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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of situational path goal leadership styles on employee retention in the big four audit firms. The study was guided by the following research objectives: To what extent does participative leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? To what extent does directive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? To what extent does supportive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? Finally, to what extent does achievement-oriented leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

The study adopted a descriptive research design, that is, it involved the observations and description of the behaviour without influencing the outcome of the respondent in any way. The target population was 220 alumni staff of the big four audit firms - KPMG, PwC, Deloitte and Ernst & Young. The study used stratified random sampling technique and sample size of 142 respondents were selected. The collected data was coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program according to each variable of the study. Data analysis was done using descriptive statistics. Correlation and regression analysis were also used for inferential statistics. For easy interpretations and understanding, figures and tables were used for the presentation of the results and findings.

Findings on participative leadership style and employee retention indicate established that the majority of the respondents agreed that their supervisors do not act without consulting the team. However, the respondents disagreed to the other statements that their supervisors encouraged initiatives from the team, the supervisors encouraged them to set individual and group goals in line with organisational goals, if their supervisors give them autonomy in doing their work and whether they involve them in the planning process when assigning responsibilities. The study therefore established that there is no significant relationship between participative leadership style and employee retention.

On directive leadership style and employee retention, many respondents tended to agree that their supervisors do not consider suggestions made the team as s/he does not have time. However, the respondents also disagreed that their supervisors give vague explanations of what is expected on the job, that their supervisor supervisors retain the final decision making authority within the team and that their supervisors expects them to
The study established that there was significant relationship between directive leadership and employee retention.

The findings on the influence of supportive leadership style on employee retention established that most of the responses were negative suggesting that the respondents tended to disagree that their supervisors respects everyone and treats them equally, creates a friendly working environment for the team and encourages the team to raise concerns about issues affecting them. Based on these results, the study shows that supportive leadership style had a weak but positive relationship with employee retention. However, there was no significant relationship between supportive leadership style and employee retention.

On achievement-oriented leadership style, most of the respondents were negative about their supervisors pride in work and self-evaluation based on personal accomplishment, their supervisors encouraging continuous improvement in their performance and consistently setting challenging goals for the teams to attain. The findings also showed that achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated negatively with employee retention, thus no significant relationship between this leadership style and employee retention.

The major conclusions drawn from the study were that participative leadership style has no significant influence on employee retention in the big four audit firms, and that directive, and achievement oriented leadership styles do not influence employee retention. Supportive leadership style has a positive, but not significant influence on employee retention. It is also reasonable to conclude that the supervisors used varied leadership styles depending on the circumstance of subordinates and the goals to be achieved.

The study recommends against using participative, directive and achievement-oriented leadership styles to achieve employee retention. The study also recommends the use of supportive leadership style to foster behaviours that encourage employee retention. The study recommends further research to be done on other factors affecting employee retention in the Kenya context since this study only examined the influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Employee retention has been one of the most serious issues facing leaders in organisations due to shortage of skilled manpower, economic growth and high employee turnover (Michael, 2008). The challenges of achieving the goals of an organisation come with it the task of finding people with good leadership qualities to lead the organisation (Boateng, Kwaeteng, Auruche, Boateng & Sarpong, 2012).

The notion of employee retention begun in the early 1970’s and 1980’s after a period where people joined an organisation and stayed for a long time or for most of their working years (Ng’ethe, Namasonge, & Iravo, 2012). Thereafter, job movement and voluntary job changes begun to increase dramatically and employers suddenly had a problem of employee turnover and this led to the development of a management tool known as employee retention (McKeown, 2002). Aguenza and Mat Som (2012) stated that retention is the process of physically keeping employee members in an organisation as it is one of the key fundamentals that are necessary for organisational success. Michael (2008) also defines retention as a voluntary effort by an organisation to create an environment which keeps employees for a long term.

While it is important for organisations, through the hiring process, to attract and retain quality employees, it is also more important for leaders to develop strategies to retain the brilliant employees in the organisation (Wakabi, 2016). Leaders and their leadership style play a key role in employee retention especially in the current competitive business environment where the leaders are required to provide strategic direction (Ng’ethe et al., 2012). They can only overcome this challenge if they view their employees as assets and as a source of competitive advantage to the organisation. According to Ng’ethe et al., (2012) this competitive advantage will be guaranteed if the talented employees are retained for as long as possible so that continuity of competitive goods and services is assured.

The primary reason for retention is to minimise the loss of good employees for the long haul. It is thought to be a wilful move by an organisation to create an environment which connects with an employee for a long period of time. Turnover is not just dangerous to an
organization, it is fairly exorbitant undertaking (Chaminade, 2007). Michael (2008) states that shortage of talented employees, economic growth and employee turnover makes employee retention a more critical activity for the managers in an organisation.

The role of retention is to prevent high calibre employees from exiting an organisation and minimise the effect of disruption of productivity and service delivery (Chiboiwa, 2010). Retention allows senior and line managers to attract and successfully retain critical skills and high performing employees (Michael, 2008). Retention policies should be geared towards identifying and retaining committed employees for as long as the relationship between the employee and the organisation in mutually beneficial (Sutherland, 2004).

In spite of the research done on employee turnover, which is directed towards identifying the factors that cause employees to stay in an organisation, very little is known about the factors that make employees to leave. Mehta, Kurbetti and Dhankhar (2014) looked at the various factors that impact on employee retention which include: career development opportunities, effective talent management strategies, recruitment, on boarding and orientation, investment in training and development, compensation and benefits, work life balance, culture of the organisation and leadership among others. Research has shown that having a cooperative and supportive leadership style could serve as a retention and commitment strategy (Leidner & Smith, 2013).

Leadership definitions keep changing as scholars try to simplify it for people to make it less complicated and more practical in daily situations (Mat, 2008). Leadership is a relationship whereby one person influences the behaviour or actions of other people (Wakabi, 2012). People often use management and leadership interchangeably. While management is all about planning and controlling organisational resources to achieve an organisation’s objectives, leadership involves the alignment of employees to the expected organisational vision, hence the two are closely related and it requires one to be a good manager in order to lead (Gwavuya, 2011). Therefore, the efficient use of resources - mobilisation, allocation, utilization and enhancement of organizational performance depends to a large extent on leadership styles, among other factors (Obiwuru, Okwu, Akapa & Nwankwere 2011).

The type of leadership approach is very key in determining the success or failure of an organisation (Ojukuku, Odetayo, and Sajuyigbe 2012). Ojukuku et al. (2012) state that a
leader should influence, direct and motivate others to perform specific tasks and should also inspire employees to accomplish the organisational goals. Obiwuru et al. (2011) also point out that leadership style plays an important role in determining the interest and commitment of employees in an organisation.

Northouse (2010) states that ineffective or inappropriate leadership styles can directly affect the performance and retention of employees in modern organizations. Employees work as a team to accomplish a typical objective and there is a great need to retain good employees. According to Northouse, organisations whose interest surpass those of the employees are bound to fail therefore, it is important to retain employees because the process of re-hiring is costly, a lot of time is spent on training new employees getting them to settle and adjust in the new culture. Mostly, organisations lose their employees to competitors because of lucrative pay, agreeable timings and development prospects (Nair & Malewar, 2013). Aguenza and Mat (2012) also point out that employee retention and engagement is critical for organisations because employees are the driving force to achieve the development and accomplishment of the organization’s goals and objectives.

Nair and Malewar (2013) explain that leadership styles are either based on behavioural or situational approach of leadership. Different theories of leadership have introduced several leadership styles. Nevertheless, the paper will focus on the situational/contingency studies and the leadership styles introduced by these studies. Bolden, Gosling, Marturano and Dennison (2003) explain that behavioural theories may help managers develop particular leadership behaviours but do not give guidance on what creates effective leadership in different situations. Bolden et al., (2003) indicate that most researchers have concluded that there is not one leadership style suitable for every manager under all circumstances but instead, contingency-situational theories were developed to indicate that different leadership styles can be used depending on factors such as the situation, people, task, organisation, and other environmental factors. In other words, the key principle of this approach is that the effectiveness of leadership is context-specific (Yukl, 2010).

Northouse (2004, p. 93) stated that situational leadership stresses that leaders need to find out about their subordinates’ needs and then adapt their style accordingly. Two of the most well-known situational/contingency theories are Fielders’ (1967) Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) contingency model and House’s (1971) path-goal theory. House’s path-
goal theory focuses on how leaders’ behaviour can influence employee performance and satisfaction (Yukl, 2010). According to Yukl, the theory draws upon the expectancy theory of motivation which focuses on the factors that influence employees’ decision to put effort on a particular task, which largely depends on the likelihood of that effort resulting to a desirable outcome. Yukl (2010) also states that leaders’ behaviours play a critical role in motivating or supporting employees to achieve those outcomes. Based on this theory, leaders follow/ adopt four leadership styles - directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership and achievement oriented leadership. According to Kyndt, Dochy, and Baert (2010) high potential employees and great leadership attributes have positive correlation to the intention of the employee to stay with the company.

The role of these leaders in employee retention is crucial since literature indicates that employees leave leaders and not organizations (Beardwell & Claydon, 2007). As organisations and their environments transform rapidly, and the labour market demands are increasingly changing, the cost of attrition is increasingly becoming high and the search for talent has also become difficult. Boateng et al., (2012) argue that leaders are expected to keep interpersonal relations, mediate excuse, and provide encouragement, give chance to divert, stimulate self-direction and increase interdependence among employees. Therefore, there is need for leaders to adopt leadership styles that accommodate employees’ needs in order to retain them.

The Big Four Audit Firms in Kenya operate in highly competitive environment locally and globally and this calls for leadership styles that enhance staff retention in order to gain competitive advantage. The Big Four are the largest accounting firms that provide an extensive range of accounting and auditing services including external audit, taxation services, management and business consultancy, and risk assessment and control. They also provide massive employment and career development opportunities to accountants and auditors around the world. They include PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), Deloitte, Ernst & Young and KPMG (Haris, 2011).

According to a report done by Deloitte, Human Capital Trends (2014), Kenya ranked employee engagement and retention as their number one priority and globally it was ranked as the number two priority. The report states that senior management and specialized skill sets are increasingly rarer to source in the Kenyan job market. The limited supply of people with the required skill sets to take on senior management roles
and positions’ requiring specialized skills has led to a high demand for the few people available to take on these roles. Retaining and engaging talent has emerged as the key human capital challenge.

Employees in these firms are now looking for better employment conditions including challenging assignments and good relationships with their immediate supervisors. This study therefore explored three of the path-goal leadership styles (directive, participative and participative leadership styles) and how they influence employee retention in the big four audit firms from the employees’ perspective rather than the leaders’ perspective.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Similar to other industries, the big four audit firms are always faced with high employee turnover rate. According to a report by Deloitte & Touche (2014), on human capital trends, retention and engagement are among the top five trends in Kenya, ranking as the most urgent to address with the largest capability gap of 28%. The report also states that leadership, retention and engagement are a top priority globally and in Kenya, East Africa, Middle East and Europe.

Employees are considered the most effective asset in achieving organisational objectives and goals and they enhance the organisation’s productivity and profitability (Leng, Xuan, Sin, Leng & Yan, 2014). In order to fully utilise this asset, leadership styles are considered the most important determinant in increasing employee commitment to an organisation (Javaid, 2012). A dedicated labour force is less likely to leave the organisation and is important for the organisations to achieve their set objectives. Moreover, the employees ‘commitment, performance and productivity should definitely increase if they are treated with noble leadership styles (Leng et al., 2014).

Boateng et al., (2012) argue that there is a difference between how people want to be managed and how people are actually managed and this gap contributes to either high or low staff retention rates. Many studies done, have attributed employee retention in organisations to other motivational factors like reward, career growth opportunities, flexible working environment among others (Wakabi, 2016). The challenge is inclined on the conduct of the leaders; surprisingly though, very little attention has been given to the impact of leadership-related variables on employee retention (Wakabi, 2016).
This study looked at the influence of different leadership styles on employee retention in the big four audit firms. Nevertheless, there is very limited research done on the leadership styles and employee retention in the big four audit firms which was explored in this research.

1.3 **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of situational path goal leadership styles on employee retention in the big four audit firms.

1.4 **Research Questions**

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1.4.1 To what extent does participative leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

1.4.2 To what extent does directive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

1.4.3 To what extent does supportive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

1.4.4 To what extent does achievement-oriented leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

1.5 **Significance of the Study**

1.5.1 **The Audit Firms**

It is expected that the study will form a basis for policy formulation on effective leadership behaviour that encourages staff retention in the “Big Four” Audit Firms. These firms could further invest in leadership development programmes to build the leadership skills that are desirable for the work environment.

1.5.2 **Leaders and Managers**

This study will help line managers to discover how their leadership styles play a big role in determining staff retention in an organisation. It will also help them learn how to employ the different situational leadership styles when dealing with staff in different situations while managing different teams.
1.5.3 Industry

Most organisations in the human resource management industry are still struggling with developing an employee value proposition or a brand promise to attract, acquire and retain talent in their organisations. The research will provide insights on the influence of leadership styles on employee retention which they can use to improve the retention policies.

1.5.4 Other Researchers and Academicians

To the academicians and human resource practitioners, the study will form a basis for further research as it provides knowledge in a Kenyan context pertaining to leadership styles and employee retention.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The population of interest covered by this study consisted of the employees in the big four audit firms in Kenya. It targeted the alumni staff within KPMG, Deloitte, Ernst & Young and PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC). The population of the study was the four audit firms based in Nairobi. The main challenges faced in conducting the study were reaching out to the alumni staff and obtaining responses to the questionnaires in good time. These were overcome by follow-up emails and phone calls to the respondents. The study was carried out within a period of five (5) months, between May to October 2016.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms

1.7.1 Leadership

Northouse (2010) defines leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal.

Yukl (2006) defines leadership as the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.

1.7.2 Leadership Styles

Leadership styles are the patterns of behaviour which a leader adopts in influencing the behaviour of his followers. The styles are either based on behavioural approach or situational approach of Leadership (Nair & Malewar, 2013).
1.7.3 Participative leadership style

Participative leadership is defined as the process which a superior and his or her subordinates make joint decisions or share influence in decision making (Somech, 2005).

1.7.4 Directive leadership style

Directive leadership is defined as the process of providing the subordinates with a guideline for decision making and action that is in favour with a leader’s perspective (Bell & Mjoli 2014).

1.7.5 Supportive leadership style

Supportive leadership is behaviour that addresses the requirements and preferences of the employees and shows concern for their wellbeing and fosters a pleasant and friendly, psychological organizational setting (House & Mitchell, 1974).

1.7.6 Achievement-Oriented leadership style

Achievement-Oriented leadership is behaviour that involves creating challenging and high standard performance goals for subordinates and seeks for continuous improvement by showing great confidence in subordinates (House & Mitchell, 1974).

1.7.7 Employee retention

An obligation to continue to do business or exchange with a particular company on an ongoing basis (Zineldin, 2000).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter introduces the topic of leadership and how leadership styles affect employee retention in organisations. It also mentions the statement of the research problem, the purpose of the research, the research questions as well as gives the definitions of the terms used in this study. It also explains the significance of the study, highlighting who will benefit from the study. Chapter two provides literature review on situational leadership styles, with specific focus on participative, directive, supportive and achievement oriented leadership styles and their role in employee retention. Chapter three looks into the research methodology; it highlights the methods and procedures that were used to carry out the study. Chapter four gives the results and findings and Chapter five highlights the discussions, recommendations and gives the conclusion.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides empirical studies in relation how situational leadership styles affect employee retention in organisations with specific focus on the path-goal theory of leadership. The chapter reviews the literature in accordance to the stated research objectives in the first chapter. The first section of the literature review looks at effect of participative leadership style on employee retention. The second section of the literature looks at the effect of directive leadership styles on employee retention and third section analyses the effect of supportive leadership style on employee retention. The chapter ends with a summary.

2.2 Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Participative leadership is defined as the process which a superior and his or her subordinates make joint decisions or share influence in decision making (Somech, 2005). Spreitzer (2005) on the other hand refers to participative leadership as organic leadership which involves hierarchical decision making among employees. The participative style is appropriate when subordinates show a lack of judgment or when procedures have not been followed (Negron, 2008).

2.2.1 History of Participative Leadership Style

Participative leadership style was first proposed in an experiment conducted by America’s National Research Council at a large telephone-parts factory called the Hawthorne Plant near Chicago in 1924 (The Economist, 2009). The Hawthorne experiment, which is also known as Hawthorne effect showed that small groups of workers had produced more and were more satisfied from their work when they felt their work environment is supportive (Nemaei, 2012). Fleishman expanded this view of supervisory in the 1940s by focusing his study on how leadership behaviors affect small groups and the result led to the development of the concepts of employee orientation. The participative leadership style which is also known as democratic or consultative decentralize power and authority (Ng’ethe et al., 2012) was also investigated by the University of IOWA in 1938, among other leadership styles and their impact on the behaviour of group members.
After 1960 various studies suggested that participative leadership style may correlate with productivity and organizational performance. These studies include Harbison and Myers (1964) research which concluded that a more democratic leadership style maybe necessary for managing productivity in advanced industrial systems. An empirical study done by Heller (1971) on 15 large American companies (260 senior managers) concluded that power sharing between bosses and subordinates (in terms of delegation and participation) is necessary for organizations (Nemaei, 2012). A study done by Vroom and Yetton (1973) focused on the situational approach leadership also suggested that there is a possibility of participative style leading to increased productivity.

Since 1980 various scholars have studied the concept of participative leadership. Researchers argue that due to the complex changing environment previous styles of leadership seem to hinder organizational performance hence there is a need for new leadership styles based on participative principles to be able to cope with the rapid rate of changes (Trevino et al., 2003). According to Rok (2009) in order to have effective leadership the leader should influence/ inspire people toward group goals through individual motivation rather than coercion. Therefore the Modern concept of leadership should be conceived as a set of values and behaviors exhibited by the leader to encourage participation, commitment and development of the followers. Because openness to new ideas is an essential element in order to encourage participation of followers, there is a growing need for more participative culture of leadership. The modern leader not only leads or involves, but also should be more responsive to feedback from others and should try to integrate the core sustainability agenda with “hearts and minds” of all followers (Rok, 2009). This offers potential benefits to an organisation including quality of work life and employees’ commitment (Nemaei, 2012) which are precursors of employee retention.

The main reasons that call for participative leadership are the changes in cultures, environment and politics. An interesting study done by Hay group (2011) claims that factors such as globalization, climate change, demographic change, individualization and digital lifestyle, organizational principles such as leadership, corporate environment and organizational structures will dramatically change by 2030. Nemaei (2012) argues that the principles of leadership are already changing and leadership paradigm has shifted from individual to collective, control to learning, self to self-in-relation and power over to
The rapid rate of changes in environment, leadership and organizational structures indicates that the use of participative decision making is a must for future organizations (Nemaei, 2012).

### 2.2.2 The Participative Leader Characteristics

The participative leader expresses consultative behaviours such as seeking suggestions from subordinates before making final decisions, although, they retain final decision authority (House & Mitchell, 1974). The participative leader also apportions responsibilities with subordinates by including them in the planning process, decision-making, and execution phases (Negron, 2008). Motivated employees become self-directed and form creative teams thus presenting a greater team cohesion and ownership amongst the group members (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996).

According to House (1996) participative leader behaviour is directed towards encouraging employee to influence decision making and departmental operations. House explains four effects of participative leadership. The first effect is to clarify path-goal relationships relating to effort and work-goal realisation and work-goal realisation and extrinsic rewards. The second effect increases the balance between employees’ goals and organizational goals, because under participative leadership employees have influence about their allocated goals and would therefore select goals they highly value. The third effect is that it increases the employees’ autonomy and ability to carry out their intentions, leading to greater effort and performance. The last characteristic is that it increases is the amount of pressure for organisational performance by increasing employee involvement and commitment. Organisation commitment is likely to drive employee retention (Yücel, 2012). A participative leader shares decision making and problem solving responsibilities with his employees and keeps them informed about issues that affect their work (Swarup, 2013).

### 2.2.3 The Role of Participative Leadership in Employee Retention

According to House and Mitchell (1974) participative leadership involves consultations with employees and taking into account their views in decisions. Khung and Thuy (2015) define participative leadership as one that involves managing group meetings, influencing commitment and conformity and assisting in conflict and communication issues. Nwokocha and Iheriohanma (2015) also refer to participative leadership style as
democratic leadership, state that it encourages employees to participate in the decision making process in an organisation.

According to Nader (1988) participative leadership style mainly focuses on the inherent motivation of employees by enriching their jobs through independence, variety and empowerment. In addition, when employees participate in independent decision making, they realize that their ideas are respected and considered by their supervisors; they also feel connected with the organization as if they are important parts in the company and try to reach maximum performance. Henson (2012) argues that this leadership style improves employee’s morale by allowing them contribute in the decision making process, then they feel like their opinions matter. Employees who are motivated become self-starters and develop creative and cohesive teams therefore presenting a sense of ownership amongst participants.

In participative leadership style, the manager still retains the ultimate responsibility in as much as they delegate authority to employees (Ushie, Agba, Ogaboh & Chime 2010). Henson (2012) also agrees that as much as participative leadership values the employees’, the final responsibility of making the absolute decision rests with the participative leader. One advantage of participative leadership is that it allows for the growth of additional leaders who can serve the organization at a later date. This is because, participative leaders actively involve the team to express their creativity and showcase their abilities and talents that would not be noticed otherwise. According to Henson (2012), the discovery of these hidden capabilities informs the organization on the talented employees who should be provided with opportunities to further develop some skill or ability for future use. Spreitzer (2005) has the same view, but in addition, he states that there is no proper difference between leaders and followers; a participative leader can be considered as a temporal coordinator for the group of like-minded people.

Various authors (Zervas and David, 2013 and Iheriohanma, 2015) view participative leadership style as one that fosters responsibility, flexibility and great determination that mostly results into employees’ improved performance. They suggest that this type of leadership style is likely to increase ambition and motivation, identity and retention of employees in an organisation. The same authors further argue that employees are more likely to be realistic about the organisational needs because of their involvement in decision making, delegation and planning in the organisation. Nwokocha & Iheriohanma,
Puni, Ofei and Okoe (2014) state that participative leadership style marks great employee productivity, satisfaction, teamwork, and commitment. It reduces the need for controls, formal rules and procedures which cause low employee absenteeism and turnover. This leadership style develops competent and committed employees who are willing to give their best, think for themselves, communicate openly, and seek responsibility (Bass, 1990 and Stogdill, 1974). With all the positive characteristics associated with participative leadership style, decision-making becomes over-stretched since opinions and lengthy discussions play a key part in the process.

In spite of the listed advantages of the participative leadership style, there are some drawbacks that come with it. Donna (2011) points out some of the shortcomings of this leadership style which should be overcome by an organisation to ensure it operates effectively and achieves higher employee performance, satisfaction and better retention levels. He mentioned five challenges presented by the democratic leadership style which include competency, crises, consensus, pseudo-participation, and adherence. He further explains that this is because an environment with a democratic leadership style creates opportunities for empowering employees, gives them room to be creative, initiative, participative, career growth and job security within an organisation. These are the most important factors that most employees consider to provide motivation and influence their decision to stay in an organisation.

Henson (2012) continues to argue that participative leadership style helps employees to adopt changes easily whenever there are changes to be made in an organisation. This is because they are involved in the process especially when decisions must be made and implemented within a short period of time. Another benefit of participative leadership that Henson (2012) mentions is retention. Participative style of leadership gives employees an opportunity to improve their income through good performance in addition to the chance to be active in determining the future success of the company. Encouraging employees to be active in the growth of the organisation inspires those employees to stay with the organisation to see their plans result in success. This improves employee retention and cut down on the costs of turnover.
Managers’ leadership styles may impose a great influence on the working attitudes, behaviours and performance of employees. Therefore, Bell and Mjoli (2014) argue that the ability of leaders to use participative leadership styles motivates employees to commit themselves to an organisation.

2.3 Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Directive leadership is defined as the process of providing the subordinates with a guideline for decision making and action that is in favour with a leader’s perspective (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). Directive leadership style is also referred to as task-oriented leadership and focuses mainly on achievement of goals (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2015). Stogdill (1950) defines task oriented leadership style as the extent to which a leader sets roles for their followers, emphasizes on achievement of goals, and establishes a well-defined pattern of communication with his/ her followers. Mai and Dang (2015) put it more clearly, by stating that task oriented leadership will make followers engage in a top-down communication, the leader explains what the follower is supposed to do, as well as the time, the place, and the method of how each function is to be accomplished.

2.3.1 History of Directive Leadership Style

In the 1950’s, studies done by the University of Michigan on level of effectiveness of task oriented behaviours, placed emphasis on planning, coordinating, and providing the followers with the resources required, including establishing goal-setting objectives for the followers Yukl, (2002). It is therefore important to understand how task oriented behaviours relate with motivation of staff and intentions to stay in or leave the organisation. Defining roles and specifying directions for employees may motivate some employees depending on what kind of employee one is dealing with. However, it may also be a de-motivator for other employees (Wakabi, B. M. 2016). Basing on McClelland’s achievement theory (McClelland, 1985), it may all depend on the characteristics of a particular employee.

2.3.2 The Directive Leader Characteristics

A leader who is task oriented will focus on providing structure to his followers and follows up by encouraging them to complete their tasks first (House & Mitchell, 1974). In this structure, the followers are expected to follows the laid down rules and procedures and this results to strict guidance by the leader. The major traits that describe the directive
Leadership style include - telling employees what to do and how to do it, specifying standards and deadlines for subordinates and very rigid and frustrating to work with (Nair and Malewar, 2013). Directive leadership stimulates subordinates thinking processes (Sagie & Koslowsky, 2000). The directiveness of these leaders helps in the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge, which may also build the capacity of subordinates. These leaders attempt to cultivate organizational culture as a strategy of controlling behaviour and building subordinates competences (Dull, 2010).

Other scholars however, argue that directive leadership is not associated with building human capacity, ownership, and responsibility (Loki, Westwood & Crawford, 2005). It is a very slow and unpredictable method of building subordinates capacity, and problems that are exacerbated by a directive culture (Dull, 2010). Furthermore, Bell and Mjoli (2014), argues that directive leaders emphasize on integration, internal cohesiveness, and development of uniformity. They create the values of control, clear delineations of responsibility and authority, and high degrees of organization and formality. As such, they stimulate organisational members to develop effective organisation processes and systems (Sagie et al., 2002). Furthermore, directive leadership strengthens the behaviours of adherence to standards of rules and procedures, which promotes job performance (Somech, 2005).

The directive leader clarifies expectations and gives specific guidance to accomplish the desired expectations based on performance standards and organizational rules (House & Mitchell, 1974). The directive leadership style is appropriate with newly hired or inexperienced subordinates and in situations that require immediate action (Negron, 2008). The directive style may be perceived as aggressive, controlling, descriptive, and structured by dictating what needs to be done and how to do it. Research indicates that the directive style is positively related to subordinates’ expectations and satisfaction for subordinates who are employed to perform ambiguous, unstructured tasks; however, negatively related to satisfaction and expectations of subordinates who are well-structured and receive clear tasks (House, 1971).

Leaders who give directives to subordinates, focus less on participation as compared to leaders who takes subordinates’ development as the most important part of effective leadership (Sagie, 2000). This leader therefore, makes organisational members to be more dependent and inflexible, facilitating them to be less initiative (Bell and Mjoli, 2014).
Liu, Lepak, Takeuchi and Sims (2003) also suggest that this leadership is much like the authoritarian leadership style which tries to establish followers as compliant subordinates by relying on such behaviours as command and direction, assigned goals, and punishments. Followers have little direction over the job and are rarely allowed to participate in decision-making. Authoritative leadership inhibits an organisation’s flexibility and dampens employees’ motivation (Goleman, 2000). However, it is important to note that authoritative leadership is useful in some leadership scenarios that demand the use of authority.

Other researchers who also likened directive leadership to the authoritarian leadership (e.g. Leng et al., 2014) argues that is an extreme of the participative leadership style with a more domineering personality. According to Leng et al., (2014), autocratic leader control team members to reach a singular objective using unilateralism. This approach to leadership generally leads to passive resistance from team-members and requires continual pressure and order from the leader to get things done. Autocratic or directive leaders tend to lack insight about themselves and others, manipulate others to their own ends without consideration of others’ feelings and without respect for them as people. Thus, it was reasoned that highly autocratic leaders are likely to rely on task behaviors, rarely using relations behaviors.

As pointed out by Leng et al., 2014, authoritarian leadership works well in a highly stable environment when expertise is concentrated in the senior managers and system engineers while transactional leadership works well in a widely prosperous economy when mobile workers are largely driven by financial considerations. Under such conditions, authoritarian leaders focus on commands, power position and use of fear to ensure compliance to symbolize the source of wisdom and direction.

Cheng (2004) claimed authoritarian leadership means a leader stresses their unquestionable and absolute authority and that they will take stringent control demand complete obedience over subordinates. Generally, it emphasizes control and obedience. As a traditional virtue, Chinese people respect elders. Cheng (2004) claimed that authoritarian leaders always demonstrate their control and authority so that the employees rarely see their leaders’ concern. Some studies showed that employees in mainland China expect high levels of authoritarian leadership.
2.3.3 The Role of Directive Leadership Style in Employee Retention

Directive leadership style results in minimal or no innovation. Virtually, no personal or organizational change, growth and development are involved. Cooperation, achievement and commitment are restrained. There is no shared vision and very slight motivation beyond coercion. In fact, most followers of these leaders are described as biding their time, waiting for the inevitable failure this leadership produces and the removal of the leader that follows (Michael, 2010).

Directive leaders are basically require their subordinated to do as they say. Typically, these leaders are inexperienced with leadership thrust upon them in the form of a new position or assignment that involves people management. They retain for themselves the decision-making rights. They can damage an organization irreparably as they force their ‘followers’ to execute strategies and services in a very narrow way, based upon a subjective idea of what success looks like. There is no shared vision and little motivation beyond coercion. Commitment, creativity and innovation are typically eliminated by directive leadership (Michael, 2010).

Hayers (2000) notes that employees who fell under stress reported directive supervision on the part of their leaders. They are rarely allowed to participate in the decision making process. It was also noted that workers who were under pressure reported harsh supervision and control from their leaders (Hayers, 2000). Therefore, there is negative impact on employee commitment. Most individuals are familiar with this kind of leadership because such leaders are prevalent even today. It is generally not considered one of the best methods of leadership.

Despite the identified drawbacks of autocratic leadership style, Swarup (2013) argued that directive leadership style is not all bad. He posits that sometimes it is the most effective style to apply in situations when: new and untrained employees who may not be acquainted with the tasks to perform or are confronted with problem of which procedure to follow, effective supervision can be provided only through detailed orders and instructions, in circumstances where employees are averse to any other leadership style, there are high-volume production needs on daily basis, there is time constraint to make a decision, a managers’ power is challenged by an employee, the workplace is ineffectively managed, and when work needs to be coordinated with another department or organization. He however, suggested that directive leadership style should not be used
when: employees become tensed, fearful and resentful, employees expect to have their opinions heard, employees begin depending on their managers to make all their decisions, and there is low employee morale, high turnover and absenteeism and work stoppage.

In the overall assessment of the characteristics of directive leadership style, it implies that an organization with this style of leadership will witness a high level of employees’ discontent which its resultant effect will be employees’ low performance and turnover in the organization. This is because in this knowledge-based economy, employees prefer organizations that will offer them the opportunity for creativity and innovativeness in order to show case their critical talents and skills. This is pertinent because one of the principles of organizational effectiveness is team work and sharing of ideas which help to solidify the bond of relationship and increase productivity in organizations. When employees are provided with such participatory opportunities in workplace, they intend to perform in their optimal level and stay in such organization.

A study done by Ekaterini (2010) to investigate the impact of leadership styles on four variables of executive’s highlights that organisational commitment, communication and job satisfaction are important attitudes in assessing employee’s intention to quit and the overall contribution of the employee to the organisation. Another study by Asmani (2015) to investigate the influence of nurse managers leadership style on staff out comes observed that there was no significant correlation between directive leadership style and staff intentions to stay at their current workplaces.

In another study conducted by Asmani (2015) to investigate the influence of nurse managers’ leadership style on staff out comes, found that directive leadership style was the least used by the nurse managers. Further analysis demonstrated that there was no significant correlation between directive leadership style and staff intentions to stay at their current workplaces. More than half (51.7%) of the nursing staff intended to leave their current workplaces, 20% of whom were actively seeking opportunities to leave.

2.4 Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Supportive leadership is behaviour that addresses the requirements and preferences of the employees and shows concern for their wellbeing and fosters a pleasant and friendly, psychological organizational setting (House & Mitchell, 1974). Supportive leadership is also known as people-oriented behaviour and it involves a two-way communication
normally focused on emotional and social support (Nwokocha and Iheriohanma, 2015). McGilton (2010) describes supportive leadership as one that focuses on developing positive relationships in order to improve job satisfaction. Supportive leadership is the behaviour, which focuses on the wellbeing of employees and has a deep concern for the needs, preferences and satisfaction of employees (House, 1974).

2.4.1 The Supportive Leader Characteristics

Leaders who are aware of their duties and responsibilities and are able to encourage their subordinates are considered to be supportive leaders. Supportive leaders create conducive working environment to foster respect, trust, cooperation, and emotional support (Daft, 2005; Gibson et al., 2000). A workplace enriched with supportive leaders brings successful results that are beneficial for the well-being of both employees and the organization. Supportive leadership is categorized into two dimension i.e. instrumental (making one’s life easier) and emotional (ease of talking with) elements.

The supportive leader behaves in a responsive manner thus creating a friendly climate and verbally recognizes subordinates’ achievement in a rewarding modus (House & Mitchell, 1974). Supportive leaders demonstrate respect for subordinates, treat everyone equal, and concern for subordinates’ well-being (House, 1974). They learn by observing outcomes and how others react to their decisions. The supportive style is suitable when subordinates show a lack of confidence in ability to complete a task and little motivation (Negron, 2008).

This dimension of leadership, leader consideration, is the degree to which a supervisor creates an atmosphere of affective support and socioemotional concern for the wellbeing of subordinates (Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt, 2002). Leader consideration is primarily oriented toward creating good relationships with worker. Oldham and Cummings (1996) made a conclusion that the leader initiating structure and leader consideration dimensions could be summarized supportive leadership. Oldham and Cummings defined the supportive leadership as all the organizational managers’ behaviors which support their subordinates’ job. It includes four characters: concerned about the feelings and needs of employees, encouraged employees to raise their concerns, praised the employees’ achievement and gave the positive feedback to them, and helped them to improve their job skills.
Oldham and Cummings (1996) argued that the managers’ supportive behaviour could increase staffs awareness of self-determination and their job proactiveness. Although lots of research has been conducted on the role of the supportive leadership, it lacks on the topic about how to measure the supportive leadership reliability and validity. In 2007, Roneney and Gottlieb explored the supportive leadership scale through focus groups and questionnaires. Their empirical study showed that the supportive leadership contains two attributes, which is the supportive behaviour to the job and to the relationship (Roneney & Gottlieb, 2007). The supportive behaviour to the job is a task-orientation support, it can guide and motivate the subordinates work hardly and finish their in-role job. The supportive behaviour to the relationship requires the managers listen to the subordinates’ and respect their advice, and assist the employees to achieve their individual goal. Therefore, different kinds of companies should take different supportive leadership to shape the employees’ behaviour basing on the nature of the jobs and the companies goal.

2.4.2 The Role of Supportive Leadership in Employee Retention

Managers’ leadership behaviors may impose great influence on the working attitudes, behaviors and performance of employees. In particular, supportive leadership can give rise to employees' reaction, generating significant and positive relationship with employees' working behaviour and attitudes (Judge et al., 2002). When managers emphasize and support their employees, and keep good relationship with them, the psychological contract will be established between employees and organization (or managers), which is positively related to employees’ attitudes and further engenders positive influence on employees’ behaviors (Henkel, Tomczak and Heitmann, 2007). Kleinman (2013) applied a prospective correlation design to assess staff nurse perceptions of nurse leadership that contribute most to nurse retention using a self-report tool. The findings revealed that active management through visibility was the only specific leadership behaviour significantly correlated with staff nurse turnover.

Based on all these arguments, employees motivated by supportive leadership regard it as the obligation to complete the in-role work, keep long relationship with the organisation, and positively participate in the organizational management and decision-making. The relationship supportive leadership may not only induce employees’ positive emotion, but also indicates managers’ recognition and love to employees (Rafferty & M.Griffin, 2006). Employees encouraged by relationship supportive leadership will see it as obligation to
support the manager’s work, keep long-term relationship with the supervisor, work hard to accomplish the in-role job, positively participate in the managerial decision, provide first-hand information and compliment their supervisors in the interpersonal association (Grandey, 2000). The desire to keep long relationship with the organization indicates that managers’ work and leadership behaviors receive employees’ recognition and make employees generate the commitment to follow managers, keep long-range relationship with the organization and support the managers’ work.

The relationship supportive leadership can improve the working efficiency and performance of employees and, promote their willingness to keep a long-term relationship with the organization. Moreover, employees will feel more obliged to do their in-role work better and make full use of their consumers’ knowledge to provide information assistance for managerial decision owing to the extra support from the managers. Grandey (2000) indicate that managers’ support to employees’ work such as providing important resources, which is a central factor for improving employees’ working performance, can stimulate employees’ enthusiasm to complete their work. If managers provide the working resources and build psychological contract between the employees and managers, employees will be more likely to perform anticipated behaviors of managers, accomplish working tasks in the requirements of managers to reciprocate managers' support.

As it is shown in some studies that managers’ support to the work is an important approach for employees to improve their performance (Luthans, Avolio & Avey, 2008). In the light of social exchange theory, employees tend to repay managers’ support through those approaches which are helpful to business development, such as positively participating in the managerial decision and performing positive word of mouth marketing, etc. Specifically, the word of mouth marketing behaviour may display some differences in different situations: when inside, employees will compliment managers; when outside, employees will praise the corporation in order to indirectly compliment their managers due to the corporation has a higher popularity compared with the managers. Effective leaders balance between directive and supportive leadership style to reduce job stress in the organization to achieve organizational goals (Jam, Akhtar, Inam, Rehman & Hijazi, 2010).
A study conducted by Dixon and Hart (2010) found a negative statistical relationship between path-goal leadership styles, in particular supportive leadership style with turnover intention. This means that this leadership styles reduced employees’ turnover intention.

Another research conducted by Farren (2008) reports that one of the factors affecting an employee’s decision to leave an organization was whether the manager developed a trusting relationship with the employee. The survey found that managers who respected and valued employees’ competency, paid attention to their aspirations, assured challenging work, valued the quality of work life and provided chances for learning, had loyal and engaged employees. In these days of corporate scandals, having a manager with integrity and respect has become more important than ever. A quality manager will inspire the employees to work harder and they will motivate employees to stay with the organization.

Among Saudi nurses in six Government hospitals, AbuAlRub and Alghamdi (2012) found no significant relationship between leadership styles and nurse’s intention to stay at work, but that supportive leadership style was found to lower turnover rates. However, a weak but positive relationship was found between job satisfaction and nurses’ intention to stay in their current job. Bott, Boyle, Hanson, Tauton and Woods (1997) conducted a study where leadership behaviors were found to determine staff nurse retention. The study tested a model developed to link nurse manager leadership and hospital staff nurse retention. It proposed that, manager characteristics (leadership style), organizational characteristics (practice autonomy), work characteristics (communication), and nurse characteristics (education, other opportunities) determine staff retention.

“The manager’s leadership behaviour was more important for unit separation (move to another work area) than turnover; job satisfaction predicted unit separation but not turnover; and, commitment predicted turnover, not unit separation” (p. 214). Bott et al., (1997) concluded that nurse turnover underestimates issues of staff dissatisfaction requiring leadership behaviors as the primary intervention to improve retention.

2.5 Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style and Employee Retention

House and Mitchell (1974) define achievement oriented leadership as one which involves creating challenging and high standard performance goals for subordinates and seeks for
continuous improvement by showing great confidence in subordinates. Achievement oriented leader behaviour is claimed to cause subordinates to endeavour for higher standards of performance and to have more confidence in their ability to meet challenging goals. McClelland and his colleagues describe it as the need to perform in terms of a standard of excellence or to be successful in competitive situations (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1953). Achievement-oriented leadership assumes that subordinates are willing and able to perform their tasks and therefore concentrates on motivating subordinates to reach high levels of performance.

McClelland speculated that achievement orientation is socially learned and that it is acquired quite early in the early stages of life, during the period of childhood. Influence from parents and the type of socialization that a child obtains between five and eight years old play a major role in instilling the need for achievement in an individual (McClelland et al., 1953). Once formed, it stabilizes within the individual and influences all the important life activities and performance of the individual. Negron (2008) noted that the achievement-oriented style is suited for unclear tasks and subordinates who may need a morale booster to increase their confidence in ability to accomplish the given goal. By setting challenging targets for the followers, the employees feel that their leader has confidence in them even when the situation is complex and not so easy to understand (Moorhead & Griffin, 2012).

2.5.1 The Achievement Oriented Leader Characteristics

Berger (2013) states that accomplishing both formal and informal goals are important aspects on leadership and hence the emphasis on achievement. He further explains three perspectives that impact the ability of leaders to achieve goals. These perspectives - individual, behavioural and contingent collectively emphasize leadership as an achievement-oriented effort that is reliant on a combination of the characteristics of the individual leader, the behaviour of the leader, and the contextual contingencies of the work at hand. House and Mitchell (1974) indicate that achievement oriented leaders do not only place emphasis on achieving goals or performance but also in pride in work and self-evaluation based on personal accomplishment.

According to McClelland et al. (1953), achievement oriented leaders set their goals realistically; they take only reasonable levels of risk; they have the need for immediate feedback on the success or failure of the tasks they have executed; they tend to be
preoccupied with a task once they start working on it; and they desire satisfaction with accomplishment as such. The effect of leader achievement oriented behaviour will depend on the achievement motivation of subordinates. Achievement motivation is a non-conscious concern for personal involvement in competition against some standard of excellence and unique accomplishment (McClelland, 1985). Individuals who are highly achievement motivated are motivated to make accomplishments through their own personal efforts rather than through influencing others or delegation of responsibility for achievement.

Eyesenck and Wilson (1975) developed a personality scale to measure the level of achievement orientation in individuals. They described achievement-oriented people as ambitious, hard-working, competitive, keen to improve their social standing, and placing a high value on productivity and creativity. Recent studies, for example Carland and Carland (1992) saw that achievement-oriented leaders can be differentiated from others through their objectives and their approaches towards risk-taking, creativity and proactivity. Xenikou and Simosi (2006) stated that achievement-oriented leaders’ personalities reflects assumptions, values and practices on organising activities, goal setting, organisational objectives, experimentation, placed emphasis on effectiveness.

Miller and Toulouse (1986) had found that high achievement oriented leaders support market-oriented strategies, with broad approaches, formal and sophisticated structures, and analytical and proactive decision-making processes. Entrialgo, Fernandez and Vazquez (2000) concluded that leaders with a high need for achievement prefer to formulate cautious, but attainable. To achieve goals they tend to look for an enhanced level of control over their settings. Achievement-oriented people will not leave anything to chance, they analyse the situations carefully so that they can manipulate proactively rather than react passively to the actions of their clients and competitors. A study done by Wood and Vilkinas (2004) noted that achievement-oriented managers, in addition to being achievement-driven, were also humanistic in their dealings and positive in their outlook.

New research based on cultural studies adds evidence of the fact that culture influences the formation of achievement-oriented abilities (Adkins and Caldwell, 2004; Xenikou and Simosi, 2006) as well as on the motives, aspirations (Kolvereid, 1992) and needs (Baum,

2.5.2 The Role of Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style in Employee Retention

Asmani (2015) in his study to investigate the influence of nurse managers leadership style on staff outcomes observed that achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated positively with staff intention to stay in their current workplaces. The study found that nurse managers used all four leadership styles (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) described by the path-goal leadership theory depending on the situation. However, the nurse managers used more of achievement-oriented leadership styles than the others.

Furthermore, the preference towards the use of achievement-oriented leadership styles by nurse managers as found in Asmani’s (2015) study also supports the work of other researchers in nursing leadership who emphasised that nurses were slowly moving away from directive leadership behaviours towards achievement-oriented leadership styles (Ahmad, Adi, Noor, Rahman & Yushuang., 2013; Grimm, 2010; Malloy & Penprase, 2010).

According to Robbins (2014) achievement-oriented leadership style brings about organizational commitment which talks about the degree of identification and contribution that employees have with their organization’s mission, values and goals. Organizational commitment is a multidimensional concept that consists of affective commitment, normative commitment and endurance commitment. Allen and Meyer (2007) define affective commitment as the employee’s emotional affection to, identify with, and involve themselves in the organization. Continuance component is defined as commitment that is based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization, while normative component is defined as the employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Chhabra, 2013).

2.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed empirical studies in relation to how the path-goal theory leadership styles - participative, directive, supportive and achievement-oriented leadership styles affect the employee retention in an organisation. The first section of the literature review looked at how participative leadership style influences employee retention by causing
employees to feel connected to the organisation and improves employee morale by allowing them to contribute to decisions that affect them at work. The second section of the literature review describes how directive leadership style can negatively influence employee retention because leaders retain decision making rights to themselves and coerce employees to execute their ideas without involving them is the process. The third section of the literature review looks at how supportive leadership style creates a positive relationship with employees’ working behaviour and attitudes thus establishing a psychological contract between the employees and the organisation. The final section of the literature review looks at achievement oriented leadership style and how it impacts on employee retention by creating challenging and high standard performance goals for subordinates and seeking for continuous improvement. The next chapter looks at the research methodology that will be used for this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the various research methods and procedures the researcher adopted in conducting the study in order to answer the research objectives raised in the first chapter. The chapter has been organised in the following structure: research design, population and sample, data collection methods, sampling design and sample size, research procedures, data analysis methods and lastly the chapter concludes with a summary of what has been pointed out.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive research design. According to Cooper and Schindler (2010) research design is a detailed outline of how a study or investigations took place. It typically includes how data will be collected, what instruments will be used, how the planned means for analysing data will be used. Descriptive studies answers questions of who, what, when, where and how of the topic. In addition, descriptive research is often used as a pre-cursor to quantitative research designs, the general overview giving some valuable pointers as to what variables are worth testing quantitatively (Cooper & Schindler, 2010).

The descriptive research design enabled the researcher to reduce any bias associated with qualitative research and sought a deeper understanding of the types of situational leadership styles that can be used to improve employee retention among the big four firms. This design was appropriate for this study because it gave conclusive results among the research variables. The dependent variable in the study being employee retention and independent variables include participative leadership, directive leadership, achievement-oriented and supportive leadership. The appropriateness of the research design was based on the what, where, when, why and how of different situational leadership styles, affect employee retention.
3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

According to Cooper and Schindler (2010) population can be defined as the total collection of elements about which a researcher wishes to make some inferences. Target population refers to all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, the entire group of individuals, events or objects to which a researcher wishes to generalize the results of the study (Cooper & Schindler, 2010). The target population included all the people who have worked in the big four audit firms and have moved within the four firms or to other organisations in the industry for the last three years. The elements of the population selected had an experience of how the leadership styles of their immediate supervisors influenced their decision to stay or leave the organisation. For this study, the population consisted of about 220 employees.

Table 3.1: Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number of Staff Alumni (past 3 years)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG Kenya</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Sampling Design

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame is the complete and correct list of population, individuals or events, source material or device from which a sample is drawn. It comprises a list of all those within a population who can be sampled, and may include individuals, organizations or institutions (Cooper & Schindler, 2010). In this study, the sampling frame was the alumni database which was obtained from the human resource department in the big four audit firms.
3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

This study used stratified random sampling. Cooper and Schindler (2010) define stratified random sampling as a process that involves stratification, that is different groups (strata) are made on the bases of different factors such as life stages, income levels and management levels.

For this case, the respondents were stratified into four groups: KPMG, Deloitte, PricewaterhouseCoopers and Ernst & Young and then random samples were drawn from each group. This technique ensured that the selection of respondents under each category was equal and unbiased. It also ensured that selection of representative respondents with the necessary information to address the specific research questions of the study to enhance the credibility and reliability of the findings of this study.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

A sample size is a smaller set of the larger population (Cooper & Schindler, 2010). Determining sample size is a very important issue for collecting an accurate result within a quantitative survey design. A sample size in a research, is the number of observations or replicates to include in a statistical sample. The sample size is important in achieving the objective of making an inference about a population from a given sample. All the four firms had a total of 220 alumni staff in the last three years. According to Hussey and Hussey (1997) no survey can ever be free from error or provide 100% assurance. Error limits of less than 5% and confidence levels of higher than 95% can be regarded as acceptable. Bearing this in mind, at a confidence level of 95%, the margin of error would be 0.05%. Using Yamane (1967) simplified sample size formula below and a confidence level of 0.05%, a sample size of 189 was selected.

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + (Ne)^2} \]

Where \( n \) is the sample size, \( N \) is the population size and \( e \) is the margin of error.

\[ \begin{align*}
  n &= \frac{220}{1 + (220 (0.05)^2)} \\
  n &= 142
\end{align*} \]
The selection of the sample was sufficient and representative enough of the entire population limiting the influence of outliers or extreme observations. The sample size distribution is indicated in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Sampling Frame</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>% Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KPMG Kenya</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernst &amp; Young</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study used data collected from primary sources. The primary data was collected by use of a structured questionnaire which was administered to the employees both electronically and manually. The questionnaire was structured according to the objectives that is participative leadership style, directive leadership style supportive leadership styles and how they influence employee retention. According to Cooper and Schindler (2010), primary data is the original information collected in relation to the specific research objective. Primary data can also be defined as the original search where data being collected from despondences is designed specifically to answer the research questions. The questionnaire comprised of both open ended and closed ended questions and was divided into six sections that is A to F. The questions had multiple choice options and the five-point Likert-type scale items of 1 to 5 where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, to reflect the appropriate levels of measurement necessary for statistical analysis. The first section of the questionnaire, Section A, included general information on the respondents (demographics); Section B to E had specific questions with regard to the four leadership styles and section F had questions in relation to employee retention. The data was analysed using SPSS.
3.5 Research Procedures

A pilot study was conducted using the prepared questionnaire which was administered to a few selected respondents from the different firms to ensure the objectivity and clarity of the items. Suggestions for improvement were presented during this process and were incorporated in the final questionnaire. The final questionnaires were then distributed to the respondents electronically. An introduction/ cover letter was included, explaining the reasons for conducting the research and the importance of the study to guarantee the respondents confidentiality and improve the response rate.

In addition, the questionnaire also provided clear instructions and an attractive layout. Each completed questionnaire was treated as a unique case and a sequential number given to each. A research assistant was trained and used to administer questionnaires to the respondents and to record the findings. This improved the speed of data collection and recording appropriate responses. Follow up was done through email after the administration of the questionnaires to ensure a high response rate.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods

The collected data was cleaned up, edited, coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program according to each variable of the study for analysis. The study used descriptive to summarise the data. Descriptive analysis involves a process of transforming a mass of raw data into tables, charts, with frequency distribution and percentages, which are a vital part of making sense of the data. Inferential statistics on the other hand involves the exploration of data to determine the relationship between the variables. In this study, the descriptive statistics such as, mean, standard deviation, percentages and frequency distribution were used to analyse the demographic profile of the participants. The mean described the use of each leadership style by the supervisors. Inferential statistics such as correlation and regression were used to analyse the relationship between each leadership style and employee retention.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter describes the research design that was adopted in the study, the population and sampling design, the data collection methods that were used when carrying out the study, research procedures and the data analysis methods utilised. Chapter four looks into the results and findings from the data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the results and findings collected from the field based on the influence of situational path goal leadership styles on employee retention in the big four audit firms. The findings are presented in the order of the research objectives. The first section of the results and findings are based on the respondents’ demographic profiles. The second section of the results and findings are based on the responses to the different sections of the questionnaire and the third section is based on the four path goal leadership styles and how they affect employee retention in the big four firms. A sample of 142 alumni staff from the big four firms was used. An online questionnaire was issued through employees’ email address. Follow up was made after a week to ensure the questionnaires were filled and submitted. SPSS was used to analyse the data collected from the respondents. The response rate is shown below.

Response Rate = \frac{\text{Number of Questionnaires Completed}}{\text{Number of Sample Size}}

= \frac{100}{142} \times 100 = 70\%

4.2 General Information

The first section of the results and findings are based on the respondents’ demographic profile from gender of the participants, age bracket, job grade/level, business unit, and supervisor leadership development training.

4.2.1 Gender of the Respondents

From the results, the study had a higher number of female respondents compared to the male respondents. As shown in Figure 4.1, the female respondents were 52% while the female respondents were 48%.
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4.2.2 Average Age of the Respondents

Majority of the respondents were between the age of 20 to 30 years with 74%, followed by 31 to 40 years with 18% and 41 to 50 years with 8%. None of the respondents was above 51 years as shown in Figure 4.2 below.

4.2.3 Job Grade/ Level

Majority of the respondents were at associate/consultant level at 49% followed by senior consultants at 28%, managers at 11%, senior managers at 7% and directors at 5%. There was no partner level represented in the survey. This is depicted in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3: Job grade of the respondents

4.2.4 Business Unit Served

The highest number of respondents were from the advisory department at 79%. As shown in Figure 4.4, followed by respondents from the audit business unit at 14% and the tax business unit had the least number of respondents at 7%.

Figure 4.4: Business units of the respondents

4.2.5 Supervisor Training on Leadership Development

Majority of the respondents stated that their supervisors have attended a leadership development training as shown in figure 4.5.
The study examined staff intentions to stay at their current workplaces and the extent to which that intention is explained by their supervisors’ leadership styles. Results in Table 4.1 indicates that majority (64%) of the respondents have been working with the big four firms for a period of between 2 to 5 years. 16% have worked for 6 to 10 years followed by 15% who have worked for less than one year and only 5% have worked for more than ten years. Eighty two percent of the respondents are still working with the one of the big four firms while 18% reported that they have left.

**Table 4.1: Aspects of Staff Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Tenure</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How long have you worked in one or either of the big four audit firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you still working with any of the big four firms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2.7 Intention to Stay**

With regard to the intention to stay, the results show that a total of 82 respondents were still working for the big four. On further questioning 22% indicated that they are
presently planning and looking to leave the firms, 24% indicated that they are seriously considering to leave in the future and 23% did not have feelings about this. The other 29% indicated that they intend to stay with the current workplace while 2% were unlikely to ever consider leaving their current workplaces. On the other hand, a total of 18 respondents left the big four firms. On further questioning, 18% prefer to continue working in their current organisations while 59% prefer very much to continue working at their current organisations. Table 4.2 shows the results.

Table 4.2: Aspects of employees’ intention to stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Intention to Stay</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you still working with any of the big four firms?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you feel about leaving the firm?</td>
<td>I am presently looking and planning to leave</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am seriously considering leaving in the future</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have no feelings about this one way or the other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I intend to stay with my current organisation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is very unlikely that I would ever consider leaving this firm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you prefer to continue working in your current organisation or going back to the big four?</td>
<td>I don’t really care whichever way</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer to continue working here</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer very much to continue working here</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you that your supervisor’s leadership style matters/ mattered in your decision to stay in the big four?</td>
<td>I have mixed feelings about its importance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is fairly important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is of no importance to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is of some importance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is very important for me to continue to be in this firm</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.3 indicate that the mean intention to stay was 2.66 with a standard deviation of 1.18
Table 4.3: Summary of employee intention to stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees’ intention to stay</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ Intention to stay (Score on a 5-point scale)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

This section provides information sought to establish the extent to which participative leadership style influences employee retention. Descriptive analysis as well as inferential statistics was used.

4.3.1 Participative Leadership Style Characteristics

The influence of participative leadership style on employee retention was gauged using a set of seven statements, on a five point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The respondents were asked whether their supervisors do not act without consulting the team. This statement had the highest mean of 2.77 with a standard deviation of 1.52 which was more inclined to agree. The respondents were also asked whether their supervisors encourage initiatives from the team. This had a mean of 2.44 with a standard deviation of 1.37 showing that the participants were almost neutral.

In addition, the respondents were asked if their supervisors encourage them to set individual and group goals in line with organisational goals. This has a mean of 2.35 with a standard deviation of 1.42 tending which was inclined towards disagree. The fourth statement asked the respondents if their supervisors give them autonomy in doing their work. This statement had a mean of 2.24 with a standard deviation of 1.32 tending towards disagree. The respondents were also asked if their supervisors involve them in the planning process when assigning responsibilities. This had a mean score of 2.23 with a standard deviation of 1.32 which inclined towards disagree.

The statement my supervisor seeks for the teams’ ideas and suggestions before making final decisions had a mean of 2.2 with a standard deviation of 1.41 and the statement my supervisor puts suggestions made by the team into action had the lowest mean of 2.04 with a standard deviation of 1.20 both tending towards disagree as shown in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Responses on Participative Leadership Style Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative leadership style and its characteristics</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor does not act without consulting the team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages initiatives from the team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages us to set individual and group goals that we value in line with the organisation’s goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gives us autonomy in doing our work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor involves the team in the planning process when assigning responsibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor seeks for the teams’ ideas and suggestions before making final decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor puts suggestions made by the team into action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Correlation between Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results of a Pearson’s correlation indicate that there was a weak negative correlation between participative leadership style and staff intention to stay (r = 0.047, p = 0.640 >0.05). This shows that there is no significant relationship between the participative leadership style and employee retention. Table 4.5 shows the results.

Table 4.5: Correlation between Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Intention to stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participative leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Regression Analysis of Participative Style Leadership and Employee Retention

A regression analysis was done to determine if participative leadership style predicted employee retention.
4.3.3.1 Model Summary

The study established an R value of 0.47, \( R^2 \) of 0.002 and adjusted \( R^2 \) of -0.008. Based on these results, the study shows that 0.2% of the variance in staff intention to stay can be explained by participative leadership style. The results are shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Model Summary - Participative Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Adjusted ( R^2 )</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 ) Change</td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.047 (^a)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.78833</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Participative leadership
b. Dependent Variable: Intention to stay

4.3.3.2 Anova

From Table 4.7 below, it is established that participative leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay \( F \) Value = 0.220, \( p>0.05 \).

Table 4.7: Anova - Participative Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.640 (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.3 Coefficient of Variation

The findings are provided in Table 4.8 below. It is established that participative leadership style does not have a significant influence on employee retention, \( \beta = -0.006 \), \( p>0.05 \).

Table 4.8: Coefficient of Participative leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Std. Error Beta t Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.734 .215 .0000000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative leadership</td>
<td>-.006 .012 -.469 .640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tolerance | VIF | 1.000 | 1.000 |
4.4 Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

This section provides information sought to establish the extent to which directive leadership style influences employee retention. Descriptive analysis as well as inferential statistics was used.

4.4.1 Directive Leadership Style Characteristics

The extent to which directive leadership style influences employee retention was gauged using seven statements on a 5 point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The respondents were asked if their supervisor do not consider suggestions made by the team as s/he does not have time. This had a mean of 2.64 with a standard deviation of 1.54 inclining towards agree. The respondents were negative to the second statement that my supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of me on the job which had a mean of 2.45 with a standard deviation of 1.45.

The respondents were also asked if their supervisors retain the final decision making authority within their teams. This had a mean of 2.36 with a standard deviation of 1.42 which inclined towards a negative. In addition, the respondents were also negative to the statement my supervisor expects us to follow standard rules and procedures which had a mean of 2.16 and a standard deviation of 1.43. The respondents were asked if their supervisors specify deadlines to complete work assigned to them. The statement had a mean of 1.78 with a standard deviation of 0.98 which inclined towards strongly disagree.

The respondents were also asked if their supervisors tell them what need to be done and how to do it. This had a mean of 1.7 with a standard deviation of 0.91 which also inclined towards strongly disagree. The final statement asked the respondents if their supervisors explain the level/standard of performance expected of them. This had a mean of 1.67 with a standard deviation of 0.93 which was also tending towards strongly disagree. The results are shown in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Responses on Directive Leadership Style Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive leadership style and its characteristics</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor does not consider suggestions made the team as s/he does not have time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of me on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor retains the final decision making authority within my team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor expects us to follow standard rules and procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor specifies deadlines to complete work assigned to us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor tells us what need to be done and how to do it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor explains the level/standard of performance expected of us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Correlation between Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results of a Pearson's correlation showed a weak negative correlation between directive leadership style and staff intention to stay (r = -0.007, p = 0.947>0.05), indicating that there is no significant relationship between the two variables. Table 4.10 below shows the results.

Table 4.10: Correlation between Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Intention to stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Regression Analysis of Directive Style Leadership and Employee Retention

A regression analysis was done to determine if participative leadership style predicted employee retention.
4.4.3.1 Model Summary
The study established an R value of 0.007, R² of 0.000 and adjusted R² of -0.010. Based on these results, the study shows that directive leadership style does not influence employee retention. The results are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Model Summary - Directive Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.007a</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.78920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Directive leadership
b. Dependent Variable: Intention to stay

4.4.4 Anova
From Table 4.12 below, it is established that directive leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay F Value = 0.004, p>0.05.

Table 4.12: Anova - Directive Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.947b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61.037</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.040</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.4.1 Coefficient of Variation
The findings are provided in Table 4.13 below. It is established that directive leadership style does not have any influence on employee retention β = -0.001, p>0.05.

Table 4.13: Coefficient of Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive leadership</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

This section provides information sought to establish the extent to which supportive leadership style influences employee retention. Descriptive analysis as well as inferential statistics was used.

4.5.1 Supportive Leadership Style Characteristics

The influence of supportive leadership style on employee retention was gauged using seven statements, on a 5 point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The statement my supervisor respects everyone and treats them equally had the highest mean of 2.43 with a standard deviation of 1.44 which was tending towards neutral. My supervisor creates a friendly working environment for the team had a mean of 2.36 and a standard deviation on 1.42 which inclined towards a negative. My supervisor encourages us to raise concerns about issues affecting us had a mean of 2.32 and a standard deviation of 1.36 inclining towards disagree.

The respondents were also asked if their supervisor encourage them even in difficult situations. This had a mean of 2.28 with a standard deviation of 1.38, this was also inclining towards disagree. In addition, the respondents were asked if their supervisor gives positive feedback/ appreciation for a job well done. This statement had a mean of 2.24 with a standard deviation of 1.42 which inclined towards disagree.

The statement my supervisor is concerned about my well-being and that of other team members had mean score of 2.23 with a standard deviation of 1.36, inclining towards disagree. Finally, the statement my supervisor does not say things that hurt my personal feelings had the lowest mean of 2.07 with a standard deviation of 1.33 which also inclined towards disagree. The results are shown in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: Responses on Supportive Leadership Style Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive leadership style and its characteristics</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor respects everyone and treats them equally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor creates a friendly working environment for the team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages us to raise our concerns about issues affecting us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages me even in difficult situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor gives positive feedback/ appreciation for a job well done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is concerned about my well-being and that of other team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor does not say things that hurt my personal feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Correlation between Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results of a Pearson’s correlation show that there was a weak but positive correlation between supportive leadership style and staff intention to stay at their current workplaces. \((r = 0.157, p = 0.118 > 0.05)\). Table 4.15 below provides details of the linear correlation between supportive leadership style and staff intention to stay which is the measure for employee retention.

Table 4.15: Correlation between Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Intention to stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Regression Analysis of Supportive Style Leadership and Employee Retention

A regression analysis was done to determine if supportive leadership style predicted employee retention.
4.5.3.1 Model Summary
The study established an R value of 0.157, $R^2$ of 0.025 and adjusted $R^2$ of 0.015. Based on these results, the study shows that only 2.5% of the variance in staff intention to stay can be explained by supportive leadership style. The results are shown in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Model Summary - Supportive Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.77937</td>
<td>.025, 2.491, 1, 98</td>
<td>.118, 2.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Supportive leadership    
b. Dependent Variable: Intention to stay

4.5.3.2 Anova
From Table 4.17 below, it is established that supportive leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay $F$ Value = 2.491, $p>0.05$.

Table 4.17: Anova - Supportive Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>59.527</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.040</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3.3 Coefficient of Variation
The findings are provided in Table 4.18 below. It is established that supportive leadership style does not have a significant influence on employee retention $\beta = 0.018$, $p>0.05$.

Table 4.18: Coefficient of Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>3.355</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Achievement-oriented Leadership Style and Employee Retention

This section provides information sought to establish the extent to which achievement-oriented leadership style influences employee retention. Descriptive analysis as well as inferential statistics was used.

4.6.1 Supportive Leadership Style Characteristics

The influence of supportive leadership style on employee retention was gauged using seven statement, on a 5 point Likert scale with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The statement my supervisor trusts in my ability to meet most objectives had a mean of 2.2 with a standard deviation of 1.33 which is tending towards a negative. My supervisor prides in work and self-evaluation based in personal accomplishment had a mean score of 2.15 and a standard deviation on 1.35 which is also tending towards a negative. My supervisor encourages continuous improvement in our performance had a mean of 2.13 and a standard deviation of 1.37 tending towards disagree.

The statement my supervisor expects us to be successful in competitive situations had a mean of 2.02 with a standard deviation of 1.38, this was also tending towards disagree. My supervisor takes considerable risks in his/her approach had a mean of 2.01 with a standard deviation of 1.16 which was also disagreed by the respondents. The statements my supervisor expects us to perform at the highest level and my supervisor consistently sets challenging goals for the team to attain had mean scores of 1.85 and 1.77 with standard deviations of 0.98 and 1.28 respectively. These were inclined towards strongly disagree. The results are shown in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19: Responses on Achievement-oriented Leadership Style Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement-oriented leadership style and its characteristics</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor trusts in my ability to meet most objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor prides in work and self-evaluation based in personal accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor encourages continuous improvement in our performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor expects us to be successful in competitive situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor takes considerable risks in his/her approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor expects us to perform at the highest level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor consistently sets challenging goals for the team to attain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.2 Correlation between Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results of a Pearson’s correlation show that achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated negatively with staff intention to stay in their current workplaces ($r = -0.12$, $p = 0.909 > 0.05$). The results in Table 4.20 below indicates that there is no significant relationship between achievement-oriented leadership style and employee retention.

Table 4.20: Correlation between achievement-oriented leadership style and employee retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Intention to stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.3 Regression Analysis of Supportive Style Leadership and Employee Retention

A regression analysis was done to determine if achievement-oriented leadership style predicted employee retention.
4.6.3.1 Model Summary

The study established an R value of 0.012, $R^2$ of 0.000 and adjusted $R^2$ of -0.010. Based on these results, the study shows that achievement-oriented leadership style does not influence employee retention. The results are shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: Model Summary - Achievement Oriented Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.78916</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.4 Anova

From Table 4.22 below, it is established that achievement-oriented leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay $F$ Value = 0.013, $p$>0.05.

Table 4.22: Anova - Achievement Oriented Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61.032</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.040</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.4.1 Coefficient of Variation

The findings are provided in Table 4.23 below. It is established that achievement-oriented leadership style does not have any influence on employee retention $\beta = -0.002$, $p$>0.05.

Table 4.23: Coefficient of Achievement-oriented Leadership Style and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.662</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented leadership</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the results and findings on the study on the influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention was presented. The results and findings were presented as per the research questions. Tables and figures were used in the presentation of the results and findings. In the next chapter, the summary of findings, discussions, conclusions and recommendations will be covered.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion on the findings of the research as compared to the findings in the literature review, the summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations on how participative, directive, supportive and achievement-oriented leadership styles influence employee retention. The research is concluded on the basis of the discussion of the research objectives.

5.2 Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess the influence of situational path goal leadership styles: participative, directive, supportive and achievement-oriented on employee retention in the big four audit firms. The study was guided by the following research objectives: To what extent does participative leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? To what extent does directive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? To what extent does supportive leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya? Finally, to what extent does achievement-oriented leadership style influence employee retention in the big four audit firms in Kenya?

The study adopted a descriptive research design which enabled the researcher to carry out an in-depth study on the influence of the four leadership styles on employee retention. The study’s target population was 220 alumni staff of the big four audit firms - KPMG, PwC, Deloitte and Ernst & Young. The collected data was coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program according to each variable of the study for analysis. Descriptive and inferential statistics like correlation and regression were used for analysis. For easy interpretations and understanding, figures and tables were used for the presentation of the results and findings.

Findings on participative leadership style and employee retention indicate established that the majority of the respondents agreed that their supervisors do not act without consulting the team. However, the respondents disagreed to the other statements that their supervisors encouraged initiatives from the team, the supervisors encouraged them to set individual and group goals in line with organisational goals, if their supervisors give them
autonomy in doing their work and whether they involve them in the planning process when assigning responsibilities. The study therefore established that there is no significant relationship between participative leadership style and employee retention.

On directive leadership style and employee retention, many respondents tended to agree that their supervisors do not consider suggestions made by the team as s/he does not have time. However, the respondents also disagreed that their supervisors give vague explanations of what is expected on the job, that their supervisor retains the final decision making authority within the team and that their supervisors expect them to follow standards rules and procedures. They also strongly disagreed that their supervisors specify deadlines to complete work assigned to them and that their supervisors tells them what needs to be done and how to do it. The study established that there was significant relationship between directive leadership and employee retention.

The findings on the influence of supportive leadership style on employee retention established that most of the responses were negative suggesting that the respondents tended to disagree that their supervisors respects everyone and treats them equally, creates a friendly working environment for the team and encourages the team to raise concerns about issues affecting them. Based on these results, the study shows that supportive leadership style had a weak but positive relationship with employee retention. However, there was no significant relationship between supportive leadership style and employee retention.

On achievement-oriented leadership style, most of the respondents were negative about their supervisors pride in work and self-evaluation based on personal accomplishment, their supervisors encouraging continuous improvement in their performance and consistently setting challenging goals for the teams to attain. The findings also showed that achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated negatively with employee retention, thus no significant relationship between this leadership style and employee retention.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Participative leadership is the type of leadership where a superior and his or her subordinates make joint decisions or share influence in decision making. It involves
hierarchical decision making among employees. The participative style is appropriate when subordinates show a lack of judgment or when procedures have not been followed (Negron, 2008). Most of the respondents indicated that their supervisors use participative leadership style as it had the highest mean score compared to the other leadership styles.

The respondents mostly agreed to the statements that their supervisors do not act without consulting the team and encourages initiatives from the team. The principles of leadership are slowly changing from individual to collective, control to learning, self to self-in-relation to others. Since the modern organizations are moving towards organic structures such as network based structure, the way modern leaders should react to the new structure is to motivate followers from bottom up rather than top down. The rapid rate of changes in environment, leadership and organizational structures indicates that the use of participative decision making is a must for future organizations.

Particularly in the big four firms, it is common for the leaders to express consultative behaviours such as seeking suggestions from their teams before making final decisions, although, they retain final decision authority. This is because the environment is highly project based and there is a lot of collaboration in planning and execution of these projects.

Findings from the survey indicate that there was a weak negative correlation between participative leadership style and staff intention to stay. Contrary to the findings of Bell and Mjoli (2014) and Henson (2012) who argued that the ability of leaders to use participative leadership styles motivates employees to commit themselves to an organisation, it was evident from the study that this leadership style only accounted for a smaller percentage of the variance in staff intention to stay and hence employee retention.

5.3.2 Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Directive leadership is defined as the process of providing the subordinates with a guideline for decision making and action that is in favour with a leader’s perspective (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). The directive leader sets roles for their followers, emphasizes on achievement of goals, and establishes a well-defined pattern of communication with his/her followers. This leader will also make followers engage in a top-down communication, explain what the follower is supposed to do, as well as the time, the place, and the method of how each function is to be accomplished.
From the survey findings, the directive leadership style was the second least used. The respondents mostly agree to the statement that their supervisors do not consider suggestions made the team as s/he do not have time. This shows that the supervisors in the big four firms moderately use this leadership style depending on the situation. Sometimes, the directive leadership style is needed in order to clarify expectations and give specific guidance to accomplish the desired expectations based on performance standards while working on projects in most of the big four firms.

The directive leadership style is appropriate with newly hired or inexperienced staff and in situations that require immediate action (Negron, 2008). This is the case in the big four audit firms as they hire a huge number of graduates fresh from university every year. They therefore need to learn the structures, be told what needs to be done and how to do it as they do not have any work experience. They are untrained and may not be acquainted with the tasks to perform or are confronted with problems of which procedures to follow, effective supervision can be provided only through detailed orders and instructions.

Results from the study show that directive leadership style has no significant relationship/influence employee retention and does not predict staff intention to stay in the big four firms. This is in line with the work done by Asmani (2015) to investigate the influence of nurse managers’ leadership style on staff outcomes which observed that there was no significant correlation between directive leadership style and staff intentions to stay at their current workplaces.

### 5.3.3 Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

Supportive leadership is behaviour that addresses the requirements and preferences of the employees and shows concern for their wellbeing and fosters a pleasant and friendly, psychological organizational setting (House & Mitchell, 1974). Supportive leadership is the behaviour, which focuses on the wellbeing of employees and has a deep concern for the needs, preferences and satisfaction of employees (House, 1974). According to the survey results, supportive leadership style was the second most used.

The respondents mostly agreed to the statements that their supervisors respects everyone and treats them equally and they create respects everyone and treats them equally. Supportive leaders create conducive working environment to foster respect, trust, cooperation, and emotional support. A workplace enriched with supportive leaders brings
successful results that are beneficial for the well-being of both employees and the organization.

In any work place, this kind of leadership is highly encouraged in order to foster good working relationships and cooperation. It also reduces conflict at the work place and also shapes the employees’ behaviour basing on the nature of the jobs and the companies goals. This behaviour is also highly encouraged in the big four firms as there is a lot of team work required and therefore necessary for the leaders to develop and maintain a personal relationship with their teams because they spend a lot of time working together and should be concerned about their well-being.

From the survey findings, only supportive leadership style had a positive, however weak correlation with employee retention. It was also the leadership style that contributed the biggest percentage of the variance in staff intention to stay. Employees motivated by supportive leadership regard it as the obligation to complete the in-role work, keep long relationship with the organisation, and positively participate in the organizational management and decision-making. Finding from the study however show that there was no significant relationship between supportive leadership style and employee retention. These findings are in line with AbuAlRub and Alghamdi (2012) who conducted a study among Saudi nurses in six Government hospitals and found no significant relationship between the four leadership styles and nurse’s intention to stay at work, but that supportive leadership style was found to lower turnover rates.

5.3.4 Achievement-oriented Leadership Style and Employee Retention

House and Mitchell (1974) define achievement oriented leadership as one which involves creating challenging and high standard performance goals for subordinates and seeks for continuous improvement by showing great confidence in subordinates. Achievement oriented leaders do not only place emphasis on achieving goals or performance but also in pride in work and self-evaluation based on personal accomplishment.

Achievement oriented leadership style was the least used by the supervisors in the big four firms as shown from the survey findings. Achievement-oriented leadership style also correlated negatively with staff intention to stay in their current workplaces and results from the regression analysis also show that it does not predict staff intention to stay in their organisations. These findings are contrary to Asmani (2015) who investigated the
influence of nurse managers leadership style on staff outcomes and observed that achievement-oriented leadership style correlated positively with staff intention to stay in their current workplaces. The study found that nurse managers used all four leadership styles (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) described by the path-goal leadership theory depending on the situation. However, the nurse managers used more of achievement-oriented leadership styles than the others.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Participative Leadership Style and Employee Retention

From the research, it is clear that there was no significant influence between participative leadership style and employee retention. Participative leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay. The study therefore concludes that participative leadership on its own is not a factor that contributes to employee retention. It can be suitable in certain circumstances but not solely as the best style of leadership for effective staff management.

5.4.2 Directive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results show that there was no statistical significance between directive leadership style and employee retention. Directive leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay. The study therefore concludes that directive leadership on its own is not a factor that contributes to employee retention. It can be suitable in certain circumstances but not solely as the best style of leadership for effective staff management.

5.4.3 Supportive Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results show that there was a positive but weak influence between supportive leadership style and employee retention. A smaller percentage of the variance in employee retention was impacted by supportive leadership style. However, this was not significant to conclude that supportive leadership style influences employee retention. The study therefore concludes that supportive leadership on its own is not a factor that contributes to employee retention. It can be suitable in certain circumstances but not solely as the best style of leadership for effective staff management.
5.4.4 Achievement-oriented Leadership Style and Employee Retention

The results show that there was no statistical significance between achievement-oriented leadership style and employee retention. Achievement-oriented leadership style does not predict staff intention to stay. The study therefore concludes that achievement-oriented leadership on its own is not a factor that contributes to employee retention. It can be suitable in certain circumstances but not solely as the best style of leadership for effective staff management.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement

5.5.1.1 The Influence of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Retention

The results indicated that participative leadership style has no significant influence on employee retention. However, the results also indicate that this leadership style is used the most by supervisors in the big four audit firms. Previous studies have revealed that the use of participative leadership style motivates employees to commit themselves to an organisation. The study therefore recommends the use of participative leadership style for various aspects like employee motivation and team work but not for employee retention.

5.5.1.2 The Influence of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Retention

From the survey findings, the directive leadership style was the second least used among the other leadership styles. The results also indicate that directive leadership style has no influence on employee retention. The study recommends against the use of directive leadership style in trying to achieve employee retention. This leadership style can however be adopted to suit different situations that call for giving directives especially when staff are new and are learning on the job.

5.5.1.3 The Influence of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Retention

Based on the findings, supportive leadership style has a positive, however, not significant influence on employee retention. The study therefore recommends that supervisors create a good working environment to foster respect, trust, cooperation, and emotional support for their employees. They should also be concerned about the well-being of the team members because they spend a lot of time working together, therefore it is important to
develop a personal working relationship. These behaviours, to a certain extent, promotes employee retention.

5.5.1.4 The Influence of Achievement-oriented Leadership Style on Employee Retention

From the survey findings, achievement-oriented leadership style was the least used among the other leadership styles. The results also indicate that achievement-oriented leadership style has no influence on employee retention. The study recommends against the use of achievement-oriented leadership style in trying to achieve employee retention. This leadership style can however be adopted under different circumstances like placing emphasis on high performance and personal accomplishment.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies

The study investigated the influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention. The big four audit firms were used as a case study in this research. The study therefore recommends that researchers and academicians in the field of human resources management should consider replicating the study in other industries or sectors in the region to provide a holistic view of the subject. They should also consider examining the factors that affect employee retention in the Kenya context since this study only examined the influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention.
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APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

1 August 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

I am Hilda Amahundu, a graduate student at United States International University Africa. I am conducting a research to determine the effect of situational leadership styles on staff retention among the big four audit firms for my research project in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Masters in Organisational Development.

Given your experience in working with the big four audit firms, you have been selected to participate in this study as a respondent. Therefore, this letter is to request for your support in providing the information for all sections of the questionnaire to enable me obtain the required information for this research.

Please note that the information you will give will be treated with utmost confidentiality and it will not be used for any other purpose besides the academic purpose. Your assistance will be highly appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Hilda Amahundu
APPENDIX 2: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

This study is a requirement for the partial fulfilment for the award of Master of Science in Organizational Development (MOD). The purpose of this research is to investigate on how situational leadership styles affect employee retention in the big four audit firms. Please note that any information you give will be treated with extreme confidentiality and at no instance will it be used for any other purpose other than for this project. Your assistance will be highly appreciated.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Kindly provide your responses by checking in the relevant box

1. Age________________

2. Gender:
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

3. Job grade served
   - Director [ ]
   - Senior Manager [ ]
   - Manager [ ]
   - Senior Consultant [ ]
   - Associate [ ]

4. Business unit served
   - Audit [ ]
   - Advisory [ ]
   - Tax [ ]

5. Has your supervisor received any leadership/manager development training?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
SECTION B: THE EFFECT OF PARTICIPATIVE LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION

This table provides a description of your supervisor’s leadership style. The descriptive statements are listed below.

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Check on the box that best describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My supervisor seeks for the teams’ ideas and suggestions before making final decisions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My supervisor involves the team in the planning process when assigning responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor encourages us to set individual and group goals that we value in line with the organisation’s goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My supervisor encourages initiatives from the team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My supervisor gives us autonomy in doing our work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My supervisor puts suggestions made by the team into action.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My supervisor acts without consulting the team.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: THE EFFECT OF DIRECTIVE LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION

This table provides a description of your supervisor’s leadership style. The descriptive statements are listed below.

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Check on the box that best describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My supervisor tells us what need to be done and how to do it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My supervisor explains the level/standard of performance expected of us.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor specifies deadlines to complete work assigned to us.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My supervisor expects us to follow standard rules and procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My supervisor retains the final decision making authority within my team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My supervisor does not consider suggestions made the team as s/he does not have time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of me on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: THE EFFECT OF SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION

This table provides a description of your supervisor’s leadership style. The descriptive statements are listed below.

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Check on the box that best describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My supervisor creates a friendly working environment for the team.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My supervisor is concerned about my well-being and that of other team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My supervisor encourages us to raise our concerns about issues affecting us</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My supervisor gives positive feedback/appreciation for a job well done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My supervisor respects everyone and treats them equally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. My supervisor encourages me even in difficult situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. My supervisor does not say things that hurt my personal feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: THE EFFECT OF ACHIEVEMENT ORIENTED LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEE RETENTION

This table provides a description of your supervisor’s leadership style. The descriptive statements are listed below.

Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements by using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Check on the box that best describes your opinion of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>My supervisor consistently sets challenging goals for the team to attain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>My supervisor expects us to perform at the highest level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>My supervisor encourages continuous improvement in our performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>My supervisor takes considerable risks in his/her approach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>My supervisors expects us to be successful in competitive situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>My supervisor prides in work and self-evaluation based in personal accomplishment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>My supervisor trusts in my ability to meet most objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION F: INTENTION TO STAY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How long have you worked in one or either of the big four audit firms

- Less than 1 year [ ]
- 2 - 5 years [ ]
- 6 - 10 years [ ]
- 11 - 15 years [ ]
- 16 - 20 years [ ]
- above 21 years [ ]

2. Are you still working with the big four firms?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

3. If answered YES in 2 above, how do you feel about leaving the firm?

- I am presently looking and planning to leave [ ]
- I am seriously considering leaving in the future [ ]
- I have no feelings about this one way or the other [ ]
- I intend to stay with my current organisation [ ]
- It is very unlikely that I would ever consider leaving this firm [ ]

4. If answered NO in 2 above, would you prefer to continue working in your current organisation or going back to the big four?

- I prefer very much to continue working here [ ]
- I prefer to continue working here [ ]
- I don't really care whichever way [ ]
- I prefer to go back to the big four [ ]
- I prefer very much to go back to the big four [ ]

5. How important is it to you that your supervisor’s leadership style matters/ mattered in your decision to stay in the big four?

- It is of no importance to me [ ]
- I have mixed feelings about its importance [ ]
- It is of some importance [ ]
- It is fairly important [ ]
- It is very important for me to continue to be in this firm [ ]
## APPENDIX 3: IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activities</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Development</td>
<td>Mon 04/04/16</td>
<td>Fri 08/07/16</td>
<td>70 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal approval</td>
<td>Wed 11/05/16</td>
<td>Tue 31/05/16</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection (Fieldwork)</td>
<td>Wed 11/05/16</td>
<td>Tue 31/05/16</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis and Interpretation</td>
<td>Wed 01/06/16</td>
<td>Wed 15/06/16</td>
<td>11 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>Thu 16/06/16</td>
<td>Thu 14/07/16</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Fri 29/07/16</td>
<td>Fri 29/07/16</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4: RESEARCH BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line Items</th>
<th>Cost in KSH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery Material</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection (Fieldwork)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to School</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Writing and Dissemination</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding and Dissemination</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>