delegating	.45	.69	.914	–1.35	2.26
Selling						
	Telling	–14.67*	.55	.000	–16.09	–13.24
	Participating	.63	.24	.052	.00	1.28
	Delegating	–14.21*	.47	.000	–15.43	–12.99
Participating						
	Telling	–15.30*	.57	.000	–16.79	–13.82
	Selling	.63	.24	.052	–1.20	.00
	Delegating	–14.85*	.49	.000	–16.13	–13.56
Delegating						
	Telling	–.45	.69	.914	–2.26	1.35
	Selling	14.21*	.47	.000	12.99	15.43
	Participating	14.85*	.40	.000	13.56	16.12

[1]Refers to leadership style interaction. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

A simple linear regression was used to determine the differences in means of turnover intention scores with leadership variables as predictor variables. The calculations produced the following results (a) Pearson's correlation of r = .592, with an adjusted r^2 = .350 and p = .000 with regard to telling leadership predicting turnover intentions, (b) Pearson's correlation of r = –.338, with an adjusted r^2 = .115 and p = .000 with regard to selling leadership predicting turnover intentions, (c) Pearson's correlation of r = –.248, with an adjusted r^2 = .061 and p = .000 with regard to participating leadership predicting turnover intentions, (d) Pearson's correlation of r = .686, with an adjusted r^2 = .468 and p = .000 with regard to delegating leadership predicting turnover intentions, and (e) Pearson's correlation of r = –.792, with an adjusted r^2 = .627 and p = .000 with regard to the overall leadership style predicting turnover intentions. Results of the linear regression show that telling and delegating leadership styles significantly positively predicted turnover intentions among employees, while selling and participating leadership styles significantly negatively predicted turnover intentions.

On the whole, leadership styles significantly negatively predicted turnover intentions among employees. Furthermore, a model summary of predictors (leadership styles) and dependent variable (turnover intention) presented a correlation coefficient (R) of .932, the coefficient of determination (R^2) of .869, adjusted R^2 of .866, standard error of estimate of 1.7, and the Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.638. The coefficient of determination of .869 indicated that 86.9% of turnover intentions could be attributed to variable predictors, especially TL and DL. See Table 45. Results of the ANOVA confirmed significant difference between leadership styles as predictor variables in predicting turnover intentions.

TABLE 12. LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR LEADERSHIP STYLES AND TURNOVER INTENT SCORE

Group	Sum of mean squares	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Regression	4605.74	5	921.15	310.84	.000[a]
Residual	693.44	234	2.96		
Total	5299.18	239			

Note: [a]Predictors: DL, TL, PL, L, SL. Dependent Variable: TI. **Significant at .05.

V. DISCUSSION

This investigation advanced the following logical inferences from analysis of the data. The research questions dealt with the relationship between leadership style and turnover intentions among hospital employees. The results of the study confirmed a relationship between leadership styles (TL, SL, PL, and DL), and TI. The Pearson correlation matrix revealed a significant negative correlation between leadership style, L, SL, and PL and turnover intentions. In addition, there was a significant positive correlation between TL, DL, and TI. There was also significant difference between the four variables of situational leadership style in their relation to turnover intentions. In terms of predictability, TL and DL positively predicted TI as opposed to SL and PL.

The predominant leadership style practiced by supervisors in all the participating hospital was TL, followed by PL. This finding was consistent with the findings of [13]. The researchers advanced the practice of transformational leadership, which in many cases is related to the SLM. Besides, in the United States, the S2 and S3 profiles are the most common profile, because the culture places a lot of emphasis on the supportive role of leaders, an important character of transformational leaders. Supervisors exhibiting SL perceived their staff as having some competence, with variable commitment but are unable but willing or motivated to carry out specific task. Many studies have promoted the use of mixed selling and participating leadership style. However, in this study, there was a significant negative correlation between SL and PL. The simple explanation for this is that SL is for followers with some competence but lack commitment. Such followers need direction, inspiration, and supervision because they are still relatively inexperienced. They also need support and praise to build up their self-esteem, and involvement in decision making to build up or restore their commitment. The leader makes the decision. PL on the other hand, is for people with competence but lack confidence or motivation. They do not need much direction because of their skills, but need support to bolster their motivation. The leader in this case makes the decision along with the followers, and supports their effort in carrying out their various tasks. In this study, there is increased use of SL, which is extremely necessary in the healthcare industry, especially in areas where employees have direct contact with patients. The hospital environment is very dynamic warranting the need for continuous quality improvement. Continuous quality improvement also involves constant in-service training and other training to meet continuing education units as part of certification and licensing agreements

In this study, the overall turnover intention score among employees were low. More than 50% of the employees tend to disagree with statements from the survey that indicated their intention to turnover.

(A) Recommendations and Implications for Further Study

Retention of employees has been a problem for many organizations for several years, and has cost organizations millions of dollars every year. In order to help alleviate this problem, the following recommendations are advanced based on logical inferences drawn from the study.

- Healthcare organizations must address employee turnover effectively by working on strategies that could improve employee retention. One of those strategies could be focusing on supervisor behavior or leadership style who are in close contact with staff, because they have a lot to do with staff turnover or retention. Supervisors have significant

impact on employee retention and turnover. Staff facing frequent conflict with his/her supervisor is most likely to turnover.

- Hospitals should put measures in place that holds managers or supervisors responsible for turnover rates. Periodic reviews of employee satisfaction of supervisor's performances should be done. Supervisors and managers should vary their leadership styles based on the prevailing situations.
- The healthcare industry is a dynamic one with the influx of new ideas geared towards improving the quality of care. As a result, emphasis must be placed on selling or coaching type of leadership since it had the lowest turnover intent average score of 16 compared to the other leadership styles from this investigation.
- This investigation supported the notion that when a leader matches his/her leadership style according to the readiness of the follower, turnover is reduced. Most of the leaders in this investigation perceived themselves as using moderate and high adaptability. That is, 83.3% of staff perceived they as using high and moderate adaptability, and 87.5% of staff perceived their supervisors as using moderate and high adaptability. On the whole, supervisors were able to vary their leadership styles to meet the needs of their staff. The logical inference from analysis of data was reduced turnover intentions.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the last two decades, turnover among healthcare organizations, especially hospitals has been a problem and has cost many hospitals billions of dollars over the years. The turnover rate continues to increase from 15.6 percent in 2010 to 20.6 percent in in 2017. Many employees have attributed this to leadership styles of the supervisors from the context of liking or disliking their behavioural style. Management in many of the hospitals fail to recognize this and have attributed turnover to variables like lack of benefits, low salaries, and other incentives. In this study, we see that employees SL had the lowest turnover followed by PL. Directing or telling leadership which is often associated with authoritarian leadership was positively correlated with turnover and indeed was a predictor of employee turnover.

REFERENCES

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2018). Job openings and labor turnover survey highlights. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/web/jolts/jlt_labstatgraphs.pdf Google Scholar

[2] Cascio, W. F. (2015). *Managing human resources: Productivity, quality of work life, profits* (10th ed.). Burr Ridge,IL: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

[3] Cole, D. A., Preacher, K. J. (2014). Manifest variable path analysis: Potentially serious and misleading consequences due to uncorrected measurement error. *Psychological Methods, 18*, 300-315. Google Scholar, Crossref, ISI

[4] Eckardt, R., Skaggs, B. C., Youndt, M. (2014). Turnover and knowledge loss: An examination of the differential impact of production manager and worker turnover in service and manufacturing firms. *Journal of Management Studies, 51*, 1025-1057. doi:10.1111/joms.12070 Google Scholar, Crossref, ISI

[5] Griffith, J., Connelly, S., Thiel, C., Johnson, G. (2015). How outstanding leaders lead with affect: An examination of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders. *Leadership Quarterly, 26*, 502-517. Google Scholar, Crossref, ISI

[6] Hall, A. (2013, March). "I'm outta here!" Why 2 million Americans quit every month (and 5 steps to turn the epidemic around). Forbes. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/alanhall/2013/03/11/im-outta-here-why-2-million-americans-quit-every-month-and-5-steps-to-turn-the-epidemic-around/#512d4e20f9fe Google Scholar

[7] Heavey, A., Holwerda, J., Hausknecht, J. (2013). Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*, 412-453. doi:10.1037/a0032380 Google Scholar, Crossref, Medline, ISI

[8] Hom, P. W., Lee, T., Shaw, J., Hausknecht, J. (2017). Seminal research in turnover during the past 100 years. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 530-545. doi:10.1037/apl0000103 Google Scholar, Crossref, Medline, ISI

[9] Jackson, E. (2014, May). The top 8 reasons your best people are about to quit and how you can keep them. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/ericjackson/2014/05/11/the-top-8-reasons-your-best-people-are-about-to-quit-and-how-you-can-keep-them/#12a43731719b Google Scholar

[10] Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Hulin, C. L. (2017). Job attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 356-374. doi:10.1037/apl0000181 Google Scholar, Crossref, Medline, ISI

[11] Kuhrt, M. (2017). ACHE Report: High healthcare CEO turnover rates now the norm. Retrieved from

[12] https://www.fiercehealthcare.com/healthcare/ache-reports-continued-high-turnover-among-healthcare-ceos

[13] Ou, A., Seo, J., Choi, D., Hom, P. (2016). When can humble top executives retain middle managers? The moderating role of top management team faultlines. *Academy of Management Journal*. Advance online publication. doi:10.5465/amj.2015.1072 Google Scholar, Crossref, ISI

[14] Waldman, D. A., Carter, M. Z., Hom, P. W. (2012). A multi-level investigation of leadership and turnover behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*, 1724-1744. doi:10.1177/0149206312460679 Google Scholar, SAGE Journals, ISI

[15] Long, L. (2017). Staff turnover top concern for healthcare recruiters. Retrieved from https://www.healthecareers.com/article/healthcare-news/staff-turnover

[16] Compdatasurvey (2015). Rising turnover rates and how employers are recruiting to full openings. Retrieved from http://www.compdatasurveys.com/2015/09/17/rising-turnover-rates-in-healthcare-and-how-employers-are-recruiting-to-fill-openings-2/

[17] Chamberline, A. (2017). Why do employees stay?A clear career path and good pay for starters. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2017/03/why-do-employees-stay-a-clear-career-path-and-good-pay-for-starters

[18] Feldman, E. (2014). Keys to reducing turnover in long-term care. Retrieved from https://www.mcknights.com/the-world-according-to-dr-el/the-keys-to-reducing-turnover-in-long-term-care/article/333071/

[19] Bradberry, T. (2016). 8 bad mistakes that makes employees leave. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/travisbradberry/2016/09/07/8-bad-mistakes-that-make-good-employees-leave/#592062c043b7

[20] Bean, M. (2016). 3 factors driving turnover at hospitals and what to do about them. Retrieved from https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/human-capital-and-risk/3-factors-driving-high-turnover-at-your-hospital-and-what-to-do-about-them.html

[21] Missouri Hospital Association (2017). Mapping Missouri's healthcare workforce: 2016 workforce report. Retrieved from https://www.mhanet.com/mhaimages/workforce/annual%20workforce%20report_2016.pdf

[22] Hersey, P. H., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

[23] Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee–organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* New York, NY: Academic Press.

[24] Jackofsky, E. J., & Slocum, J. W. (1987). A causal analysis of the impact of job performance on voluntary turnover. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 8*, 263–270.

[25] Price, J. L. (1977). *The study of turnover.* Ames: Iowa State University Press.