

The copyright © of this thesis belongs to its rightful author and/or other copyright owner. Copies can be accessed and downloaded for non-commercial or learning purposes without any charge and permission. The thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted as a whole without the permission from its rightful owner. No alteration or changes in format is allowed without permission from its rightful owner.



**THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL
SUPPORT, HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES AND
LEADERSHIP STYLES ON TURNOVER INTENTION
AMONG GENERATION-Y EMPLOYEES IN SELANGOR
MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

MOHD ZAID BIN MOHD IDRUS




MASTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA

AUGUST 2017

**THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, HUMAN
RESOURCE PRACTICES AND LEADERSHIP STYLES ON TURNOVER
INTENTION AMONG GENERATION-Y EMPLOYEES IN SELANGOR
MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**



**Research Paper Submitted To
Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business,
Universiti Utara Malaysia,
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Human Resource Management**

August 2017



**Pusat Pengajian Pengurusan
Perniagaan**
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Universiti Utara Malaysia

**PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PENYELIDIKAN
(Certification of Research Paper)**

Saya, mengaku bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certified that)
MOHD ZAID MOHD IDRUS (817196)

Calon untuk Ijazah Sarjana
(Candidate for the degree of)
MASTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

telah mengemukakan kertas penyelidikan yang bertajuk
(has presented his/her research paper of the following title)

**THE INFLUENCE OF PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES AND
LEADERSHIP STYLES ON TURNOVER INTENTION AMONG GENERATION-Y IN SELANGOR
MANUFACTURING COMPANIES**

Seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas penyelidikan
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the research paper)

Bahawa kertas penyelidikan tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.
(that the research paper acceptable in the form and content and that a satisfactory knowledge of the field is covered by the research paper).

Nama Penyelia Pertama : **DR. ZULKIFLEE BIN DAUD**

Tandatangan : 

Tarikh : **7 OGOS 2017**

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this dissertation/project paper in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Post-Graduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), I agree that the Library of this university may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this dissertation/project paper in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence, by the Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business where I did my dissertation/project paper. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this dissertation/project paper or parts of it for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM) in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation/project paper.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this dissertation/project paper in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah Darul Aman

ABSTRACT

Employee turnover is an unavoidable scenario faced by many organizations regardless of its economic sectors. Uncontrollable turnover is very costly for the employer because it encompasses of efforts, times and costs of rehiring, training, and low productivity effects. Turnover intention is found as the strongest predictor for actual turnover in previous studies. Due to high turnover ratio among manufacturing workers in Malaysia, it demands great concern and some understandings on turnover intention subject. This research investigated the causes that triggering workers' intention to leave towards their current company. In this regard, this study tries to determine the significance relationships of perceived organizational support, human resource practices and leadership styles on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor manufacturing companies. Data were gathered using questionnaires collected from 200 local employees in various manufacturing companies in Selangor. Hypothesis for direct effect were tested using correlation and regression analyses. Results showed that only leadership styles which are transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style (management by exception passive) and laissez-faire leadership style were significantly associated with employee's turnover intention. Implications of the findings, potential limitations, and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Employees Turnover Intention, Perceived Organizational Support, Human Resource Practices, Leadership Styles, Generation Y Employees.

ABSTRAK

Pusing ganti pekerja adalah senario yang tidak dapat dielakkan dan dihadapi oleh kebanyakan organisasi tanpa mengira sektor ekonominya. Pusing ganti pekerja yang tidak terkawal adalah amat mahal bagi majikan kerana ia merangkumi usaha, masa dan kos menggaji semula, memberi latihan, dan juga kesan produktiviti yang rendah. Niat untuk meninggalkan didapati sebagai peramal paling kuat untuk pusing ganti pekerja sebenar dalam kajian lepas. Oleh kerana nisbah pusing ganti pekerja yang tinggi di kalangan pekerja perkilangan tempatan di Malaysia, ia menuntut perhatian besar dan beberapa pemahaman mengenai perihal niat untuk meninggalkan. Kajian ini menyiasat sebab-sebab yang mencetus niat pekerja untuk meninggalkan syarikat semasa mereka. Dalam hal ini, kajian ini cuba untuk menentukan hubungan yang signifikansi berkenaan sokongan organisasi, amalan pengurusan sumber manusia dan gaya kepimpinan ke atas niat untuk meninggalkan di kalangan pekerja generasi Y yang bekerja di syarikat sektor pembuatan di Selangor. Data kajian ini telah dikumpulkan menggunakan borang soal selidik yang diperolehi daripada 200 orang pekerja tempatan di pelbagai syarikat berkaitan di Selangor. Hipotesis ke atas kesan langsung diuji menggunakan analisis korelasi dan regresi. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan bahawa hanya gaya kepimpinan yang terdiri daripada gaya kepimpinan transformasi, gaya kepimpinan transaksi (tindakan pasif pengurusan-dengan-pengecualian), dan gaya kepimpinan laissez-faire (kebebasan) mempunyai hubungan yang signifikan dengan hasrat pekerja untuk meninggalkan organisasi. Implikasi dapatan kajian, limitasi dan cadangan kajian pada masa hadapan turut dibincangkan.

Kata kunci: Niat untuk meninggalkan pekerjaan di kalangan pekerja, Persepsi terhadap sokongan organisasi, Amalan pengurusan sumber manusia, pelbagai gaya kepimpinan dan pekerja di kalangan generasi Y.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

'In the name of Allah, The Most Gracious and The Most Merciful, and peace be upon our Greatest Prophet Muhammad S.A.W'.

First, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Zulkiflee bin Daud, who has given me with unlimited support, encouragement and guidance me to complete this research paper. Without his professional support, I may have not completed this research, and I am proud to say that you are the best supervisor.

To my lovely wife (Shirin binti Khashim) and supporting parents, thank you for all your prayers, patience, support, and word of encouragement for me to keep going till the final end of this journey.

I also would like to thank my postgraduate friends for providing me with many discussions, constructive comments and suggestions in completing this research paper.

Finally, yet importantly, I would like to express my gratitude to all respondents from various manufacturing companies in Selangor for their involvement in this study. Without their sincere participations, this study will not be as successful as today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Research Background.....	2
1.3	Problem Statement	8
1.4	Research Questions	13
1.5	Research Objectives	14
1.6	Scope of the study	14
1.7	Significance of the study	16
1.8	Organization of the thesis.....	17
2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Generation Y	19
2.3	Employee's Turnover Intention	21
2.4	Perceived Organizational Support	24
2.5	Human Resources Practices	26

2.5.1	Training and Development.....	28
2.5.2	Compensation and benefits	28
2.5.3	Career Development.....	29
2.5.4	Performance Appraisal.....	31
2.6	Leadership Styles	33
2.6.1	Transformational Leadership	34
2.6.2	Transactional Leadership	37
2.6.3	Laissez-Faire Leadership	39
2.7	Research Framework.....	40
2.8	Development of Hypothesis.....	41
2.8.1	Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Turnover Intention	41
2.8.2	Relationship between Human Resource Practices and Employee Turnover Intention.....	44
2.8.3	Relationship between Leadership Styles and Employee Turnover Intention .	54
2.9	Conclusion	61
3.1	Introduction	62
3.2	Research Design.....	62
3.3	Population and Sampling	63
3.3.1	Sampling Framework.....	65
3.4	Operational Definitions and Measurements.....	66
3.4.1	Turnover Intention	66
3.4.2	Perceived Organizational Support.....	67
3.4.3	Human Resources Practices	68
3.4.4	Leadership Styles	73
3.5	Layout of Questionnaire.....	77

3.6	Pilot Test	77
3.7	Data Collection Procedure	78
3.7.1	Technique of Analysis.....	79
3.7.1.1	Inferential analysis	79
3.7.1.1.1	Data Screening	79
3.7.2	Factor Analysis	81
3.7.3	Correlation Analysis	85
3.7.4	Regression Analysis	87
3.8	Conclusion	89
4.1	Introduction	90
4.2	Respondents' profile	91
4.2.1	Gender and Age.....	92
4.2.2	Position, Academic Qualification and Years in Current Employer	92
4.2.3	Current Status of Employment.....	93
4.3	Reliability Test.....	95
4.4	Data Screening	100
4.5	Multivariate Outliers	107
4.6	Factor Analysis	108
4.6.1	Factor Analysis for Employee's Turnover Intention	111
4.6.2	Factor Analysis for Perceived Organizational Support.....	113
4.6.3	Factor Analysis for Training and Development.....	115
4.6.4	Factor Analysis for Compensation and Benefits.....	118
4.6.5	Factor Analysis for Career Development.....	121
4.6.6	Factor Analysis for Performance Appraisal.....	123
4.6.7	Factor Analysis for Transformational Leadership	126
4.6.8	Factor Analysis for Transactional Leadership	129

4.6.9	Factor Analysis for Laissez Faire Leadership.....	132
4.7	Correlation Analysis.....	135
4.8	Regression Analysis Perceived Organizational Support, Training and Development, Compensation and Benefits, Career Development, Performance Appraisal, Transformational Leadership, Management by Exception Active, Management by Exception Passive and Laissez Faire Leadership towards Employee's Turnover Intention.....	136
4.8.1	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).....	137
4.8.2	Coefficient.....	137
4.9	Conclusion	139
5.1	Introduction	140
5.2	Turnover Intention amongst Manufacturing Companies Employees in Malaysia	141
5.3	The effect of leadership styles on employee's turnover intention	149
5.4	Implications of the study.....	151
5.5	Limitations and Direction for Future Study	155
5.6	Conclusion	156
REFERENCES		158

List of Tables		Pages
3.3.1	Example of Proportionate Stratified Sampling adapted from Daniel (2011)	62
3.4.1	Turnover Intention items	63
3.4.2	Perceived Organizational Support items	64
3.4.3	HR Practices items	66
3.4.4	Leadership Styles items	69
3.7.3	The Coefficient Scale and Relationship Strength of Correlation	80
4.2	Total of Returned Questionnaires	87
4.2.4	Demographic Analysis (n = 177)	88
4.3.1	Reliability Test Result	90
4.3.2	Cronbach alpha value for each variable understudied	91
4.4.1	Skewness and Kurtosis Values	95
4.4.2	Cronbach alpha value for IV (POS1)	96
4.4.3	Skewness and Kurtosis Values (new)	96
4.4.5	Scatter Plot Graphs	97
4.5.1	Mahalanobis Box Plot	102
4.6	KMO and Bartlett's Test Value	103
4.6.1	Factor Analysis for Employee's Turnover Intention	104
4.6.2	Factor Analysis for Perceived Organizational Support	107
4.6.3	Factor Analysis for Training and Development	109
4.6.4	Factor Analysis for Compensation and Benefits	112
4.6.5	Factor Analysis for Career Development	114
4.6.6	Factor Analysis for Performance Appraisal	117

4.6.7	Factor Analysis for Transformational Leadership	119
4.6.8	Factor Analysis for Transactional Leadership	123
4.6.9	Factor Analysis for Laissez Faire Leadership	126
4.7	Correlation Analysis	129
4.8	Regression Analysis	130
4.8.1	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	131
4.8.2	Coefficient	132
5.2	Turnover Intention amongst Manufacturing Companies Employees in Malaysia	135
5.2.1	Number of persons engaged by category of workers and sex, 2014	139
5.2.2	Percentage share of persons engaged by category of workers and sex, 2014	140

List of Figure

2.7	Research Framework	40
-----	--------------------	----

List of Appendices

Appendix 1	Questionnaire
Appendix 2	Analysis of Respondent's Profile
Appendix 3	Reliability Test
Appendix 4	Normality Test
Appendix 5	Linearity Test
Appendix 6	Multivariate Outliers
Appendix 7	Factor Analysis
Appendix 8	Correlation Analysis
Appendix 9	Regression Analysis

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
DV	Dependent Variables
DW	Durbin Watson
FMM	Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
H1	Hypothesis number one
H2	Hypothesis number two
H3	Hypothesis number three
HR	Human Resource
HRM	Human Resource Management
IV	Independent Variables
KMO	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin
LMX	Leader Member Exchange
MEF	Malaysian Employees Federation
MIDA	Malaysian Development Investment Authority
MSA	Measurement of Sampling Adequacy
N	Symbol for population
POS	Perceived Organizational Support
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
R ²	R Square
SPSS	Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences
USA	United States of America
VIF	Variance Inflation Factor
YEM	Yamaha Electronics Manufacturing
β	Beta

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a general description of the research which outlines the study based on the research background, problem statement, research objectives, research questions, scope of the study, significance of the study, organization of the thesis and a summary of this chapter. The purpose of this study is to examine the factors including Perceived Organizational Support, Human Resource Practices and Leadership Styles that influence Turnover Intention among Generation Y employees in Selangor manufacturing companies. This study is important for the industry as the company's desire to find talented young people today is challenging and difficult. With the change of the younger employment force from Generation X to Generation Y, companies play an important role in the development and growth of the future generations as well as the success of the organization in the nation. Based on this situation, the employers are able to find ways to reduce turnover intention among Generation Y employees and eventually enable the organization to compete and sustain in the market.

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

Abdalla, H. G. (2010). *The Influence of Transformational and Transactional Leadership on Employee Performance and Organizational Commitment: A case study in the UAE Public Sector*. Dubai: The British University.

Abdelbaset Queiri, W. F. (2015). Explaining Generation-Y Employees Turnover in Malaysian Context. *Asian Social Science*, Vol. 11, No.10; ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN ISSN 1911-2025.

Abdul Hakim Ahmad Dardar, A. J. (2012). The Impact of Job Training, Job Satisfaction and Alternative Job Opportunities on Job Turnover in Libyan Oil Companies. *The international conference on Asia Pacific Business Innovation & Technology Management* (pp. 389-394). Universiti Teknologi Malaysia: Abs Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Abraham Zewdie Bekele, A. D. (2014). The effect of Employees' Perception of Performance Appraisal on Their Work Outcomes. *International Jurnal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, Vol. 2, Issue 1, pp. 136-173.

Agriculture, T. U. (2017). Inferential Analysis. Retrieved Mac 18, 2017 from <http://cyfar.org/inferential-analysis>.

Aguinis, H. J. (2011). Why we hate performance management-and why we should love it. *Business Horizons*, Vol.54 Iss 6, pp. 503-507.

Ahmad Rasmi AlBattat, A. P. (2013). Overcoming Staff Turnover in the Hospitality Industry using Mobley's Model. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, ISSN 2164-4063, Vol. 3, No. 6, Doi: 10.5296/ijld.v3i6.4844.

Ahmed, A. H. (2010). Performance appraisal impact on attitudinal outcomes and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (10): 62-68.

Alam, M. &. (2009). Level of job satisfaction and intent to leave among Malaysian nurses [Electronic version]. *Business Intelligence Journal*, 3(1), 23-137.

Al-Hummadi, B. A. (2013). *Leadership, Employee Satisfaction and Turnover in the UAE Public Sector*. Faculty of Business, The British University in Dubai.

Allen, D. G. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 29, Iss 1, pp. 99-103.

Allen, N. M. (1990). The measurement of antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol.63, pp. 1-18.

Alvi, M. (2016). A Manual for Selecting Sampling Techniques in Research . *Munich Personal RePEC*, Paper No. 70218.

Ang, J. (2016). The top 4 concerns Malaysian bosses have about staff this year. Retrieved Mac 17, 2017 from <http://www.humanresourcesonline.net/top-4-concerns-malaysian-bosses-staff-year/>.

Anku-Tsede, A. A. (2015). Linking Transformational Leadership to Employee Turnover: The Moderating Role of Alternative Job Opportunity. . *International Journal Business Administration* , Vol. 6, No. 4, Department of Organization and Human Resource Management, University of Ghana.

Anthony, W. P. (2002). *Human resource management: a strategic approach (4th ed)*. College Of Business, Florida State University, USA: Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers.

Arbaiy, N. S. (2007). Staff performance appraisal using fuzzy evaluation. *International Federation for Information Processing*, pp. 197-203.

Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of human resources systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 670-687.

Arthur, M. B. (1999). *The New Careers: Individual Action and Economic Change*. London: Sage Publications.

Aube, C. V. (2007). Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. The moderating effect of locus of control and work autonomy. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22 (5), 479-495.

Avolio, B. Z. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25 pp. 961-968.

Balzer, W. K. (1997). *User's Manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JIG) Scales*. United States: Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University.

Barbara Bigliardi, A. P. (2005). Organizational socialization, career aspirations and turnover intentions among design engineers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 26 Iss 6 pp. 424-441.

Barling, J. W. (1996). Effects on transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: a field experiment. *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 827-32.

Baruch, Y. (2003). Career systems in transition: a normative model for career practices. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 32, Iss 2, pp. 231-51.

Baruch, Y. R. (1992). Career planning and managing in high tech organizations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, pp. 477-496.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 19-36.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire for research*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Bateman, T. S. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee 'citizenship'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 587-595.

Beard, R. (2013). Customer Feedback: 19 Strategies To Get More Feedback. Retrieved on February 22, 2017 from <http://blog.clientheartbeat.com/customer-feedback/>.

Bebe, I. A. (2016). Employee Turnover Intention in the U.S. Fast Food Industry. *Doctorate of Business Administration*, Walden University.

Becker, B. H. (1999). Overview: Strategic human resource management in five leading firms. *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 38, pp. 287-301.

Benardin, J. H. (1998). *Human Resource Management: An Experiential Approach*. Singapore: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Bennis, W. G. (1997). *Learning to Lead*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Bennis, W. N. (2004). *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper Business.

Benson, G. S. (2006). Employee development, commitment and intention to turnover: A test of 'employability' policies in action. *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 16. pp. 173-192.

Benson, G. S. (2006). Employee Development, Commitment and Intention to Turnover: a Test of 'Employability' policies in action. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16 (2), 173-192.

Bentein, K. V. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: a latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.90, No.3, pp. 468-82.

Bergh, Z. T. (1999). Psychology in the work context. *South Africa: International Thompson Publishing (Pty) Ltd.*

Bergmann, T. J. (2002). *Compensation decision making (4th Ed)*. Southwestern: Mason: OH.

Berry, B. (2004). Recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers for hard to staff schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, Vol. 87, Iss 638, pp. 5-27.

Blain, A. (2008). The Millenial Tidal Wave: Five Elements That Will Change The Workplace of Tomorrow. *Journal of the Quality Assurance Institute*, (22) 2: 11-13.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.

Boyd, B. (2015). 4 Effective Ways To Combat Laissez-Faire Leadership. Retrieved on Mac 1, 2017 from <http://exclusive.multibriefs.com/content/4-effective-ways-to-combat-laissez-faire-leadership/business-management-services-risk-management>.

Bristol, G. (2015). Lower Employee Turnover and Improve the Bottom Line. Retrieved on January 15, 2017 from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/241777>.

Brown, M. H. (2005). Performance appraisal systems: Determinants and change. . *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43, pp. 659-679.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in organizations*. London: Sage Publications.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods. 5rd Ed*. London: Oxford University Press.

Burn, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, A. B. (2002). *Marketing research: Online research applications (4th ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bycio, P. R. (1995). Further Assessment of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Applied Sciences Psychology*, Vol. 80, pp. 468-478.

Campus, P. S. (2013). PSYCH 485 Lesson 10: Transformational Leadership. Retrieved on February 16, 2017 from <https://sites.psu.edu/leadership/2013/06/17/transformational-leadership-3/>.

Carter, M. (2008). Employee Training and Development: Reasons and Benefits. <http://www.managementhelp.org/index.html>.

Carter, M. R. (2012). Staying in nursing: whether nurses intend to remain employed? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 68, 1589-1600.

Cerny, C. K. (1977). A study of a measure of sampling adequacy for factor-analytic correlation matrices. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 12(1). 43-47.

Chang, E. (1999). Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, Vol. 52. pp. 1257-1278.

Chaturvedi, K. (2016). Sampling Methods. Retrieved February 14, 2017 from <http://www.pitt.edu.edu/~super7/43011-44001/43911.ppt>.

Chaudhry, A. Q. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez-faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3, Iss 7, pp. 258-264.

Chen, H. B. (2005). Leadership style an nursing faculty job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Vol. 4, Iss 37, pp. 374-380.

Cherry, K. (2017). What is laissez-Faire Leadership? The Pros and Cons of the Delegative Leadership Style. Retrieved on April 10, 2017 from <https://www.verywell.com/what-is-laissez-faire-leadership-2795316>.

Chew, J. C. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 29, Iss. 6, pp. 503-522.

Chiu, C. L. (2005). Modeling turnover intentions and their antecedents using the locus of control as a moderator: a case of customer service employees. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol.16, No.4, pp. 481-99.

Cho, S. J. (2009). Employees intent to leave: A comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. *International journal of hospitality management*, 28, 374-381.

Cho, S. R. (2006). Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, pp. 262-277.

Cho, S. W. (2006). Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances. *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 25, pp. 262-277.

Choi Sang Long, L. Y. (2012). Leadership Styles and Employees' Turnover Intention: Exploratory Study of Academic Staff in a Malaysian College. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, Vol. 19, Iss 4, pp. 575-581.

Choi Sang Long, P. P. (2012). The impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Employees' Turnover Intention: A conceptual Model. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. , Vol. 4, No.2, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia & Wawasan Open University.

Choong Sok Nee, L. C. (2013). *A Study of Employees' Turnover Intention Among Generation Y in Fast-Food Industry*. Kuala Lumpur: Faculty of Business and Finance, University Tunku Abdul Rahman.

Chris Perryer, C. J. (2010). Predicting turnover intentions. *Management Research Review*, Vol.33 Iss 9 pp. 911-923.

Chun Chang Lee, S.-H. H.-Y. (2011). A Study on Factors Affecting Turnover Intention of Hotel Employees. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 2(7): 866-875.

Coakes, S. J. (2010). *SPSS : Analysis without anguish. Version 17.0 for Windows*. Milton, Queensland: John Wiley & Sons Australia, Inc.

Connell, J. F. (2003). Engendering trust in manager subordinate relationships: Predictors and outcomes. . *Personnel Review*, 32(5): 569-587.

Cruz, C. S. (2007). Gen Y : How Boomer Babies are Changing the Workplace. *Hawaii Business*, 52(11), 38.

Dabke, S. S. (2008). Job Satisfaction of Women in Construction Trades. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, Vol. 134, No. 3. pp. 205-216.

Daft, R. L. (2010). *Management (9th Ed)*. Mason, OH, USA: South-Western, Cengage Learning.

Dailey, R. C. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as antecedents of job dissatisfaction and intent to leave. *Human Relations*, Vol. 45, pp. 305-317.

Daniel, J. (2011). *Sampling essentials: practical guidelines for making sampling choices*. Sage Publications.

Dargham, S. N. (2010). Effective management of the performance appraisal process in Lebanon: An exploratory study. *Maître de Conférences à la FGM*.

Defillippi, R. A. (1994). The boundaryless career: A competency-based perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, pp. 307-324.

Delaney, J. T. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4): 949-969.

Delery, J. E. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4): 802-835.

Denisi, A. S. (2006). Performance appraisal, performance management and improving individual performance: A motivational framework. *Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 2, Iss 2, pp. 253-277.

Dessler, G. (1991). *Personnel/Human Resource Management (5th ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Diala, L. G.-M. (2014). Career Development and Turnover in Food and Beverage Industry. *International Journal of Computer & Organization Trends*.

Dirks, K. T. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4): 450-467.

Downe, A. L. (2012). Corporate Talent Needs and Availability in Malaysian Service Industry. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 224-235.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary process*. New York: The Free Press.

Dr. Albert Puni, C. B. (2016). Leadership Styles, Employee Turnover Intentions and Counterproductive Work Behaviours. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, ISSN 2278 - 0211 (Online).

Dress, G. G. (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital and organizational performance. *Acad Manage*, 446-456.

Dudovskiy, J. (2016). Stratified Sampling. Retrieved February 18, 2017 from <http://research-methodology.net/sampling-in-primary-data-collection/stratified-sampling/>.

E. Kevin Kelloway, J. B. (2000). What we have learned about developing transformational leaders. *Leadership & organization development journal*, 355-362.

Eder, P. (2008). Perceived organizational support: reducing the negative influence of co-worker withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 34 No.1, pp. 55-68.

Eisenberger, R. A. (2001). Reciprocal of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.86, No.1, pp. 42-51.

Eisenberger, R. F. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75, No. 1, pp. 51-59.

Eisenberger, R. F.-L. (1990). Perceived organization support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.75, No.1, pp. 51-9.

Eisenberger, R. H. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.

Eisenberger, S. H. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (1): 500-507.

Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol 12, Iss 4, pp. 555-578.

Erickson, T. J. (2008). Plugged In: The Generation Y Guide to Thriving at Work. *Harvard Business Press: Boston, MA*.

Fabrigar, L. R. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.

Fadilah Puteh, M. K. (2015). Assessing Gen Y Impact on Organizational Performance: An Analysis from Top Management Perspective. *Journal of Administrative Science* , Vol. 12, Issue 1.

Fakhryan, M. J. (2012). The effect of performance appraisal satisfaction on employee's outputs implying on the moderating role of motivation in workplace. *International Journal of Business and Management*.

Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. 3rd Ed. London: Sage Publication.

Filmser, P. R. (2003). *Multivariate outlier detection in exploration geochemistry*. Department of Statistics, Vienna University of Technology, Austria: Technical report TS 03-5.

Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: the developing research agenda. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74: 473-487.

Gall, M. D. (2003). *Educational Research : An Introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gay, L. R. (1996). *Research methods for business and management*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Ghani, M. A. (2015). *The relationship between pay satisfaction, leadership styles and intention to leave among local employees at Yamaha Electronics manufacturing (M) Sdn. Bhd*. Master Thesis. Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Gill, A. F. (2010). The relations of transformational leadership and empowerment with employee job satisfaction: A study among Indian restaurant employees. *Business and Economics Journal*, Vol 18, pp. 1-19.

Gill, A. M. (2011). The effect of empowerment and Transformational Leadership on Employee Intentions to Quit: A Study of Restaurant Workers in India. *International Journal of Management*, 28(1), 217-229.

Given, L. M. (2008). *The sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Gomez-Mejia, L. B. (2012). *Managing human resources (7th ed)*. Boston: Pearson.

Good, L. P. (1996). Assessing hierarchical differences in job-related attitudes and turnover among retail managers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.20, No.1, pp. 27-36.

Grant, A. M. (2012). Leading with meaning: Benificiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 2, 458-476.

Griffeth, R. W. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: update, moderator test and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, Vol.26, pp. 463-488.

Gruber, J. M. (1994). Health insurance and job mobility: The effects of public policy on job-lock. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 48, Iss 1, pp. 86-102.

Gruman, J. A. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 21, Iss 2, pp. 123-136.

Guest, D. C. (2002). A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organizational commitment among graduates in the first ten years at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, pp. 731-748.

Gupta, N. J. (1991). Rethinking dysfunctional employee behaviors. *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, Iss 1, pp. 39-59.

Gutteridge, T. G. (1999). *Organizational Career Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Hair Jr., J. M. (2007). *Research Methods for Business*. California.

Hair, J. A. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis (4th ed)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. B. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis (6th ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. E. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis (6th edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hair, J. F. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis (5th Edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, D. T. (1996). The new protean career: Psychological success and the path with a heart. In Hall, D.T. (Ed). *The Career is Dead - Long Live the Career*, pp. 15-45, Jossey Bass: San Francisco, CA.

Hamidifar, F. (2010). A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee job satisfaction at Islamic Azad University branches in Tehran, Iran. *AU-GSB e-Journal*, Vol. 3, 45-58.

Hamstra, M. V. (2011). Transformational-transactional leadership styles and followers' regulatory focus: Fit reduces followers' turnover intention. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10(4), 182-186.

Harris, G. C. (2005). Multiple dimensions of organizational identification and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions and psychological wellbeing. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, Vol.37, No.3, pp.159-69.

Harvey, P. S. (2007). Coping with abusive supervisors: the neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 18, pp. 264-280.

Hassan, Z. Y. (2013). Transformational Leadership Practices and Student Satisfaction in an Educational Setting in Malaysia. *ASCENT International Conference Proceedings-Accounting and Business Management (IJABM)* (pp. 253-265). Kuala Lumpur: Financial Training & Management Services (FTMS) College.

Hater, J. J. (1988). Superior's evaluations and subordinates perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73, pp. 695-702.

Heavey, A. H. (2013). *Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review*. Journal of Applied Psychology: 98, 412-453.

Heneman, H. G. (2000). Compensation attitudes: A review and recommendation for future research. *Compensation in organizations: Progress and Prospects*, pp. 61-103.

Higgins, J. (2005). *The Radical Statistician*. Retrieved on January, 13, 2017 from http://www.biddle.com/documents/bcg_comp_chapter4.

Horeczy, A. L. (2012). *Leadership Preferences of Generation Y*.

Howell, J. M. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership locus of control and support for innovation: key predictors of consolidated-business unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 891-902.

Huselid, M. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.38, pp. 635-72.

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 635-672.

Jacobsen, D. (2013). 12 Surefire Tips To Reduce Employee Turnover. Retrieved on February 13, 2017 from <http://www.globoforce.com/gfblog/2013/12-surefire-tips-to-reduce-employee-turnover/>.

Jake G. Messersmith, J.-Y. L.-Y. (2014). Turnover at the Top: Executive Team Departures and Firm Performance. *Organization Science*, 776-793.

Jayasundera J. M. A., J. J. (2017). Perceived Organizational Support and Turnover Intention of Generation Y Employees: The Role of Leader-Member Exchange. *Sri Lankan Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, No. 2.

Johari, J. Y. (2012). Promoting employee intention to stay : do human resource management practices matter?. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, Vol. 6, Iss 2, pp. 396-416.

Johari, J. Y. (2012). Promoting employee intention to stay: do human resource management practices matter?. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, Vol. 6, Iss 2, pp. 396-416.

Jones, G. R. (2004). *Essentials of Contemporary Management*. Boston: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Kahumuza, J. S. (2008). Examining the direct and some mediated relationships between perceived support and intention to quit [Electronic version]. *Management Dynamics*, 17(4), 2-19.

Karen, H. C. (2000). *Compensation, incentive and organizational change: Ideas and evidence from theory and practice*. United States of America: The Ohio State University.

Karsh, B. B. (2005). Job and organizational determinants of nursing home employee commitment, job satisfaction and intent to turnover. *Ergonomics*, 48, 1260-81.

Kee, M. R. (2015). High Commitment Compensation Practices and Employee Turnover Intention: Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences.*, Vol. 6, No. 6, S4. MCSE Publishing, Rome-Italy. Stamford University Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh & Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Kesen, M. (2016). The Impact of Employee Training and Innovation on Turnover Intention: An Empirical Research. . *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 1, ISSN: 2222-6990, Adnan Menderes University, Turkey.

Khan, S. I. (2015). *Transformational Leadership and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Effects of Trust and Job Performance*. Bangkok: The Graduate School of Bangkok University.

Khawaja Jehanzeb, A. B. (2015). What is the role of training and job satisfaction on turnover intentions? *International Business Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia & King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Kimutai, T. R. (2017). The Relationship Between Employee Compensation and Employee Turnover in Small Businesses Among Safaricom Dealers in Eldoret Municipality, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, Page 490.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). What Leader Really Do. *Harvard Business Review, May-June*, pp. 103-111.

Kraimer, M. L. (2011). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational support for development: The critical role of career opportunities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 485-500.

Lam, T. L. (2002). New employees' turnover intentions and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality Tourism Research*, 26(3): 217-234.

Lam, T. Z. (2003). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast food industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 15., Iss 4, pp. 214-220.

Lansbury, R. (1988). Performance management: A process approach. *Human Resource Management, Australia*, pp. 46-55.

Larrabee, J. H. (2003). Predicting registered nurse job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, Vol. 33, Iss 5, pp. 271-283.

Lauver, K. K.-B. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organisation fit [Electronic version]. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 454-470.

Lavelle, J. J. (2009). Fairness in human resource management, social exchange relationships and citizenship behavior: testing linkages of the target similarity model among nurses in the United States. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 20, pp. 2419-2434.

Leibowitz, F. Z. (1986). *Designing Career Development Systems (1th ed)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lembang, S. A. (2015). *Factors Related to Intention to Stay among Gen Y in Malaysian Manufacturing Companies*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Lim Ying San, A. O. (2015). A Study of Generation Y in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 10, No. 6; ISSN 1833-3850 E-ISSN 1833-8119.

Lips-Wiersma, M. H. (2007). Organizational career development is not dead: A case study on managing the new career during organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 28, pp. 771-792.

Lomax, R. E. (2004). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modelling*. New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Loncar, P. S. (2010). Pay Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention. . *Industrial Relations*., Vol. 65, p. 470-490.

Long, S. C. (2005). The impact of human resource management practices on employees' turnover intention: A conceptual model. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 4, Iss 2, pp. 629-641.

Lowe, K. B. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 7 Iss 3, pp. 385-425.

Lumley, E. J. (2011). Exploring the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in the information technology environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15, Vol. 15, pp. 100-118.

Maertz, C. G. (2007). The effect of perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.28, No.8, pp. 1059-1075.

Maria L. Kraimer, M. A. (2009). The influence of Expatriate and Repatriate Experiences on career advancement and repatriate retention. *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 27-47. University of Iowa.

Martin, R. E. (2001). Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories (ILTS), transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, Vol. 4, Iss 3, pp. 247-262.

Martin, R. O. (2001). Role of Organizational Identification on Implicit Leadership Theories (ILTS).

Martocchio, J. J. (2013). *Strategic Compensation: A human resource management approach (7th ed)*. United States of America: Pearson Education Inc.

Mathias, R. J. (2004). *Human Resource Management (10th ed)*. Mason, United States: Thomson South-Western.

Mathis, R. L. (2003). *Human resource management (10th ed)*. United States: South Webster, OH: Thomson.

McNamara, C. (2008). *Employee benefits and compensation: Basics about employee motivation: Nuts and bolts guide to leadership and supervision in business*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Authenticity Consulting LLC.

Medina, E. (2012). *Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover Intention: What does Organizational Culture Have To Do With It?* New York: Columbia University.

Mereama Chase, M. M. (2005). Career Progression and Development in NZ Public Service. *Career Progression and Development Survey*.

Mester, C. V. (2003). Leadership style and its relation to employee attitudes and behaviour [Electronic version]. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(2), 72-82.

Meyers, L. (2006). *Applied Multivariate Research: Design and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, California, US: SAGE Publication.

Meyers, L. S. (2006). *Applied Multivariate Research : Design and Interpretation*. California: SAGE Publications.

Michal Biron, C. B. (2013). Performance and turnover intentions: a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 28 Iss pp. 511-531.

Milman, A. (2003). Horly employee retention in small and medium attractions: The central Florida example. *International Jurnal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22. Iss 2. pp. 17-35.

Milman, A. R. (2004). Predicting job retention of hurly employees in the lodging industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol.11. Iss 1. pp. 23-41.

Minbaeva, D. (2005). HRM practices and MNC knowledge transfer. *Personal Review*, Vol. 34, Iss 1, pp. 125-144.

Mondy, R. N. (2005). *Human Resources Management (9th ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Edn Inc.

Mowday, R. T. (1983). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 88, Iss 6, pp. 1315-1317.

Muchinsky, P. (1993). *Psychology Applied to Work (4th edition)*. California: Brooks/Cole publishing company.

Mulder, P. (2016). Transactional Leadership. Retrieved on January 12, 2017 from <https://www.toolshero.com/leadership/transactional-leadership/>.

Mullin, L. J. (2005). *Management and organzational behaviour (7th Ed)*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Murray, J. (2014). Employee. Retrieved on August 19, 2014 from <http://biztaxlaw.about.com/od/glossary/g/employeedef.htm>.

Nadler, L. N. (1989). *Developing Human Resources (3rd ed)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

NAS. (2006). Generation Y: The Millenials - Ready or Not, Here They Come. Retrieved from: <http://www.nasrecruitment.com/talenttips/NASinsights/GenerationY.pdf>.

Nasurdin, M. A. (2008). Predicting Turnover Intentions of Hotel Employees: The Influence of Employee Development Human Resource Management Practices and Trust in Organization. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, January-April 2006, Vol. 8, No. 1, No. 1, pp. 21-42.

Nelson, E. H. (2009). Coaching on the dark side. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 4(1), 9-21.

Newman, A. T. (2011). The impact of employee perceptions of training on organizational commitment and turnover intentions: A study of multinationals in Chinese service sector. *The international journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 22 (8).

Nguni, S. S. (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian Case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 17. Iss 2, pp. 145-177.

Nik Norsyamimi, M. N. (2012). *Turnover Intention : An Examination of Job Characteristics and Transformational Leadership Style Among Operators in Electrical and Electronics Sub-Sector*. Master Thesis. Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Noe, R. A. (2013). Analyzing the relationship between human resource management (HRM) activities and employees; intention to stay in the organization through organizational commitment. *International Journal of Agriculture and Crop Sciences*, Vol. 4. Iss 19. pp. 2247-2254.

Nordin, N. (2013). Transformational Leadership Behaviour and its Effectiveness Outcomes in a Higher Learning Institution. *WCIK E-Journal of Integration Knowledge*.

Norman, G. S. (2008). *Biostatistics: The Bare Essentials (3rd ed)*. London: B.C Decker.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice, 5th Ed.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Nzuve, S. N. (2007). *Management of Human Resources: A Kenyan Perspective, Nairobi.* Basic Modern Management Consultants.

Okumbe, J. A. (1998). *Educational Management: Theory and Practice.* Nairobi University Press.

Oluokun, M. O. (2003). *The relationship between transactional and transformational leadership behaviours and employee turnover intentions in municipal sector organizations.* Doctoral Dissertation. Nova Southeastern University.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step to data analysis using SPSS for windows (Version 15) (3rd ed).* New York: Open University Press.

Pallant, J. (2011). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS program. 4th Ed.* Australia: Allen & Unwin, Berkshire.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38, 213-232.

Pfeffer, J. (2007). Human Resources from an Organizational Behavior Perspective: Some Paradoxes Explained. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 21, No. 4. pp. 115-134.

Pienaar, C. B. (2008). The retention of academics in the early career phase [Electronic version]. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(2), 32-41.

Pieterse-Landman, E. (2012). *The relationship between transformational leadership, employee engagement, job characteristics and intention to quit.* Department of Industrial Psychology, Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences, Stellenbosch University.

Polit, D. F. (2001). *Essential of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization (5th edition)*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Poon, M. L. (2004). Effects of performance appraisal politics on job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Personnel Review*, Vol.33 No. 3, pp. 322-334.

Porter, L. S. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 603-609.

Poutsma, E. L. (2006). The diffusion of calculative and collaborative HRM practices in European Firms. *Industrial Relations*, 45, 513-546.

R.G., G. (1989). The chi-square plot: A tool for multivariate outlier recognition. *Journal of Geochemical Exploration*, Vol. 32, pp. 319-341.

Randall P. Bandura, R. J. (2014). Voluntary helpful organizational behavior. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38:7, 610-627.

Randy K. Chiu, V. W.-M.-P. (2002). Retaining and motivating employees: Compensation preferences in Hong Kong and China. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 31, Issue: 4, pp. 402-431.

Rhoades, L. E. (2001). Affective commitment of the organizational support: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.86 No.5, pp. 825-36.

Rhoades, L. E. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A Review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.

Riaz, A. H. (2010). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons*, Vol. 1, Iss 1, pp. 29-38.

Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*, 2th Ed. Center for Leadership Studies Binghamton University: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Robbins, S. P. (2010). *Management*. India: Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd.

Roberts, D. R. (2002). Job engagement: Why it's important and how to improve it. *Employment Relation Today*, Vol. 29, Iss 3, pp. 21-29.

Robyn, A. D. (2013). Intention to quit amongst Generation Y academics in higher education. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol. 39, Iss 1, pp. 1-14.

Rousseeuw P.J., V. Z. (1990). Unmasking multivariate outliers and leverage points. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 85 (411), pp. 633-651.

Sadeghi, A. P. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 186-197.

Sadeghi, A. P. (2013). The Role of Transformational Leadership Style in Enhancing Lecturers' Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 4, Iss 8.

Sanchez-Manjavacas, A. S.-I. (2014). Internal employability as a strategy for key employee retention. *Innovar*, 24(5), 7-22.

Sarros, J. C. (2001). The transformational-transactional model in practice. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 22 Iss 8.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Approach (4th edition)*. India: Wiley.

Sekaran, U. (2013). *Research Methods for business: A skill building approach*. London: Wiley.

Sekaran, U. a. (2013). *Research Methods for Business : A Skill-Building Approach. 6th Edition*. New York: Wiley.

Sekaran, U. A. (2013). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach. 6th Ed.* West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Sekaran, U. B. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach (5th edition)*. United Kingdom: John Wiley.

Settoon, R. B. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.

Shahrul Nizam Salahudin, M. N. (2016). Generation Y : Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. *3rd International Conference on Business and Economics* (pp. 449-454). College of Business and Accounting, Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Malaysia.

Shahzad K., B. S. (2008). Impact of HR practices on the perceived performance of University teachers in Pakistan. *International Business Review*, 4(2), 110-123.

Shaw, J. D. (1998). An organizational level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41, Iss 5, pp. 511-525.

Shweta Pandey, D. M. (2016). A study of performance appraisal for generation Y: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, Vol. 3, Issue 9, Page No. 228-230.

Snedecor, G. W. (1989). *Statistical Methods*. 8th Ed. Iowa State: University Press.

Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism : An examination of direct and indirection effects [Electronic version]. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 49-58.

Soureh Arzil, L. F. (2014). Relationship of transformational and transactional leadership style with job satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 6, No. 3.

Statistics, L. F. (2016). *Labor Force Survey Report Malaysia*. Putrajaya: Department of Statistics, Malaysia.

Sun, J. (2004). Understanding the impact of perceived principal leadership style on teacher commitment. *International Schools and Education Advancement*, Vol. 32, Iss 2, pp. 18-31.

Sweeney, P. D. (1993). Workers' Evaluations of the 'Ends' and the 'Means': An Examination of Four Models of Distributive and Procedural Justice. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 23-40.

Sykes, A. O. (1993). *An Introduction to Regression Analysis*. Chicago: Coase-Sandor Institute for Law & Economics.

Tabachnick, B. F. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics (5th ed)*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Takleab, A. G. (2005). Is it Pay Levels or Pay Raise that Matter to Fairness and Turnover? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, No. 26, pp. 899-921.

Talat Islam, S. U. (2013). Turnover Intentions: The influence of perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1238-1242.

Tan, C. L. (2011). Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Innovation: Assessing the Mediating Role of Knowledge Management Effectiveness. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, Volume 9, Issue 2, pp. 155-167.

Teijlingen van, E. R. (2001). The importance of conducting and reporting pilot studies: the example of the Scottish Births Survey. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 34: 289-295.

Treasury. (2017). *Malaysia Economic Report 2016/2017*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Finance Malaysia.

Tumwesigye, G. (2010). The relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4 (6), pp. 942-952.

Tumwesigye, G. (2010). The relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of

organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4, Iss 6, pp. 942-952.

Twenge, J. M. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(8), 862-877.

Van Knippenberg, D. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: self-definition, social exchange and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol.27, No.5, pp. 571-584.

Verhees, J. M. (2012). The Relationship Between Training and Employees' Turnover Intentions and the Role of Organizational Commitment. *Master Thesis Human Resources*, Tilburg University, Netherlands.

Vignaswaran, R. (2005). The relationship between Performance Appraisal Satisfaction and Employee Outcome.

Vignaswaran, R. (2008). *The relationship between performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: A study conducted in Peninsular Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Malaya.

Vigoda, E. (2000). Organizational politics, job attitudes and work outcomes: exploration and implications for the public sector. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol.57, pp. 326-347.

Villanova, P. B. (1993). Rater leniency and performance appraisal discomfort. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 53, pp. 789-799.

Vorhauser-Smith, S. (2012). No Career Path, No Retention. Retrieved Mac 12, 2017 from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/sylviavorhausersmith/2012/11/12/no-career-path-no-retention/#7156a60256dd>.

Vrabie, A. (2014). When does Laissez-faire management work best? Retrieved on February 24, 2017 from <http://b;pg.sandglaz.com/when-does-laissez-faire-management-work-best/>.

Wali Rahman, Z. N. (2013). Employee development and turnoverintention: theory validation. *European Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 37 Iss pp. 564-579.

Walsh, K. T. (2007). Developing in-house careers and retaining management talent. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 48, Iss 2, pp. 163-182.

Wanjiru, N. S. (2007). *A survey of factors that influence employee retention in manufacturing firms in Nairobi*. University of Nairobi.

Waterman, R. H. (1994). Toward a career-resilient workforce. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 87-95.

Wayne, S. S. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: a social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.40, No.1, pp. 82-111.

Weibo, Z. K. (2010). A critical review of employee turnover model (1938-2009) and development in perspective of performance. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol.4 (19), 4146-4158.

Wells, J. E. (2010). Turnover intentions: Do leadership behaviors and satisfaction with the leader matter. *Team Performance Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 23-40.

William, M. L. (2006). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91. pp. 392-413.

Wood, B. G. (2009). Linking MBA learning and leadership coaching. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 4(1), 87-104.

Worley, J. A. (2009). The survey of perceived organizational support: Which measure should we use?. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 35(1), 1-5.

Yui Tim Wong, Y. W. (2015). An integrative model of turnover intention. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, Vol.6 Iss 1 pp. 71-90.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yusoff, W. W. (2013). Generation-Y Turnover Intention in Business Process Outsourcing Sector. *ICMEF*, Kota Kinabalu.

Zainun, N. F. (2015). *Work Stressors, Technostress and Employee Commitment to Change : The Moderating Effect of Internal Communication*. Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Zheng, Y. K. (2001). Developments concerning career development and transition. *Management Research News*, Vol. 24 Iss 3/4, p. 33-44.

Zikmund, W. G. (2010). *Business research methods (8th ed.)*. Mason, OH: Cengage Learning.



Appendix 1

Questionnaire- English Version



Dear Participant,

This survey is a part of Master's thesis by Mohd Zaid Mohd Idrus, MHRM candidate at Universiti Utara Malaysia. The purpose of this research is to examine **the influence of perceived organizational support, human resource practices and leadership style on turnover intention among generation-y employees in Selangor manufacturing companies**. You will be asked to complete the questionnaire that will be used only for academic purpose. Moreover, the questionnaire contains the questions regarding your manager's behaviours as well as your perceptions and intentions on the job. Please feel free to express your feelings in an open manner. Your honest response is very important for the success of this project. I assure that your information will be kept CONFIDENTIAL and will be used only in a combined statistical form. No one will have access to your responses, but me. However, if you have any questions concerning this survey, please do not hesitate to ask.

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant, please contact Othman Yeop Abdullah, Graduate School of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia (www.oyagsb.uum.edu.my).

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mohd Zaid Mohd Idrus

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

INFORMED CONSENT

- The primary objective of this study is to investigate the relationship between **perceived organizational support, human resource practices** (training and development, compensation and benefits, career development and performance appraisal) and **leadership style** (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) and turnover intention of Generation Y
- Please note that participation in this research project is voluntary, and that the respondent may withdraw from the study at any time.

SECTION A: EMPLOYEE'S TURNOVER INTENTIONS

This section is designed to measure the extent to which you intent to leave with your current employer. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
A1	I often think about quitting.					
A2	It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year.					
A3	I will probably look for a new job next year.					
A4	I often think of changing my job.					

SECTION B : ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

This section is designed to measure the influence of organizational support on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
B1	The organization values my contribution to its well-being					
B2	The organization strongly considers my goals and values					
B3	I will probably look for a new job next year.					
B4	The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me					
B5	The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part					

SECTION C : HUMAN RESOURCES PRACTICES

SUB SECTION C (A) : TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

This section is designed to measure the influence of Human Resource Practices (Training and Development) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
C1A	My organisation provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training					
C2A	My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job -specific skills and knowledge					
C3A	My organisation provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organisation which may be of use to me in my future career					
C4A	My organisation provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training					

	programmes and seminars outside of the organization					
C5A	My organisation provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions					

SUB SECTION C (B) : COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

This section is designed to measure the influence of Human Resource Practices (Compensation and benefits) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
C1B	I am very satisfied with my salary.					
C2B	My employee's benefits are very good.					
C3B	I receive an additional bonus if I do additional work.					
C4B	I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism.					

C5B	Salaries are competitive compared to other similar organizations.					
C6B	There are opportunities for recognition in my job.					

SUB SECTION C (C) : CAREER DEVELOPMENT

This section is designed to measure the influence of Human Resource Practices (Career development) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
C1C	Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that there are better chances for internal promotion in my firm					
C2C	The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion					
C3C	I consider that I have real options for internal promotion in my organization					

C4C	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion					
C5C	I feel I have already achieved all I want to achieve in my career					

SUB SECTION C (D) : PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

This section is designed to measure the influence of Human Resource Practices (Performance Appraisal) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
C1D	I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback					
C2D	The feedback I receive on how I do my job is highly relevant					
C3D	I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way					
C4D	My organization seems more engaged in providing positive					

	feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance					
C5D	Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization					

SECTION D : LEADERSHIP STYLE

SUB SECTION D (A) : TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

This section is designed to measure the influence of Leadership Style (Transformational Leadership) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
D1A	I have complete confidence in my manager					
D2A	In my mind, my manager is a symbol of success and accomplishment					
D3A	My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence					
D4A	My manager serves as a role model for me					

D5A	In stills pride in being associated with him/her					
D6A	My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides					
D7A	I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle					
D8A	My manager listens to my concerns					
D9A	My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals, and aspirations which are shared in common					
D10A	My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles					

SUB SECTION D (B) : TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

This section is designed to measure the influence of Leadership Style (Transactional Leadership) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
D1B	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts					
D2B	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets					
D3B	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved					
D4B	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards					
D5B	Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures					
D6B	Keeps track of all mistakes					
D7B	Directs my attention towards					

	failures to meet standards					
D8B	Fails to interfere until problems become serious					
D9B	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action					
D10B	Shows that he/she is a firm believer in “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”					

SUB SECTION D (C) : LAISSEZ - FAIRE

This section is designed to measure the influence of Leadership Style (Laissez-faire) on turnover intention among generation Y employees in Selangor Manufacturing Companies. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (x) in the appropriate block.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
D1C	Leadership should be inspirational.					
D2C	My leader has power to influence workers and that comes from his status and position.					
D3C	My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates.					

D4C	My leader asks subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made.					
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

SECTION E: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

In this section, we would like to find out and know a little more about you. You are requested to put a cross (x) in the appropriate block.

E1. Please indicate your age category.	
Younger than 20	1
21-29	2
30-39	3

E2. Please indicate your gender	
Male	1

E3. Please indicate your position.	
Non-Executives	1
Executives	2

E4. Please indicate your highest academic qualification.	
SPM	1
Diploma	2
Bachelor Degree	3
Master Degree	4
PhD	5

E5. How many years have you been working with your current employer?	
Less than 1 year	1
1-5 years	2
6-10 years	3

11-15 years	4
16-20 years	5
More than 20 years	6

A6. What is the current status of your contract of employment?	
Permanent (Indefinite)	1
Fixed	2
Temporary	3

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey



Appendix 2
Analysis of Respondent's Profile



Frequencies

				Statistics		Number of years working with current employer	Current status of employment
	Age	Gender	Position	Highest academic qualification			
N	Valid	177	177	177	177	177	177
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0

Age					
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Younger than 20	4	2.3	2.3	2.3
	21-29	101	57.1	57.1	59.4
	30-39	72	40.7	40.7	100
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	

Gender					
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Male	90	50.8	50.8	50.8
	Female	87	49.2	49.2	100.0
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	

Position					
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	Non-Executives	73	41.2	41.2	41.2
	Executives	101	57.1	57.1	98.3
	No respond	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	

Highest academic qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SPM	32	18.1	18.1	18.1
	Diploma	48	27.1	27.1	45.2
	Bachelor	83	46.9	46.9	92.1
	Degree				
	Master Degree	13	7.3	7.3	99.4
	No respond	1	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	

Number of years working with current employer

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	17	9.6	9.6	9.6
	1-5 years	61	34.5	34.5	44.1
	6-10 years	41	23.2	23.2	67.2
	11-15 years	16	9.0	9.0	76.3
	16-20 years	22	12.4	12.4	88.7
	More than 20 years	20	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Current status of employment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Permanent (Indefinite)	121	68.4	68.4	68.4
	Fixed	30	16.9	16.9	85.3
	Temporary	23	13.0	13.0	98.3
	No respond	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	177	100.0	100.0	



Appendix 3

Reliability Test

UUM

Universiti Utara Malaysia

RELIABILITY TEST

DV = Employee Turnover Intention

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.933	4

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I often think about quitting	9.1073	9.778	.822	.919
It is likely that i will actively look for a new job next	9.0226	9.340	.872	.903
I will probably look for a new job next year	9.0056	9.403	.852	.909
I often think of changing my job	8.9831	9.414	.824	.919

Universiti Utara Malaysia

IV = POS

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.663	5

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The organization values my contribution to its well-being	12.8870	6.146	.467	.590
The organization strongly considers my goals and values	12.8249	6.236	.442	.601
I will probably look for a new job next year	12.9548	6.305	.277	.684
The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me	12.9605	5.754	.432	.605
The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	12.7119	6.070	.504	.575

IV = Training & Development

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.939	5

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training	13.3107	11.647	.840	.925
My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge	13.2316	11.963	.817	.929
My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be useful to me in my future career	13.2486	11.665	.847	.924
My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programmes and seminars outside of the organization	13.3955	11.320	.847	.924

My organization provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions	13.3898	11.296	.836	.926
--	---------	--------	------	------



IV = Compensation & Benefit

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.897	6

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I am very satisfied with my salary	14.7910	17.803	.753	.875
My employee's benefits are very good	14.4915	18.320	.625	.894
I receive an additional bonus if i do additional work	14.8305	17.017	.762	.873
I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism	14.7345	17.594	.723	.879
Salaries are competitive compared to other similar organizations	14.7006	16.984	.773	.871
There are opportunities for recognition in my job	14.5593	17.714	.700	.882

IV = Career Development

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.862	5

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that are better chances for internal promotion in my firm	12.5537	9.442	.667	.836
The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion	12.5141	9.615	.728	.823
I consider that i have real options for internal promotion in my organization	12.5254	9.603	.735	.822
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion	12.5819	8.904	.728	.820
I feel i have already achieved all i want to achieve in my career	12.7627	9.171	.583	.863

IV = Performance Appraisal

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.901	5

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback	12.8475	10.869	.762	.878
The feedback i receive on how i do my job is highly relevant	12.8701	10.534	.827	.864
I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way	12.8531	10.240	.756	.879
My organization seems more engaged in providing positive feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance	12.8305	10.198	.787	.872
Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization	12.6667	11.019	.650	.901

IV = Transformational Leadership

RELIABILITY

**/VARIABLES=D1A D3A D4A D5A D6A D7A D8A D9A D10A
 /SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
 /MODEL=ALPHA
 /SUMMARY=TOTAL.**

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.947	9

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I have complete confidence in my manager	26.2825	38.908	.644	.948
My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence	26.3107	37.624	.796	.940
My manager serves as a role model for me	26.4124	37.505	.806	.940
Instills pride in being associated with him/her	26.4011	37.389	.794	.940
My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides	26.3955	36.263	.841	.938
I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle	26.4463	36.783	.823	.939
My manager listens to my concerns	26.3277	37.744	.760	.942

My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals and aspirations which are shared in common	26.3785	36.555	.827	.939
My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles	26.3333	37.087	.828	.939



IV = Transactional Leadership

RELIABILITY

/VARIABLES=D1B D2B D3B D4B D5B D6B D8B D10B
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA
/SUMMARY=TOTAL.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.919	8

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	22.4972	25.433	.713	.910
Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	22.3898	24.694	.793	.904
Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	22.4011	24.617	.799	.903
Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	22.4859	24.194	.833	.900
Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	22.4746	24.421	.801	.903

Keeps track of all mistakes	22.5424	25.341	.713	.910
Fails to interfere until problems become serious	22.7119	26.286	.619	.918
Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"	22.6384	26.880	.576	.921

IV = Laissez Faire

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.851	4

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Leadership should be inspirational	10.5480	6.249	.518	.876
My leader has power to influence workers and that comes from his status and position	10.8870	5.169	.721	.798
My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates	11.0000	5.034	.771	.776
My leader ask subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made	10.9040	4.905	.765	.778



Appendix 4
Normality Test
UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

NORMALITY TEST

```
COMPUTE Turnover_Intention=(A1 + A2 + A3 + A4) / 4.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE POS=(B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 + B5) / 5.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE TND=(C1A + C2A + C3A + C4A + C5A) / 5.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE CNB=(C1B + C2B + C3B + C4B + C5B + C6B) / 6.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE Career_Development=(C1C + C2C + C3C + C4C + C5C) / 5.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE Performance_Appraisal=(C1D + C2D + C3D + C4D + C5D) / 5.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE Transformational_leadership=(D1A + D3A + D4A + D5A + D6A +  
D7A + D8A + D9A + D10A) / 9.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE Transactional_leadership=(D1B + D2B + D3B + D4B + D5B + D6B +  
D8B + D10B) / 8.  
EXECUTE.  
COMPUTE Laissez_Faire=(D1C + D2C + D3C + D4C) / 4.  
EXECUTE.  
DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet2.  
  
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\user\Desktop\backup\Data Kajian Zaid 2017-edited.sav'  
/COMPRESSED.  
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=Turnover_Intention POS TND CNB  
Career_Development Performance_Appraisal  
Transformational_leadership Transactional_leadership Laissez_Faire  
/STATISTICS=SKEWNESS SESKEW KURTOSIS SEKURT  
/ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

		Statistics								
		Turnover_	POS	TND	CNB	Career_	Performance_	Transforma	Transactional	Laissez
N	Intention	177	177	177	177	Development	Appraisal	tional_	leadership	Faire
N	Valid	177	177	177	177	177	177	177	177	177
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Skewness	.049	-.800	-.732	-.234	-.479	-.640	-.662	-.822	-1.139
	Std. Error of Skewness	.183	.183	.183	.183	.183	.183	.183	.183	.183
	Kurtosis	-.392	2.051	-.023	-.095	.377	.091	.128	.823	1.466
	Std. Error of Kurtosis	.363	.363	.363	.363	.363	.363	.363	.363	.363

REDO RELIABILITY TEST FOR IV (POS)

RELIABILITY

```
/VARIABLES=B1 B2 B5
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA
/SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```


Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's	
Alpha	N of Items
.760	3

	Item-Total Statistics				Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation		
The organization values my contribution to its well-being	6.6328	1.893	.708		.538
The organization strongly considers my goals and values	6.5706	1.996	.645		.614
The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	6.4576	2.431	.437		.840

AFTER REDO THE RELIABILITY TEST


		Statistics												
		Turnover_	Intention	TND	CNB	Career_	Development	Performance	Appraisal	Transformational	Transactional	Laissez_	Faire	POS1
N	Valid	177	177	177		177		177		177		177	177	177
	Missing	0	0	0		0		0		0		0	0	0
Skewness		.049	-.732	-.234		-.479		-.640		-.662		-.822	-1.139	-.910
Std. Error of		.183	.183	.183		.183		.183		.183		.183	.183	.183
Skewness		-.392	-.023	-.095		.377		.091		.128		.823	1.466	.988
Std. Error of		.363	.363	.363		.363		.363		.363		.363	.363	.363
Kurtosis														
Std. Error of														
Kurtosis														











LINEARITY TEST

Graph











Multivariate Outliers

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.464 ^a	.215	.178	.92073

a. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

b. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	39.000	8	4.875	5.751	.000 ^b
	Residual	142.420	168	.848		
	Total	181.420	176			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

Universiti Utara Malaysia

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	3.459	.397		8.717	.000
	TND	.098	.134	.082	.733	.465
	CNB	-.260	.123	-.212	-2.105	.037
	Career_Development	.058	.138	.043	.420	.675
	Performance_Appraisal	-.154	.160	-.122	-.962	.337
	Transformational_leadership	-.499	.157	-.374	-3.173	.002
	Transactional_leadership	.116	.172	.082	.677	.499
	Laissez_Faire	.436	.134	.323	3.252	.001
	POS1	-.002	.159	-.001	-.013	.989

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

Residuals Statistics ^a					
	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2.2758	4.3892	3.0099	.47073	177
Std. Predicted Value	-1.559	2.930	.000	1.000	177
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.086	.438	.195	.073	177
Adjusted Predicted Value	2.0968	4.2711	3.0071	.47155	177
Residual	-2.26330	2.57209	.00000	.89956	177
Std. Residual	-2.458	2.794	.000	.977	177
Stud. Residual	-2.523	2.879	.001	1.004	177
Deleted Residual	-2.38451	2.73206	.00275	.95131	177
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2.565	2.944	.002	1.011	177
Mahal. Distance	.547	38.757	7.955	6.944	177
Cook's Distance	.000	.113	.007	.013	177
Centered Leverage Value	.003	.220	.045	.039	177

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

EXAMINE VARIABLES=MAH_1
/PLOT BOXPLOT STEMLEAF
/COMPARE GROUPS
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EXTREME
/CINTERVAL 95
/MISSING LISTWISE
/NOTOTAL.

Explore

Case Processing Summary

	Valid		Cases		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Mahalanobis Distance	177	100.0%	0	0.0%	177	100.0%

Descriptives

		Statistic	Std. Error
Mahalanobis Distance	Mean	7.9548023	.52194324
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	6.9247293
		Upper Bound	8.9848752
	5% Trimmed Mean	7.2316250	
	Median	6.0064022	
	Variance	48.219	
	Std. Deviation	6.94400313	
	Minimum	.54665	
	Maximum	38.75664	
	Range	38.20999	
Skewness	Interquartile Range	7.53242	
		1.738	.183
	Kurtosis	3.863	.363

Extreme Values


		Extreme Values	
		Case Number	Value
Mahalanobis Distance	Highest	1	83
		2	85
		3	67
		4	61
		5	84
	Lowest	1	.38
		2	.21
		3	.125
		4	.40
		5	.170

Mahalanobis Distance Stem-and-Leaf Plot

Frequency Stem & Leaf

8.00 1 . 00001111
 9.00 1 . 222223333
 8.00 1 . 44444555
 8.00 1 . 66666777
 1.00 1 . 8
 2.00 2 . 01
 11.00 Extremes (≥ 21)

Stem width: 10.00000
 Each leaf: 1 case(s)



DIDAPATI ADA 11 ORANG RESPONDEN YANG EKSTRIM DAN PERLU DIBUANG DARIPADA SENARAI DATA

BERIKUT ADALAH NOMBOR RESPONDEN YANG TERLIBAT :
130, 106, 90, 87, 85, 84, 83, 67, 61, 42, 23 (JUMLAH 11)

REGRESSION
/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Turnover_Intention

/METHOD=ENTER TND CNB Career_Development Performance_Appraisal
 Transformational_leadership
 Transactional_leadership Laissez_Faire POS1
 /SAVE MAHAL.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.438 ^a	.192	.151	.91566

a. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

b. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.235	8	3.904	4.657	.000 ^b
	Residual	131.635	157	.838		
	Total	162.870	165			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	3.174	.429		7.396	.000
	TND	.119	.153	.092	.779	.437
	CNB	-.193	.137	-.149	-1.406	.162
	Career_Development	-.162	.166	-.122	-.976	.331
	Performance_Appraisal	-.102	.188	-.081	-.543	.588
	Transformational_leadership	-.616	.186	-.443	-3.309	.001
	Transactional_leadership	.485	.216	.318	2.251	.026
	Laissez_Faire	.343	.155	.252	2.216	.028
	POS1	.015	.179	.010	.081	.936

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

Residuals Statistics^a					
	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.8957	4.2447	2.9608	.43509	166
Std. Predicted Value	-2.448	2.951	.000	1.000	166
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.093	.363	.202	.068	166
Adjusted Predicted Value	1.8755	4.2100	2.9594	.44071	166
Residual	-2.21601	2.38083	.00000	.89319	166
Std. Residual	-2.420	2.600	.000	.975	166
Stud. Residual	-2.488	2.690	.001	1.005	166
Deleted Residual	-2.34195	2.54835	.00146	.94829	166
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2.530	2.745	.001	1.012	166
Mahal. Distance	.723	24.942	7.952	5.789	166
Cook's Distance	.000	.069	.007	.013	166
Centered Leverage Value	.004	.151	.048	.035	166

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

EXAMINE VARIABLES=MAH_2
/PLOT BOXPLOT STEMLEAF
/COMPARE GROUPS
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EXTREME
/CINTERVAL 95
/MISSING LISTWISE
/NOTOTAL.

Explore

	Case Processing Summary					
	Valid		Cases		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Mahalanobis Distance	166	100.0%	0	0.0%	166	100.0%

		Descriptives		Statistic	Std. Error
Mahalanobis Distance	Mean		7.9518072	.44934069	
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	7.0646085		
		Upper Bound	8.8390060		
	5% Trimmed Mean		7.5778867		
	Median		6.4452413		
	Variance		33.517		
	Std. Deviation		5.78934979		
	Minimum		.72336		
	Maximum		24.94246		
	Range		24.21910		
	Interquartile Range		7.94563		
	Skewness		.846	.188	
	Kurtosis		-.137	.375	

		Extreme Values		
		Case Number	Value	
Mahalanobis Distance	Highest	1	96	24.94246
		2	74	22.89126
		3	11	21.99613
		4	147	21.44252
		5	141	21.30162
	Lowest	1	37	.72336
		2	21	.73979
		3	39	.77582
		4	115	.82090
		5	166	1.13121 ^a

a. Only a partial list of cases with the value 1.13121 are shown in the table of lower extremes.

Mahalanobis Distance Stem-and-Leaf Plot


Frequency Stem & Leaf

22.00	0 . 0000111111111111111111
34.00	0 . 222222222222222233333333333333
23.00	0 . 44444444444444445555
14.00	0 . 666667777777
23.00	0 . 888888889999999999999999

12.00	1 . 000000011111
11.00	1 . 222333333333
7.00	1 . 4444455
8.00	1 . 66777777
5.00	1 . 88899
5.00	2 . 01111
1.00	2 . 2
1.00	Extremes (>=25)

Stem width: 10.00000

Each leaf: 1 case(s)



DARIPADA KEPUTUSAN DI ATAS, DILIHAT MASIH ADA SEORANG LAGI RESPONDEN YANG EKSTRIM DAN PERLU DIBUANG DARIPADA SENARAI DATA.

NOMBOR RESPONDEN IALAH 96

REGRESSION
/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Turnover_Intention

/METHOD=ENTER TND CNB Career_Development Performance_Appraisal
 Transformational_leadership
 Transactional_leadership Laissez_Faire POS1
 /SAVE MAHAL.

Model Summary^b				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.437 ^a	.191	.149	.91853

a. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB,
 Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND,
 Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal
 b. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.040	8	3.880	4.599	.000 ^b
	Residual	131.617	156	.844		
	Total	162.657	164			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention
 b. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB,
 Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND,
 Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

Model	Coefficients^a					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	
1	(Constant)	3.185	.436		7.299	.000
	TND	.116	.155	.089	.751	.454
	CNB	-.193	.138	-.148	-1.397	.164
	Career_Development	-.168	.171	-.125	-.981	.328
	Performance_Appraisal	-.092	.199	-.073	-.464	.643
	Transformational_leadership	-.619	.188	-.444	-3.296	.001
	Transactional_leadership	.482	.218	.312	2.211	.028
	Laissez_Faire	.346	.156	.253	2.213	.028
	POS1	.015	.180	.010	.083	.934

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

Residuals Statistics ^a					
	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.8979	4.2499	2.9636	.43505	165
Std. Predicted Value	-2.450	2.956	.000	1.000	165
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.095	.350	.204	.068	165
Adjusted Predicted Value	1.8752	4.2155	2.9619	.44097	165
Residual	-2.21495	2.38546	.00000	.89585	165
Std. Residual	-2.411	2.597	.000	.975	165
Stud. Residual	-2.479	2.688	.001	1.005	165
Deleted Residual	-2.34098	2.55640	.00176	.95216	165
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2.521	2.744	.001	1.012	165
Mahal. Distance	.769	22.767	7.952	5.718	165
Cook's Distance	.000	.068	.007	.013	165
Centered Leverage Value	.005	.139	.048	.035	165

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

EXAMINE VARIABLES=MAH_3
 /PLOT BOXPLOT STEMLEAF
 /COMPARE GROUPS
 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EXTREME
 /CINTERVAL 95
 /MISSING LISTWISE
 /NOTOTAL.

Explore

	Case Processing Summary					
			Cases			
	Valid	Percent	N	Missing	N	Total
Mahalanobis Distance	165	100.0%	0	0.0%	165	100.0%

Descriptives

		Statistic	Std. Error
Mahalanobis Distance	Mean	7.9515152	.44515296
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	7.0725452
		Upper Bound	8.8304851
	5% Trimmed Mean	7.5971174	
	Median	6.5442441	
	Variance	32.697	
	Std. Deviation	5.71809326	
	Minimum	.76923	
	Maximum	22.76731	
	Range	21.99808	
	Interquartile Range	7.84536	
	Skewness	.808	.189
	Kurtosis	-.263	.376

Extreme Values

		Case Number	Value
Mahalanobis Distance	Highest	1	74
		2	22.57969
		3	146
		4	21.87671
		5	144
			21.67007
	Lowest	1	140
		2	21.37852
		3	37
		4	.76923
		5	39
			.76925
		3	114
		4	.81250
		5	21
			.83214
		165	1.13671 ^a

a. Only a partial list of cases with the value 1.13671 are shown in the table of lower extremes.

Mahalanobis Distance Stem-and-Leaf Plot

Frequency Stem & Leaf

22.00	0 . 000011111111111111111111
32.00	0 . 222222222222222333333333333333


23.00 0 . 4444444444444444444555
16.00 0 . 6666666777777777
22.00 0 . 8888888999999999999999
13.00 1 . 000000011111
7.00 1 . 2223333
11.00 1 . 4444444555
6.00 1 . 667777
7.00 1 . 8888999
4.00 2 . 0111
1.00 2 . 2
1.00 Extremes (>=23)

Stem width: 10.00000

Each leaf: 1 case(s)

REGRESSION

/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Turnover_Intention
/METHOD=ENTER TND CNB Career_Development Performance_Appraisal
Transformational_leadership
Transactional_leadership Laissez_Faire POS1
/SAVE MAHAL.



SETELAH DIUJI LAGI, ADA SATU LAGI RESPONDEN YANG EKSTRIM
IAITU NOMBOR 74

REGRESSION
/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT Turnover_Intention
/METHOD=ENTER TND CNB Career_Development Performance_Appraisal
Transformational_leadership
Transactional_leadership Laissez_Faire POS1
/SAVE MAHAL.

	Case Processing Summary					
	Valid		Cases Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Mahalanobis Distance	164	100.0%	0	0.0%	164	100.0%

Regression

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.437 ^a	.191	.149	.92124

a. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal
b. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.066	8	3.883	4.576	.000 ^b
	Residual	131.545	155	.849		
	Total	162.611	163			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention
b. Predictors: (Constant), POS1, Laissez_Faire, CNB, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Transactional_leadership, Performance_Appraisal

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	3.182	.438		7.269	.000
	TND	.124	.157	.095	.788	.432
	CNB	-.191	.138	-.147	-1.385	.168
	Career_Development	-.174	.173	-.129	-1.004	.317
	Performance_Appraisal	-.086	.201	-.067	-.425	.671
	Transformational_leadership	-.634	.195	-.454	-3.247	.001
	Transactional_leadership	.498	.226	.321	2.206	.029
	Laissez_Faire	.336	.160	.246	2.093	.038
	POS1	.014	.180	.009	.079	.937

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

Residuals Statistics^a					
	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.8816	4.2542	2.9649	.43657	164
Std. Predicted Value	-2.482	2.953	.000	1.000	164
Standard Error of Predicted Value	.096	.350	.205	.068	164
Adjusted Predicted Value	1.8690	4.2203	2.9633	.44239	164
Residual	-2.22062	2.38056	.00000	.89834	164
Std. Residual	-2.410	2.584	.000	.975	164
Stud. Residual	-2.479	2.676	.001	1.005	164
Deleted Residual	-2.34807	2.55207	.00159	.95553	164
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2.521	2.731	.001	1.012	164
Mahal. Distance	.779	22.543	7.951	5.689	164
Cook's Distance	.000	.069	.007	.013	164
Centered Leverage Value	.005	.138	.049	.035	164

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

EXAMINE VARIABLES=MAH_4
 /PLOT BOXPLOT STEMLEAF
 /COMPARE GROUPS
 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES EXTREME
 /CINTERVAL 95
 /MISSING LISTWISE
 /NOTOTAL.

Explore

	Case Processing Summary					
	Valid		Cases		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Mahalanobis Distance	164	100.0%	0	0.0%	164	100.0%

Descriptives

			Statistic	Std. Error
Mahalanobis Distance	Mean		7.9512195	.44424193
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	7.0740085	
		Upper Bound	8.8284306	
	5% Trimmed Mean		7.6007696	
	Median		6.4443492	
	Variance		32.366	
	Std. Deviation		5.68907253	
	Minimum		.77902	
	Maximum		22.54299	
	Range		21.76397	
	Interquartile Range		7.96272	
	Skewness		.805	.190
	Kurtosis		-.257	.377

Extreme Values

		Case Number	Value
Mahalanobis Distance	Highest	1	11
		2	139
		3	143
		4	145
		5	79
	Lowest	1	.77902
		2	.78341
		3	.80220
		4	.85261
		5	1.13027 ^a

a. Only a partial list of cases with the value 1.13027 are shown in the table of lower extremes.

Mahalanobis Distance Stem-and-Leaf Plot


Frequency Stem & Leaf

22.00	0 . 0000111111111111111111
32.00	0 . 22222222222222333333333333
22.00	0 . 44444444444444445555
16.00	0 . 66666667777777
23.00	0 . 888888899999999999999999
12.00	1 . 0000000111

6.00	1 . 222233
13.00	1 . 444444445555
5.00	1 . 67777
6.00	1 . 888899
5.00	2 . 00111
2.00	2 . 22

Stem width: 10.00000

Each leaf: 1 case(s)



UJIAN TERAKHIR MENUNJUKKAN SEMUA RESPONDEN YANG EKSTRIM
TELAH DIBUANG DARIPADA DATA

Appendix 7

Factor Analysis



Factor Analysis

DV = EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTION

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.802
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square df	583.167 6
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

		I often think about quitting	It is likely that i will actively look for a new job next	I will probably look for a new job next year	I often think of changing my job
Anti-image Covariance	I often think about quitting	.281	-.115	.017	-.112
	It is likely that i will actively look for a new job next	-.115	.196	-.121	-.003
	I will probably look for a new job next year	.017	-.121	.222	-.109
	I often think of changing my job	-.112	-.003	-.109	.290
Anti-image Correlation	I often think about quitting	.817 ^a	-.491	.070	-.394
	It is likely that i will actively look for a new job next	-.491	.773 ^a	-.578	-.012
	I will probably look for a new job next year	.070	-.578	.783 ^a	-.430
	I often think of changing my job	-.394	-.012	-.430	.841 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	
1	3.360	83.992	83.992	3.360	83.992	83.992	
2	.274	6.844	90.836				
3	.251	6.286	97.122				
4	.115	2.878	100.000				


Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
It is likely that i will actively look for a new job next	.935
I will probably look for a new job next year	.922
I often think of changing my job	.906
I often think about quitting	.903

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.



Universiti Utara Malaysia

IV = POS

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.678
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Square	159.566
df	3
Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

	The organization values my contribution to its well-being	The organization strongly considers my goals and values	The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part
Anti-image Covariance	The organization values my contribution to its well-being	.485	-.287
	The organization strongly considers my goals and values	-.287	.513
	The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	-.177	.695
Anti-image Correlation	The organization values my contribution to its well-being	.637 ^a	-.574
	The organization strongly considers my goals and values	-.574	.653 ^a
	The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	-.304	.792 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Component	Total	Total Variance Explained			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Initial Eigenvalues	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.132	71.068	71.068	71.068	2.132	71.068	71.068
2	.553	18.420	89.488				
3	.315	10.512	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
The organization values my contribution to its well-being	.882
The organization strongly considers my goals and values	.865
The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	.779

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.



IV = TND

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.863
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	656.743
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training	My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be use of use to me in my future career	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programmes and seminars outside of the organization	My organization provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions
Anti-image Covariance	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training	.342	-.079	-.038	-.091
	My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge	-.079	.271	-.156	.003
	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be use of use to me in my future career	-.038	-.156	.266	-.049

	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programmes and seminars outside of the organization	-.091	.003	-.049	.295	-.153
	My organization provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions	-.052	-.037	-.028	-.153	.313
Anti-image Correlation	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training	.916 ^a	-.260	-.127	-.286	-.158
	My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge	-.260	.834 ^a	-.581	.012	-.129
	My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be use of use to me in my future career	-.127	-.581	.846 ^a	-.174	-.097

My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programmes and seminars outside of the organization	-.286	.012	-.174	.852 ^a	-.504
My organization provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions	-.158	-.129	-.097	-.504	.872 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Total Variance Explained							
Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Cumulative %
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	
1	3.901	78.016	78.016	3.901	78.016	78.016	78.016
2	.442	8.848	86.864				
3	.287	5.735	92.599				
4	.207	4.133	96.732				
5	.163	3.268	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix ^a	
	Component 1
My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to learn general skills and knowledge inside the organization which may be useful to me in my future career	.892
My organization provides a good environment for new recruits to learn job-specific skills and knowledge	.884
My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake general training programmes and seminars outside of the organization	.882

My organization provides its employees with good opportunities to undertake in-house job-specific training	.880
My organization provides assistance for its employees to take management training and development courses externally at educational institutions	.877

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.



IV = CNB

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.840
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	506.128
	df	15
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

		I am very satisfied with my salary	My employee's benefits are very good	I receive an additional bonus if i do additional work	I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism	Salaries are competititve compared to other similar organizations	There are opportunities for recogniti on in my job
Anti-image Covariance	I am very satisfied with my salary	.457	-.167	-.045	-.070	-.063	-.095
	My employee's benefits are very good	-.167	.563	-.157	.118	-.039	-.079
	I receive an additional bonus if i do additional work	-.045	-.157	.379	-.193	-.032	.006
	I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism	-.070	.118	-.193	.367	-.120	-.064
	Salaries are competititve compared to other similar organizations	-.063	-.039	-.032	-.120	.437	-.150
	There are opportunities for recognition in my job	-.095	-.079	.006	-.064	-.150	.505
Anti-image Correlation	I am very satisfied with my salary	.890 ^a	-.330	-.108	-.170	-.140	-.198
	My employee's benefits are very good	-.330	.780 ^a	-.339	.259	-.079	-.148
	I receive an additional bonus if i do additional work	-.108	-.339	.814 ^a	-.518	-.077	.013

I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism	-.170	.259	-.518	.779 ^a	-.300	-.149
Salaries are competititve compared to other similar organizations	-.140	-.079	-.077	-.300	.884 ^a	-.320
There are opportunities for recognition in my job	-.198	-.148	.013	-.149	-.320	.891 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Total Variance Explained

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.792	63.198	63.198	3.792	63.198	63.198
2	.727	12.117	75.315			
3	.542	9.037	84.352			
4	.377	6.277	90.629			
5	.342	5.696	96.325			
6	.221	3.675	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
I receive an additional bonus if i do additional work	.833
Salaries are competititve compared to other similar organizations	.824
I am very satisfied with my salary	.821
I believe that the salaries are fair and there are no favouritism	.812
There are opportunities for recognition in my job	.786
My employee's benefits are very good	.684

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

IV = Career Development

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.809
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	407.511
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

	Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that are better chances for internal promotion in my firm	The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion	I consider that i have real options for internal promotion in my organization	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion	I feel i have already achieved all i want to achieve in my career
Anti-image Covariance	Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that are better chances for internal promotion in my firm	.454	-.208	-.103	-.011
	The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion	-.208	.416	-.118	-.052
	I consider that i have real options for internal promotion in my organization	-.103	-.118	.425	-.152
	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion	-.011	-.052	-.152	.400
	I feel i have already achieved all i want to achieve in my career	-.041	-.009	.000	-.240
Anti-image Correlation	Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that are better chances for internal promotion in my firm	.818 ^a	-.479	-.234	-.025

The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion	-.479	.813 ^a	-.281	-.127	-.020
I consider that i have real options for internal promotion in my organization	-.234	-.281	.844 ^a	-.369	.000
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion	-.025	-.127	-.369	.777 ^a	-.509
I feel i have already achieved all i want to achieve in my career	-.081	-.020	.000	-.509	.790 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Total Variance Explained

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.273	65.466	65.466	3.273	65.466	65.466
2	.759	15.187	80.652			
3	.410	8.206	88.858			
4	.292	5.836	94.694			
5	.265	5.306	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
I consider that i have real options for internal promotion in my organization	.847
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion	.837
The firm possesses mechanisms for internal promotion	.832
Compared to our closest competitors, I feel that are better chances for internal promotion in my firm	.807
I feel i have already achieved all i want to achieve in my career	.716

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

IV = Performance Appraisal

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.820
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	618.371
	df	10
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

	I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback	The feedback i receive on how i do my job is highly relevant	I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way	My organization seems more engaged in providing positive feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance	Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization
Anti-image Covariance	I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback	.214	-.124	.005	-.103
	The feedback i receive on how i do my job is highly relevant	-.124	.180	-.128	-.006
	I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way	.005	-.128	.361	-.021

	My organization seems more engaged in providing positive feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance	-.103	-.006	-.021	.346	-.186
	Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization	.020	-.028	-.054	-.186	.523
Anti-image Correlation	I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback	.792 ^a	-.630	.019	-.380	.060
	The feedback i receive on how i do my job is highly relevant	-.630	.768 ^a	-.502	-.023	-.093
	I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way	.019	-.502	.867 ^a	-.061	-.124

My organization seems more engaged in providing positive feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance	-.380	-.023	-.061	.846 ^a	-.436
Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization	.060	-.093	-.124	-.436	.861 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.700	73.991	73.991	3.700	73.991	73.991
2	.579	11.588	85.579			
3	.371	7.428	93.008			
4	.237	4.746	97.753			
5	.112	2.247	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component 1
The feedback i receive on how i do my job is highly relevant	.920
I am satisfied with the way my organization provides me with feedback	.902
My organization seems more engaged in providing positive feedback for good performance than criticizing poor performance	.864
I think that my organization attempts to conduct performance appraisal the best possible way	.846

Performance appraisal is valuable to me as well as to my organization

.758

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. 1 components extracted.



IV = Transformational Leadership

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.916
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1303.827
	df	36
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

		I have complete confidence in my manager	My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence	My manager serves as a role model for me	Instills pride in being associated with him/her	My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides	I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle	My manager lists to my concerns	My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals and aspirations which are shared in common	My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles
Anti-image Covariance	I have complete confidence in my manager	.299	-.104	.031	.007	-.059	.031	-.026	-.001	-.109
	My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence	-.104	.268	-.071	-.023	-.044	-.034	.019	-.037	.015
	My manager serves as a role model for me	.031	-.071	.302	-.135	-.051	.055	-.053	.029	-.066
	Instills pride in being associated with him/her	.007	-.023	-.135	.315	-.025	-.056	.043	-.072	.004

	My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides	-.059	-.044	-.051	-.025	.227	-.113	-.013	-.014	.023
	I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle	.031	-.034	.055	-.056	-.113	.276	-.067	.010	-.069
	My manager listens to my concerns	-.026	.019	-.053	.043	-.013	-.067	.362	-.130	-.028
	My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals and aspirations which are shared in common	-.001	-.037	.029	-.072	-.014	.010	-.130	.303	-.079
	My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles	-.109	.015	-.066	.004	.023	-.069	-.028	-.079	.261
Anti-image Correlation	I have complete confidence in my manager	.908 ^a	-.367	.104	.022	-.228	.108	-.080	-.002	-.392
	My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence	-.367	.936 ^a	-.249	-.080	-.179	-.124	.062	-.130	.056
	My manager serves as a role model for me	.104	-.249	.893 ^a	-.437	-.197	.190	-.161	.096	-.237

Instills pride in being associated with him/her	.022	-.080	-.437	.920 ^a	-.093	-.190	.127	-.234	.015
My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides	-.228	-.179	-.197	-.093	.923 ^a	-.451	-.047	-.054	.094
I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle	.108	-.124	.190	-.190	-.451	.901 ^a	-.213	.035	-.258
My manager listens to my concerns	-.080	.062	-.161	.127	-.047	-.213	.928 ^a	-.392	-.091
My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals and aspirations which are shared in common	-.002	-.130	.096	-.234	-.054	.035	-.392	.922 ^a	-.280
My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles	-.392	.056	-.237	.015	.094	-.258	-.091	-.280	.914 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Total Variance Explained

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Cumulative %	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %		Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.477	71.967	71.967	71.967	6.477	71.967	71.967
2	.568	6.307	78.274				

3	.458	5.084	83.358			
4	.403	4.474	87.832			
5	.294	3.263	91.094			
6	.276	3.071	94.165			
7	.209	2.327	96.492			
8	.187	2.079	98.572			
9	.129	1.428	100.000			


Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Componen 1
My manager displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides	.88
My manager shows how to look at problems from new angles	.87
My manager engages in words and deeds which enhances image of competence	.87
I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle	.85
My manager makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals and aspirations which are shared in common	.84
I have complete confidence in my manager	.83
Instills pride in being associated with him/her	.82
My manager serves as a role model for me	.82
My manager listens to my concerns	.80

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.



Universiti Utara Malaysia

IV = Transactional Leadership

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.868
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	825.006
	df	28
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

		Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	Keeps track of all mistakes	Fails to interfere until problems become serious	Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"
Anti-image Covariance	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	.328	-.169	-.063	-.045	.013	.052	-.029	.037
	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets		-.169	.272	-.076	.002	-.076	.013	-.040
	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved			-.063	-.076	.321	-.111	.030	-.046

	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	-.045	.002	-.111	.279	-.133	-.039	.033	-.076
	Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	.013	-.076	.030	-.133	.333	-.127	-.060	.019
	Keeps track of all mistakes	.052	.013	-.069	-.039	-.127	.480	-.098	-.078
	Fails to interfere until problems become serious	-.029	-.040	.004	.033	-.060	-.098	.579	-.214
	Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"	.037	.022	-.046	-.076	.019	-.078	-.214	.608
Anti-image Correlation	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	.834 ^a	-.565	-.195	-.147	.039	.130	-.066	.084
	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	-.565	.842 ^a	-.257	.008	-.251	.037	-.100	.054
	Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	-.195	-.257	.898 ^a	-.370	.092	-.177	.009	-.105

Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	-.147	.008	-.370	.872 ^a	-.436	-.106	.081	-.186
Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	.039	-.251	.092	-.436	.865 ^a	-.318	-.138	.041
Keeps track of all mistakes	.130	.037	-.177	-.106	-.318	.895 ^a	-.186	-.145
Fails to interfere until problems become serious	-.066	-.100	.009	.081	-.138	-.186	.882 ^a	-.360
Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"	.084	.054	-.105	-.186	.041	-.145	-.360	.859 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Com pone nt	Total Variance Explained								
	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings				
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.775	59.686	59.686	4.775	59.686	59.686	3.281	41.012	41.012
2	1.089	13.617	73.303	1.089	13.617	73.303	2.583	32.290	73.303
3	.617	7.714	81.016						
4	.505	6.310	87.326						
5	.348	4.346	91.672						
6	.291	3.640	95.312						
7	.212	2.648	97.960						
8	.163	2.040	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	.872	-.053
Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	.850	-.195
Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	.837	.035
Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	.824	-.399
Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	.755	-.502
Keeps track of all mistakes	.729	.368
Fails to interfere until problems become serious	.668	.408
Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"	.605	.578

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 2 components extracted.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	.901	.094
Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	.889	.217
Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	.780	.390
Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards	.706	.514
Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures	.623	.560
Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "if it ain't broke, don't fix it"	.098	.831
Keeps track of all mistakes	.328	.748
Fails to interfere until problems become serious	.256	.740

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.^a

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

**Component Transformation
Matrix**

Component	1	2
1	.771	.637
2	-.637	.771

Extraction Method: Principal
Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with
Kaiser Normalization.



IV = Laissez Faire

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.790
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	372.864
	df	6
	Sig.	.000

Anti-image Matrices

	Leadership should be inspirational	My leader has power to influnce workers and that comes from his status and position	My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates	My leader ask subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made
Anti-image Covariance	Leadership should be inspirational My leader has power to influnce workers and that comes from his status and position My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates My leader ask subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made	.747 -.144 -.018 -.014	-.144 .344 -.115 -.109	-.018 .299 -.166 .306
Anti-image Correlation	Leadership should be inspirational	.876 ^a	-.285	-.038
				-.029

My leader has power to influence workers and that comes from his status and position	-.285	.809 ^a	-.360	-.337
My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates	-.038	-.360	.762 ^a	-.551
My leader ask subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made	-.029	-.337	-.551	.767 ^a

a. Measures of Sampling Adequacy(MSA)

Component	Total	Total Variance Explained			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Initial Eigenvalues	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.853	71.319	71.319	71.319	2.853	71.319	71.319
2	.699	17.476	88.795				
3	.253	6.336	95.131				
4	.195	4.869	100.000				

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

	Component 1
My leader has power to influence workers and that comes from his status and position	.904
My leader makes vague explanations of what is expected from subordinates	.902
My leader ask subordinates for suggestion on what assignments to be made	.899
Leadership should be inspirational	.643

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

a. 1 components extracted.

Appendix 8

Correlation Analysis



		Correlations									
		Turnover_Intention	POS1	TND	CNB	Career_Developm ent	Performance_Appr aisal	Transformational_L eadership	Management_by_e xception_active	Management_by_e xception_passive	Laissez_Faire
Turnover_Intention	Pearson Correlation	1	-.101	-.053	-.227**	-.131	-.189*	-.218**	-.053	.146	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.200	.502	.003	.095	.015	.005	.498	.062	.141
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
POS1	Pearson Correlation	-.101	1	.728**	.583**	.653**	.700**	.636**	.626**	.432**	.532**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.200		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
TND	Pearson Correlation	-.053	.728**	1	.551**	.561**	.690**	.652**	.625**	.421**	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.502	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
CNB	Pearson Correlation	-.227**	.583**	.551**	1	.653**	.684**	.594**	.526**	.380**	.387**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Career_Development	Pearson Correlation	-.131	.653**	.561**	.653**	1	.757**	.593**	.645**	.593**	.548**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.095	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Performance_Appraisal	Pearson Correlation	-.189*	.700**	.690**	.684**	.757**	1	.804**	.719**	.514**	.578**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Transformational_leadership	Pearson Correlation	-.218**	.636**	.652**	.594**	.593**	.804**	1	.781**	.500**	.597**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Management_by_exception_activ e	Pearson Correlation	-.053	.626**	.625**	.526**	.645**	.719**	.781**	1	.631**	.738**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.498	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Management_by_exception_pas sive	Pearson Correlation	.146	.432**	.421**	.380**	.593**	.514**	.500**	.631**	1	.624**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
Laissez_Faire	Pearson Correlation	.115	.532**	.600**	.387**	.548**	.578**	.597**	.738**	.624**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.141	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).



Appendix 9
Regression Analysis
UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

Regression

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.461 ^a	.213	.167	.91183	1.555

a. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez_Faire, CNB, Management_by_exception_passive, POS1, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Management_by_exception_active, Performance_Appraisal

b. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	34.569	9	3.841	4.620	.000 ^b
	Residual	128.042	154	.831		
	Total	162.611	163			

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), Laissez_Faire, CNB, Management_by_exception_passive, POS1, Transformational_leadership, Career_Development, TND, Management_by_exception_active, Performance_Appraisal

Coefficients^a

Model	Coefficients ^a			Collinearity Statistics			
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients					
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1 (Constant)	2.966	.446		6.654	.000		
POS1	.045	.179	.030	.249	.803	.361	2.769
TND	.135	.156	.103	.867	.387	.363	2.758
CNB	-.188	.137	-.144		.172	.462	2.163
Career_Development	-.227	.173	-.168		.192	.310	3.228
Performance_Appraisal	-.069	.199	-.054	-.346	.730	.207	4.821
Transformational_leadership	-.539	.199	-.386		.007	.252	3.968
Management_by_exception_active	.023	.198	.017	.117	.907	.246	4.059
Management_by_exception_passive	.444	.151	.300	2.945	.004	.492	2.033
Laissez_Faire	.339	.159	.248	2.136	.034	.379	2.638

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

Residuals Statistics^a					
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	1.8105	4.2409	2.9649	.46052	164
Residual	-2.33498	2.21513	.00000	.88630	164
Std. Predicted Value	-2.507	2.771	.000	1.000	164
Std. Residual	-2.561	2.429	.000	.972	164

a. Dependent Variable: Turnover_Intention

