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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the various factors that take place in Kenyan organizations that can trigger an employee’s intention to quit a case of graduate students in USIU-Africa. The following research questions guided the study: To what extent is the perceived leadership styles of managers affect employees’ intention to quit: To what extent does employees’ organization based self-esteem impact intention to quit: To what extent does perceived supervisor support impact employee intention to quit: To what extent does organization justice influence employee intention to quit an organization.

The population of the study was composed of 60 graduate students of USIU under the various graduate programs. The graduate students were chosen at random from their respective graduate courses in the different schools. Descriptive survey research design was used for this study and close-ended questionnaires were used to collect primary quantitative data for this study. Data that was collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Data findings of this study are presented using tables and figures.

The findings indicated that the correlation between leadership and turnover intent was statistically significant, $r = -0.482$, $p < 0.01$, two tailed. However, the direction of the relation is negative, whereas the strength of this relationship was low at $3 > |r| < .5$.

The findings showed that the correlation between organization based self-esteem and perceived supervisor support was statistically significant, $r = 0.620$, $p < 0.01$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship was positive; whereas the strength of the relationship was higher at $3 < |r| > .5$.

The findings indicate that perceived supervisor support has a significant correlation with organizational justice, $r = 0.688$, $p < 0.01$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship is positive whereas its strength is rather high at $3 < |r| > .5$.

The findings indicate that organizational justice and turnover intent was found to be statistically significant at $r = -0.355$, $p < 0.05$, two tailed. However, the direction of the relationship is negative, whereas its strength was also low at $3 > |r| < .5$.

This study concluded that leadership that an organization adopt affects the intention of the employees to quit their work and this is because leadership style is directly related to the organizational justice that is extended to the employees; employees’ organization based self-esteem affects the intention of the employees to quit their jobs; there is strong relationship
between perceived supervisor support and the employees’ intention to quit; there is a strong relationship between organizational justice and the employees’ intention to quit especially where the employees are treated with fairness, their financial and emotional needs are given a high priority by the management.

This study recommended that transformational leadership style is the most appropriate for organizations as it takes into account not the interest of the leaders but those of the employees as encourages innovation and freedom of expression. Secondly, organizations need to provide environments in which the employees will realize their self-worth and hence seek to demonstrate it through their contribution to the realization of the goals and objectives of the organization. Thirdly, organizations should be help employees in accomplishing their tasks rather than finding fault in their work. And finally, by creating a fair working environment should be the goal of organizations that are especially facing higher levels of turnovers.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION.

1.1 Background of the Study.
Employee retention represents one of the major factors impacting today’s modern manager during hire. In an era of globalization, employee turnover has been identified as one of the most challenging issues in organizations, as it is extremely damaging and costly for organizations (Gamble and Huang, 2008). Given that turnover was an ongoing concern of the 20th century and remains so at present, it is not surprising that a large body of research (exceeding 1,000 studies) has accumulated on this topic and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner, 2000; Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, and Eberly, 2008; Maltarich, Nyberg, and Reilly, 2010).

Retaining the desirable employees is beneficial to an organization in gaining competitive advantage that cannot be substituted by other competitors in terms of producing high morale and satisfied coworkers who will provide better customer service and enhanced productivity, which subsequently resulting in sales generating, customer satisfaction, smooth management succession and improved organizational learning (Heathfield, 2005).

Employee retention is more important than hiring and employers at first underestimated costs associated with turnover of key staff (Ahlrichs, 2000). Employees are the backbone of an organization and in order to retain the best talents, strategies aimed at satisfying employee’s needs are implemented regardless of global companies or small-sized firms (Hong et al., 2012). When the Human Resource Management journal was launched in 1990, it was able to capture a rising wave of interest in human resource management and in particular the relationship between human resource management and performance (Guest, 2011).

However, some international organizations such as Google seem to have mastered the art of retaining their staff. Of course, some employees still leave but the company has one of the lowest rate of turnover in the globe. In what is termed as a knowledge economy, a company cannot afford to lose a talented employee because he/she is a valuable asset and is therefore expensive to replace. A loss of employees with vital skills or talents can incur sizeable personnel costs (Peterson and Luthans, 2006) and imperil organizational effectiveness, such as decreased customer service (Shaw et al., 2005).
The benefits of retention are saving cost for further recruitment, fewer training to be conducted for new candidates, improvement of productivity, increase employees’ performance and thus increase profits and meet their organizational goals and objectives (Hong et al., 2012). Indeed, a one standard deviation increase in turnover rates can depress financial performance by as much as 27% according to a study by Park and Shaw (2011).

According to Google’s former vice president of people operation and author of “Work Rules!”, people do not work in a company for years because of money (Google Inc. 2015). People stay in a company for two reasons, the first is the quality of the people they work with and which was the reason why Google hires employees of high standards and other potential managers and colleagues had to approve of the potential employee (Google Inc. 2015). Secondly, the employees have to feel that the work they are doing is meaningful and because of this satisfaction, it doesn’t matter what the organization provides for them which he calls lavish perks in Google such as free gourmet dishes, massages etc., these perks do not attract not retain employees (Google Inc. 2015). This is as a result of organization-based self-esteem which increases with most job-experienced employees (Pierce et al., 1989). In the global arena U.S multinationals struggle to retain host-country personnel, who increasingly predominate their workforces, especially in countries where talent shortages are acute, such as China and India (Hom, 2011: Wessel, 2011).

Managers have to exert a lot of effort in ensuring the employees turnover are always low, as they are gaining increasing awareness of which, Meaghan et al (2002), employees are critical to organization since their values to the organization are not easily replicated. Through understanding of various well-known motivational theories such as their values to the organization are not easily replicated. Maslow’s Need Hierarchy and McClelland’s Need Theory, we can point out the critical factors that have implication towards retention practices focus on physical and emotional needs, working environment, supervision, responsibilities, fairness and equity, employee development and feedback on performance (Ramlall, 2004). This is related the leadership style practiced by the managers towards employees, what results to supervisor support.

According to Landsman (2004), the suggested that training is a valuable activity for enhancing skills and improving staff performance, and that training can address some of the
factors contributing to staff retention, such as perceived support from the supervisor, the agency and community. Such training clearly defines the role of the employee in the organization hence less job stress. This causes a sense of organizational justice when they perceive fairness.

According to the theory of reason action, a person’s intention to perform a specific behavior is the immediate determinant of the behavior (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). As the name implies, the theory of reasoned action is based on the assumption that human beings usually behave in a sensible manner; that they take account of available information and implicitly or explicitly consider the implications of their actions. Consistent with its focus on volitional behaviors, the theory postulates that a person’s intention to perform (or not to perform) a behavior is the immediate determinant of that action (Kuhl et al., 1985).

According to Tett and Meyer (1993; cited in Tuzun and Kalema, 2012), “Prior research provides consistent support for intent to leave as the strongest predictor of actual turnover”. This intention to leave is considered as the last part of a series in the withdrawal cognition process and it is a conscious and purposeful aspiration to leave the organization in the near future (Mobley, Horner and Hollinsworth, 1978).

1.2 Problem Statement.
As the Kenyan labor market tightens over the years and unemployment becomes a major cause of concern for the Kenyan government and organizations that are being forced to create employment. Although currently high unemployment rates are discouraging employees from quitting, forward-looking companies nonetheless are preparing themselves for the eventual pent-up turnover that will arise as the economy recovers (Allen, Bryant and Vardaman, 2010). However, the rate of turnover in Kenya is still relatively high as employees seek better paying jobs that encourage personal growth and that increase job satisfaction.

This could be an indication that employees are not satisfied or their supervisors and managers do not support them neither do they have the leadership skills that would cause an employee to stay in an organization. Organizations should look into the reasons as the economy is recovering so as not to be caught off-guard. Recent studies show that employees in organizations that conduct trainings are more likely to stay in an organization (Maina and
Waiganjo, 2014) and so this study seeks to look at other factors that could affect the employees’ turnover intention.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study is to analyze the factors that take place in Kenyan organizations that can trigger an employee’s intention to quit.

1.4 Research Questions
1.4.1 To what extent is the perceived leadership styles of managers affect employees’ intention to quit?
1.4.2 To what extent does employees’ organization based self-esteem impact intention to quit?
1.4.3 To what extent does perceived supervisor support impact employee intention to quit?
1.4.4 To what extent does organization justice influence employee intention to quit an organization?

1.5 Significance of the Study.
Employee turnover has been identified as one of the most challenging issues in organizations because it is time consuming and costly to recruit and train new employees. However, this is especially true in non-governmental organizations where employees seek job satisfaction rather than job security that is mostly experienced in government institutions in Kenya. This local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations are the ones that experience high turnover based on low motivation and organization-based self-esteem.

1.5.1 Management.
Managers significantly affect an employee’s turnover intention through their support to the employees. They are usually the direct supervisors and they need to understand how to create an environment at the workplace that is positive also known as positive affect. Positive affect indicates pleasurable engagement in work, and feelings of enthusiasm, alertness and activity. Managers are asked to generate healthy stress among their employees (Hargrove et al., 2012).
1.5.2 Human Resource managers.
Human Resource managers are in charge of recruiting, training and dismissal of employees. This study is beneficial to them as they know the employees in the organization, the organization culture and goals and objectives. They should hire employees whose values match with those of the organization. They should ensure induction is thoroughly and managers are supportive of employees. This will reduce turnover intention.

1.6 Scope of the Study.
The study sample is 60 graduate students that are employed in local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya. It will be conducted from January to July 2017. The target population of this study will be graduate students in USIU-Africa. The personnel will be picked at random from the organizations and administered with research material.

1.7 Definition of the Terms.
1.7.1 Employee retention. 
Employee retention refers to the policies and practices companies use to prevent valuable employees from leaving their job (Hargrove et al., 2012)

1.7.2 Organization-based self-esteem.
Organization-based self-esteem is the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization. (Pierce et al., 1989).

1.7.3 Eustress.
Eustress, on the other hand, refers to positive stress or beneficial stress either psychological or physical (Hargrove et al., 2012).

1.8 Chapter Summary.
This chapter presents the background information to the research problem, identifies the problem statement and the relevant theories to the study. It includes the purpose of the study and an overview of the research questions that will be addressed in the research project. It also presents the significance of these studies to local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya.
Chapter two presents the literature review. It discusses the existing research literature on the organization justice, organization- based self-esteem by employees that have perceived leadership styles practiced through perceived supervisor support in local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya and how it affects the employees in management intention to quit. The discussion tackles all the research questions posed and provides a firm theoretical background for the study.

Chapter three presents the research methodology used in this study. It details the research design, population and sampling, data collection methods, research procedures and how data collected was analyzed. Chapter four presents the results and findings of the study. Chapter five presents the discussion, conclusion, and recommendations for action and further research.
CHAPTER TWO.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the literature review on the perceived leadership styles in various organizations in Kenya, the perceived supervisor support at the work place hence encouraging various forms of organization justice and how all this contributes to the employees’ intention to quit the organization.

2.2 Perceived Leadership Style

Leadership style is the relatively consistent pattern of behavior that characterizes a leader (DuBrin, 2001) and today’s organizations need effective leaders who understand the complexities of the rapidly changing global environment (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy, 2014). Chug-Hsiung Fan et al identified that leadership style can affect organizational commitment and work satisfaction positively and work satisfaction in turn can affect organization commitment and work performance positively.

Northouse (2007) stated, “Leadership is a process through which some individual influences a group of people to attain common goals”. Leaders now don’t rely upon their legitimate power to persuade individuals to do as they are told but they take an interest in an interaction with their subordinates or they raise and widen the interest of their subordinates (Northouse, 2007). Leadership has an adverse effect on the attitude of the employees towards their jobs. Leavers often cite unfair or abusive supervision as a prime reason for leaving (Bhattacharya, 2008: Campion, 1991: Holtom et al., 2005: Tepper, 2000).

Leadership is therefore considered to be a pull-to-stay force (Harris et al., 2011: Mitchell et., 2001). Leadership theorists have long conceived a wider array of potential pull-to-stay forces, such as idealized influence and inspiration (Avey et al., 2008: Bass 1985). According to Mintzberg (2010) true leaders engage others with their consideration and modesty because they involve themselves in what they are actually doing not for individual gains. Different leadership styles may affect organizational electiveness or performance (Nahavandi, 2002). According to Oladipo et al(2013), the success or failure of proper organizations, nations and
other social units has been largely credited to the nature of their leadership style. There are various theoretical approaches to study the various leadership styles but transactional and transformational leadership framework has received considerable research support (Bass and Avolio, 1993).

According to Burns (1978) transformational leadership is perceived when leaders encourage their subordinates to increase the level of their beliefs, morals, perceptions, motivations and coalitions with organization objectives. Transformational leaders show confidence and respect in their subordinates and have the ability to influence their subordinate’s behavior in a way that results in more work fulfillment and positive organizational outcomes (Givens, 2008). Transformational leadership may embed followers via greater job fit and links (Mitchell and Lee, 2001) and induce relational identification (Sluss and Ashforth, 2008). They help their subordinates be productive, innovative and creative and adaptable to the ever-changing environmental conditions within an organization (Furkan, Kara, Tascan, and Avsalli, 2010) and try to prevent the chances of work related problems (Berson and Avolio, 2004).

Transactional leadership deals with the exchange between the leaders and their subordinates. According to Naidu and Van der Walt (2005) this is a leader-follower exchange based leadership in which leader exchanges rewards or punishments with the follower for the task performed, and in return expects productivity, efforts and loyalty from follower. Such leaders looking to satisfying their own self-interest, practice control strategies to get subordinates to perform in a preferred way (Kanungo, 2001). They may become less engaging, less appealing and become mediocre when transact with subordinates by rewards concentrated on realizing the work achieved, or concentrating on their mistakes, or delaying in the making of decisions, or avoiding to interfere until something has happened (Howell and Avolio, 1993). These are known as laissez-faire leaders/passive transactional leaders.
2.2.1 Transformational Leadership

The rate of change taking place in organizations today has resulted in search of more flexible, adaptive leadership. Adaptive leaders work with their followers to generate creative solutions to complex problems emerging in the changing organization environment, while also developing them to handle a broader range of leadership responsibilities (Bennis, 2001). Bass (1985) labeled the type of adaptive leadership described as transformational. Bass (1985) also argued that transformational leadership energizes groups to persist when conditions are unpredictable, difficult and stressful. Transformational leaders help forge stronger links to the organization by expressing individualized consideration towards followers, who then feel more trust and loyalty to leaders (Waldman et al., 2015).

Emergence of transformational leadership depends in part on the context in which the leader and follower interact. Bass (1985) argued that “transformational leadership is more likely to reflect social values and to emerge in terms of distress and change”. These leaders delegate assignments as opportunities of growth for the employees. Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) suggested that charismatic-transformational leaders transform the self-concepts of their followers. Transformational leaders uniformly show individualized consideration across members of an entire collective (Waldman et al., 2015). By way of attributed charisma, followers also develop higher admiration and trust for leaders (Judge and Piccolo, 2004), forming stronger relational identification (Sluss and Ashforth, 2007).

Such relational identification can, in turn, generalize to organizational identification since followers are likely to view transformational leaders as corporate representatives (Sluss and Ashforth, 2008). These leaders encourage entire collectives of individuals to internalize and pursue corporate objectives, direction, and vision (Kozlowski and Ilgen, 2006). Transformational leadership enhances the development of employees, challenging them to think in ways in which they are not accustomed to thinking, inspiring them to accomplish beyond what they felt was possible, and motivating them to do so by keeping in mind the values and high moral standards that guide their performance (Avolio, 1999).

They inspire followers to subordinate personal goals by instilling a collective sense of mission or purpose with which they can identify, and thus adopt group or organizational
goals as their own (Waldman et al., 2015). This inspiration is strengthened by leaders’ espousal of attractive visions that appeal to followers’ values (Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993). Idealized influence and inspirational leadership are displayed when the leader envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination and confidence (Bass 1999).

According to Bass (1999) a leader moves the follower beyond self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration. Greater person-organizational fit in terms of goals and values should in turn reinforce staying (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005: Mitchell and Lee, 2001). Wang and Walumbwa (2007) reported that strong transformational leadership can weaken the effects of working-family conflict, which can drive work withdrawal behaviors by inducing job dissatisfaction (Hom and Kinicki, 2001).

Waldman et al (2015) research found out that even if transformational leaders were to exit the organization (or move to another unit), their departure may not necessarily prompt followers to quit, given that such leaders may promote intense-on-the-job ties among followers (Carmeli et al., 2009). This could show an elevation of maturity in the followers as they change their ideals on their concerns of self-actualization and others well-being and the organizations goals. Transformational leaders can be directive or participative, authoritarian or democratic.

Sun and Wang (2016) looked into the role of transformational leadership in making a meaningful contribution to reducing employees’ turnover intention and actual quitting behavior through captivating a collaborative culture. They discovered that transformational leadership can create an organizational culture that facilitates the building of social bonds between individual employees and their workplace, and reduces employees’ leaving intention and actual quitting behavior (Sun and Wang, 2016). In addition, this kind of leader also deters employees from forming quitting intention through creating forces that ‘pull’ employees towards staying in the organization (Sun and Wang, 2016).
2.2.2 Transactional Leadership.

Transactional leaders use disciplinary powers and incentives to motivate employees. They cater to the followers’ immediate self-interests. Exhibiting transactional leadership meant that followers agreed with, accepted, or complied with the leader in exchange for rewards, praise and resources or the avoidance of disciplinary action. Rewards and recognition were provided contingent on followers successfully carrying out their roles and assignments (Podsakoff, Todor, and Skov, 1982). This style of leadership suggests close monitoring of the employees for any errors, deviances and mistakes and taking corrective action as soon as they occur.

This transactional contingent reward leadership is the first dimension of transactional leadership that clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals set are achieved; these should result in individuals and groups achieving expected levels of performance (Bass, 1985). Bass (1985) argued that “transactional leadership is more likely to be observed in a well-ordered society”.

The new theory of efficient leadership (Iliescu et al., 2007) considers the transactional leadership to be sufficient when lower performance levels are desired or when the organization confronts minor changes. For major changes, transformational leadership is the most appropriate. Bass (1985) argues that transformational leadership builds on transactional leadership and not vice versa.

The second dimension of transactional leadership is management-by-exception. When practicing management-by-exception, a leader only takes action when things go wrong and standard are not met (Bass and Avolio, 1989). These leaders avoid giving directions if the old ways work and allow followers to continue doing their jobs as always if performance goals are met (Hater and Bass, 1988). This dimension can be either active or passive.

A laissez-faire leader is a passive leader. This leader waits for a problem to occur before taking action or takes no action at all to correct the errors that may have occurred. Contrary to the transactional leaders, they avoid clarifying expectations, specifying agreements and providing objectives for their employees/followers. Bass (1990a) concludes that there is a
negative association between laissez-faire leadership and a variety of subordinate performance effort and attitudinal indications.

According to Bass, Avolio, Jung and Berson (2003) transactional leadership can build a base level of trust in the leader as he or she reliably executes what has been agreed over time but when clarity exists around expectations and performance objectives.

2.3 Self-Esteem Impact on Intention to Quit.

Coopersmith (1967) defined self-esteem as, “The evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regards to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval and indicates the extent to which an individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful and worthy. In short self-esteem is a personal judgement of the worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds towards himself (pp. 4-5)”.

Other self-esteem scholars (Marsh, 1993; Wells and Marwell,1976) agree that self-esteem may form around any number of dimensions of the self (for example the physical self, social self). The aggregate of these evaluations is termed global self-esteem the overall evaluation of personal worth that people make and maintain with regard to themselves (Coopersmith, 1967; Rosenberg, 1965).

Self-esteem is the evaluative aspect of the self-concept that corresponds to an overall view of the self as worthy or unworthy (Baumeister, 1998). Those who have high self-esteem are presumed to be psychologically happy and healthy (Branden,1994; Taylor and Brown, 1988), whereas those with low-esteem are believed to be psychologically distressed and perhaps even depressed (Tennen and Affleck, 1993). This can affect an employees’ productivity in their work, career success and enjoyment of life in general.

High self-esteem is associated with those who feel good about themselves; they are therefore able to cope effectively with tough situations and negative feedback. This is because they believe people respect them and value their input. Although extremely high self-esteem is consequently harmful (Baumeister, 1998), most people with high self-esteem appear to lead happy and productive lives. By contrast, people with low self-esteem dislike themselves and hence may have a negative perception to everything around them. Low self-esteem is mostly
linked to alienation, shyness, loneliness and consequently depression. This research will look into how self-esteem affects the employee outlook on the leadership styles, the organizational justice and eventually the job satisfaction of the employee. However, self-esteem has been a difficult concept to measure with accuracy and it is mostly influenced by the various definitions of self-esteem that have evolved over time.

Self-esteem comes from various sources according to various theories. For instance, William James (1890) argued that self-esteem developed from the accumulation of experiences in which peoples’ outcomes exceeded their goals on some important dimension, under the general rule that self-esteem = success/pretensions. This assessed the personal motivations and appraisals that came after that. The high self-esteem employee is likely to engage in more task related activities and to persist at task performance longer than the employee with a low level of self-esteem (Gardner and Pierce, 1998).

The literature on the origins of self-esteem (Korman, 1970; 1976) suggests that self-esteem is a function of three different forces; the implicit signals sent by macro-organization structures (e.g., job design, technology), the messages sent by significant others in one’s social environment (e.g., feedback from a supervisor), and the individual’s feelings of efficacy and competence derived from his or her own experiences (e.g., successful completion of a project).

Many researchers have conceptualized self-esteem hierarchically, possessing different levels of specificity and focus (Korman, 1970; Marsh, 1993). Hierarchically, self-esteem has been studied in organization sciences at the global, organization-based and task-specific levels. However, this is just the psychological aspect of self-esteem, this research seeks to look into the organization based self-esteem.

Self-esteem refers to the evaluation that individuals make and customarily maintain with regard to themselves (Firth et al., 2004). In a study by Moore (2002), a related construct, self-efficacy was associated with reduced intention to quit. Moore (2002) found that social support from supervisors reduced the level of burnout, reduced nurses’ intention to quit. However, this research looks at the variables of perceived leadership styles practiced by managers and supervisors that affects the overall perception of the supervisor support to the
employees and hence may reduce the intention to quit and the overall turnover behavior in organizations.

However, factors like the employee self-esteem affects their productivity in terms career growth and hence it affects the overall career commitment of the employee to an organization that they feel emotionally attached to. Employees' emotional bond to their organization also known as their affective commitment has been considered an important determinant of dedication and loyalty (Rhoades et al., 2001) and it increases their involvement in the organization's activities, their willingness to pursue the organization's goals and objectives, and their desire to remain with the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982). Such personal factors that mediate between stressors and intention to quit are aspects of personal agency, social support and self-esteem (Avison and Gotlib, 1994; Coyne et al., 1990; Coyne and Downey, 1991; Turner and Roszell, 1994). Personal agency is a sense of powerlessness, locus of control and personal control of situations in a person’s life. Research findings strongly suggest that a greater sense of personal agency is associated with a reduced risk of negative outcomes following major negative life events and role-related stress (Turner and Roszell, 1994). However, there is extensive evidence that there is an inverse relation between career commitment/ the conviction of one’s motivation to work in a chosen career, and the turnover (Bartol, 1979).

2.3.1 Organization-Based Self-Esteem

During the 1970’s, Korman (1970, 1971,1976) published several papers focused on employee self-esteem. He suggested that an individual’s self-esteem formed around work and organizational experiences would play a significant role in determining employee motivation, work-related attitudes and behaviors. In a study by Moore (2002), he explored the aspect of self-efficacy that was assessed specifically among nurses in relation to their professional abilities and he was able to associate it with reduced intention to quit. Self-efficacy is a belief about the probability that one can successfully execute some future action or task or achieve some result (Gardner and Pierce, 1998). High self-efficacious employees believe they are likely to be successful at most or all of the job duties and responsibilities (Gardner and Pierce 1998).
Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunhan (1989) used all the conceptions of self-esteem and defined organization-based self-esteem as the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization. Like other forms of self-estees employees with high organization-based self-esteem have a high sense of having satisfied needs from their organizational roles in the past. Such employees see themselves as meaningful, worthwhile, effectual and important in their organizations. This means that organization-based self-esteem reflects the self-perceived value that individuals have of themselves as organization members acting within an organizational context. As a result, organization-based self-esteem has been posited as a determinant of employee attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment (Covin, Kolenko, Sightler, and Tudor, 1992; Matheson and Sterns, 1991; Pierce et al., 1989).

Organization-based self-esteem is an outer level conceptualization of the self-state-like reflecting unstable feelings of self-regard (Campbell, 1990). With increasing tenure, self-esteem evolves from a primarily outer level to a less changeable inner level self-concept (Campbell, 1990). Thus, for most job-experienced employees’ organization-based self-esteem is highly stable (Pierce et al., 1989).

Employees with high self-esteem are likely to have a strong sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977). According to Bandura (1977, 1978), self-efficacy reflects an individual’s momentary belief in his or her capability to perform a specific task at a specific level of performance. Self-efficacy is the second judgment that organizational members form themselves that has significant organizational implications (Eden and Aviram, 1993; Lee and Boblco, 1994; Martocchio, 1994).

Gardner and Pierce (1998) clarified the relationship between the two perceptions of the self and how they lead to a better understanding of organization management. In their study organization-based self-esteem emerged as the stronger predictor (against self-efficacy) of ratings of performance and employee satisfaction. Organization-based self-esteem has positive effects on employee attitudes and role behaviors and may, in part be shaped by the individual’s generalized feelings of efficacy. Employees who possess high levels of organization-based self-esteem have confidence in their abilities and may be described as
peers as being motivated, capable and empowered. The strength of the employee’s positive and organizationally grounded self-esteem works to facilitate the organization’s pursuit of its goals through the high organization-based self-esteem employee.

**2.4 Perceived Organization Support Impact on Intention to Quit.**

Perceived Organization Support can be defined as the overall extent to which employees believe that their organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In spite of the longevity of service within an organization, it has been said that it is important for employees to have the requisite support from their organization in order to perform up to and beyond expected levels. Eisenberger et al., (1986; cited in Mishra, 2014:847) declared that “Employees’ perception of the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being is called perceived organization support. Accordingly, Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002) have mentioned that on the basis of the organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986), three common forms of perceived favorable treatment received from the organization should serve to increase POS; fairness, supervisor support and favorableness of organization rewards and job condition (which includes such job aspects as training, autonomy, and role stressors).

In an era of globalization, employee turnover has been identified as one of the most challenging issue in organizations, as it can be extremely damaging and costly for organization (Gamble and Huang, 2008). Turnover research reveals that negative job characteristics like routine tasks, unfair reward systems, employment alternatives, and workplace change can trigger deliberations about leaving (Burton et al., 2010: Holton et al., 2005). This is why perceived organization support is important to employees in an organization. Theory of reasoned action is explains this phenomenon further.

According to the theory of reasoned action, a person’s intention to perform a specific behavior is the immediate determinant of the behavior (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). An extension of the model proposed by Ajzen (1985), the theory of planned behavior, explicitly incorporates perceived behavioral control as an antecedent to behavioral intentions. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) divide the beliefs antecedent to behavioral intention into two conceptually distinct sets: behavioral and normative. The behavioral beliefs influence an individual’s
attitudes towards performing the behavior, whereas the normative beliefs influence the individual’s subjective norm about performing the behavior.

Because of this model, intention to quit has been attributed to be the most immediate predictor of eventual turnover hence reflecting an individual’s motivation to stay or leave (Cotton and Tuttle, 1986) an organization. As a result, a researcher may treat the intention to quit as the final cognitive variable and that will directly influence the turnover behavior of the employee (Mobley et al., 1979). This is called the theory of planned behavior which is accomplished by including beliefs regarding the possession of requisite resources and opportunities for performing a given behavior. The more resources and opportunities individuals think they possess, the greater should be their perceived behavioral control over performing the behavior. When people believe that they have little control over performing the behavior because of a lack of requisite resources, then their intentions to perform the behavior may be low even if they have favorable attitudes and/or subjective norms concerning performance of the behavior (Madden et al., 1992). Ajzen and Madden’s (1986) research was the first complete test of the theory of planned behavior.

The central construct within organizational support theory, perceived organizational support, refers to the degree to which employees believe their work organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). According to the theory, employees develop perceived organization support in response to socio-emotional needs and the organization’s readiness to reward increased effort made on its behalf (Eisenberger et al, 1986; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Shore and Shore 1995). The theory is an application of social-exchange theory to the employer-employee relationship.

Organizational Support theory maintains that, based on the norm of reciprocity, workers trade effort and dedication to their organization for such tangible incentives as pay and fringe benefits and such socio-emotional needs such as needs for esteem, approval, and affiliation, leading to organizational membership and role status becoming part of one’s social identity and helping to reduce occupational strain and to enhance employee well-being (Eisenberger et al.,1986; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002).
These variables can be mediated by personal dispositional factors and by environmental and organizational factors. Among the personal factors that mediate between stressors and intention to quit are aspects of personal agency, self-esteem and social support (Avison and Gotlib, 1994; Coyne et al., 1990; Coyne and Downet, 1991; Turner and Roszell, 1994). Personal agency refers to concepts such as sense of powerlessness, locus of control and personal control (Firth et al., 2004). One of the personal agency variables, locus of control, which refers to the extent to which people believe they or external factors such as chance and powerful others are in control of the events that influence their lives (Levenson, 1974; Rotter, 1966) has been studied in relation to the workplace. Rahim and Psenicka (1996) found that an internal locus of control mediated the relationship between job stressors and the intention to leave a job and more specifically to be positively related to job satisfaction (Sujan, 1986) and to being employed (Waters and Moore, 2002). On the contrast, external orientation was found to be negatively related to job satisfaction by Behrman and Perreault, 1984) and was higher among unemployed versus employed people (Waters and Moore, 2001).

There are several reasons why people quit their current job and switch to other organizations. The extent of the job stress, low commitment in the organization; and job dissatisfaction usually result in resignation of employees (Firth, 2007). Numerous studies showed how high employee involvement can relate to the intention of leaving an organization (Arthur, 1994). Other studies show that employees will retain in their organization if he/she has a good relationship with (Clarke, 2001).

To a manager, one must seek to reduce the employee turnover as it increases the costs involved in induction and training of new staff and it also affects the organizations productivity. Managers need to actively monitor workloads, and the relationships between supervisors and subordinates in order to reduce and manage stress (Firth et al., 2004). While the actual quitting is the main interest of researchers and managers, the intention to quit is the greatest indicator of such behavior as it is similar.

Perceived supervisor support involves constant communication to the employees and what is expected of them that can affect their commitment to the organization. Tsu, Huang and Lam
(2013) found that transformational leadership makes employees more likely to stay by strengthening employees’ attachment to their supervisors and organization. Moore (2002) found that low levels of communication between management/supervisors and subordinates contributes to an increase in the subordinates’ feelings of stress and hence to their intention to quit also increases. It is also inclusive of reward systems in place when employees perform above and beyond and how their efforts are appreciated by management. An organization that does not have such systems affects the employees’ dedication as they desire to be acknowledged hence it works as a boost to their self-esteem (Moore, 2002).

2.4.1 Perceived Supervisor Support.

All employers value their employees’ dedication and loyalty to their organization. Employees usually develop general views on how their supervisors value them in the organization, their value and their well-being (Kottke and Sharafinski, 1988). Eisenberger et al. (1986) suggested that employees’ perceptions of the organization’s commitment to them, referred to as perceived organizational support. Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) described how an employee’s sense of commitment is based on employees’ global beliefs concerning the extent to which they sense the organization’s commitment to them. Organization commitment goes both ways. Employees’ perceive that in exchange for their effort and commitment to an organization they are entitled to various benefits, both tangible (like pay raises, promotions) and less tangible (like receptiveness to employees’ needs) (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Using a social exchange framework, Eisenberger and his colleagues argued that employees who perceive a high level of organizational support are more likely to feel an obligation to “repay” the organization in terms of affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1986). They found that perceived organization support was related to absenteeism (Eisenberger et al., 1986), conscientiousness in carrying out conventional job responsibilities, and innovation on behalf of the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1990). This relationship is further enhanced by supervisor support towards the employees. Supervisors act as agents in organizations and are given the responsibility of directing and evaluating their subordinates’ performance and hence the employees may view their supervisor’s favorable or unfavorable orientation...
towards them as an indication of an overall organization’s support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Levinson, 1965).

Studies have shown a negative relationship between perceived supervisor support and employee intention to quit. They draw a conclusion that supervisors to a certain extent are viewed as part of an organization and therefore their positive behavioral support determines the employees’ perceived organization support and ultimately it increases job retention (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

Employee perception of their supervisors’ status is determined on personal observations of upper management treatment of supervisors (Eisenberger et al., 2002). According to this study, perceived high standing of a supervisor within an organization would be seen by employees as the supervisors’ illustration of the organizations character. Perceived high supervisor status was found to involve beliefs concerning the organization’s positive valuation of supervisors’ contributions and its concern about the well-being of the supervisor; this means the supervisors influence on the subordinates is important in making organization decisions and this is seen in the autonomy and the authority given to the supervisor in his/her job responsibilities (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

Increased perceived supervisor support reduces employee intention to quit that is evidence of beneficial treatment received from these supervisors should increase the perceived organization support that leads to felt obligation to aid the organization and to affective commitment to the organization that should reduce turnover (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001).

Dalal’s (2005) meta-analysis suggests employees who are treated fairly by their supervisors will contribute positive efforts and those who feel unfairly supervised will respond with unproductive behavior. This is an indication that perceived supervisor support is highly interlinked with organization justice especially interactional fairness. Colquitt et al. (2013) noted that selecting and promoting supervisors who are predisposed to follow justice rules especially those high in emotional stability and empathy, might increase overall organizational fairness levels. Colquitt and Greenberg (2003) and Colquitt et al. (2005) suggested that managers who appreciate how certain boundary conditions moderate the
influence of fairness may optimize their supervisory efforts. Being fair require supervisors’ efforts especially when the organization is going through turmoil (Brockner, 2006).

2.5 Organization Justice Influence on Employee Intention to Quit.

Collins, Mossholder and Taylor (2012) reported that fairness mattered more (or less) to employees depending on the strength of connections with their supervisors and organizations. Utilizing cognitive aspects of attachment, they identified intention to quit as potentially moderating the beneficial effects of fairness. They found that the performance of employees with higher intention to quit was unaffected by supervisors’ process fairness, whereas the performance of those with lower intention to quit was influenced positively (Collins et al., 2012).

Scholars recognize that employees can also be emotionally rooted in their organizations (Colquitt et al., 2013; Cropanzano, Stein and Nadistic, 2011) and this is regardless of the cognitive processes that influence the outcomes of perceived fairness (Colquitt et al., 2012). This research seeks to explore further the implication of fairness and intention to quit. Research has demonstrated that cognitive links like turnover intent can moderate the fairness-task performance relationship (Collins et al., 2012).

Recent research in the organization justice area suggests that justice can actually be broken down into four empirically distinct dimensions: distributive, procedural, interpersonal and informational (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter and Ng, 2001; Greenberg, 1993). Prior research has also found perceptions of organizational justice are related to key variables, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions (Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Thorn 2010).

Most early conceptualizations of procedural justice emphasized the structural aspects of procedures (Thibaut and Walker, 1975) process control concepts and criteria for fair allocative procedures (Leventhal’s 1976, 1980; Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Later on, attention shifted to the social aspect of justice also known as interactional justice (Bies and Moag, 1986) which was to capture the quality of interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented.
Greenberg (1993) added an additional element to the debate by suggesting that the social aspect of justice could be more meaningfully assessed by considering two distinct types of interpersonal treatment; interpersonal justice, which relates to how workers are treated during enactment of procedures and informational justice. Colquitt (2001) indicated that procedural, interpersonal and informational justice is empirically distinct entities that although correlated, exhibited differential effects on several individual and group-level outcome variables.

Recent research by Gim and Desa (2014) concluded that practitioners should learn that employees do not just assess the fairness of the compensation they received (outcome) but also the procedures involved in the distribution of the compensation. Both distributive justice and procedural justice are equally important to employees at the workplace (Gim and Desa, 2014).

2.5.1 Procedural Justice.

Procedural justice focuses on “the fairness of the procedures responsible for reward distribution” (Mahony, Hums, Andrew, and Dittmore, 2010). Recent research following the distributive research focused on processes that lead to decision outcomes which is also known as procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980; Leventhal, Karuza, and Fry, 1980; Thibaut and Walker, 1975). Leventhal’s view of procedural fairness emphasizes the structural features of allocative processes. It is the voice during a decision-making process or influence over the outcome (Thibaut and Walker,1975) or by adherence to fair process criteria, such as consistency, lack of bias, correctability, representation, accuracy and ethicality (Leventhal,1980; Leventhal et al., 1980). It is basically how supervisors administer organizational policies and rules.

Procedural fairness is a socially and hierarchically embedded practice; that is, fairness perceptions are socially constructed and fairness expectations are fueled by interpersonal observations and interference (Folger and Bies, 1989; Lamertz, 2002; Lind, Kray, and Thompson, 1998). Procedural fairness has been known to have substantial effects on all organization outcomes (Cropanzano and Stein, 2009). Masterson et al. (2000) found procedural justice to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than interactional justice. It is also a better predictor of organizational commitment and turnover intentions (Dailey and
Kirk, 1992: Folger and Konovsky, 1989: McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992). For example, employees may be dissatisfied if they do not receive the desired distribution, but if they believe the organization’s process is unfair, this would lead to decreased commitment and desire to stay (Mahony et al., 2015).

Previous research has shown that aspects of manager-employee relationship and characteristics of individual managers (supervisors) predict whether procedures will be enacted fairly (Scott, Colquitt, and Zapata, 2007; Seppala, Lipponen, Pirttila-Backman, and Lipsanen, 2012). Lower level managers (supervisors) may assimilate higher level behavior thus they may enact procedures in an unfair manner if they experience unfairness themselves; however, they may contrast behavior at higher levels thus enacting fairer procedures after experiencing unfairness themselves (Houwelingen et al., 2014).

2.5.2 Distributive Justice.

Distributive justice relates to perceptions of the “fairness in the distribution of resources” (Mahony, et al., 2010). It was concerned with implicit norms for allocation such as equity or equality (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Homans 1961; Leventhal 1976). Adams’ (1963, 1965) Equity Theory was the basis for much of the early organizational justice research (Mahony et al, 2010). According to Adams’ theory, individuals compare their ratio of outcomes to contributions to the same ratios for others to determine if the outcomes they received were fair (Harris, Andrews and Kacmar, 2007). Admans believed that if the ratios are equal, then people were likely to perceive the distributions as fair. However, when the ratios are unequal, they are likely to perceive the distributions as unfair and this is likely to impact their behavior in the future (Adams, 1963).

Folger and Konovsky (1989) defined distributive justice as the perceived fairness of the amounts of compensation employees receive. Cropanzano and Folger (1989) found that resentment was highest when subjects perceived that unfair procedures prevented them from receiving high rewards for task performance. Cropanzano and Folger (1989) suggested that referent cognitive theory offers a potential conceptual framework for the interactive effects of distributive and procedural justice. They argued that the theory predicts that resentment should be maximized in organizations when outcomes are poor- distributive justice is low- and the procedures used by a decision maker are unfair. The theory also suggests that
employees will contrast this situation to the more positive outcome that they would have obtained had the decision maker used fair allocation procedures. Distributive justice has been found to be an important predictor of two personal outcomes, one of them being job satisfaction (McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992) that leads to turnover retention. Distributive and procedural justice occurs concurrently.

Later research suggested people do not always perceive distributions based to be fair (Mahony et al., 2015). Researchers said in some settings people may perceive equal distribution or distributions based on need to be more fair (Deutsch, 1975; Sheppard, Lewicki, and Minton, 1992). Because of these differences, it is important to examine perceptions across organizational types because what is believed to be fair may vary considerably depending on the setting (Mahony et al., 2015). In general, prior results tend to indicate distributive justice as a better predictor of job satisfaction (Dailey and Kirk, 1992; Folger and Konovsky , 1989; McFarlin and Sweeny, 1992).

2.5.3 Interpersonal and Informational Justice.

Interpersonal justice is defined as the quality of interpersonal treatment individuals receive as procedures are enacted (Colquitt, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). It is also known as Interactional Justice. Mahony et al., (2010) defined it as “the interpersonal treatment and communication used while implementing the procedures” and examines perceptions of the fairness of “how decisions are enacted by authority figures” (Colquitt and Greenberg, 2003, p. 166). It contains the sensitivity and respect elements that were initially part of interactional justice concept (Bies and Maag, 1986). Later, Greenberg (1993) argued for splitting interactional justice into two dimensions, interpersonal justice and informational justice, and Colquitt (2001) found some support for this model.

Empirical evidence suggests that when organizations and their most immediate representatives (i.e supervisors) treat employees fairly, they respond with positive in-role and discretionary work behaviors (Ambrose and Schminke, 2009). Through fairness, the supervisors encourage positive relational norms such as integrity, honesty and civility that thereafter encourage subordinates to reciprocate with positive work behaviors that benefit their supervisors (Ambrose and Schminke, 2009).
Informational justice deals with the adequacy of explanations regarding execution of policies (Colquitt, 2001). Supervisors exhibit informational fairness when they clearly explain procedures used to determine employee outcome and supervisors who do so help employees understand and contextualize their workplace (Ambrose, Hess and Ganesan, 2007). Informational and interpersonal dimensions are the two social forms of fairness (Greenberg, 1993) and are especially relevant when considering relational phenomena (Rupp and Cropanzano, 2002). According to Mahony et al., (2015), interactional justice was significantly correlated with both organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

### 2.6 Chapter Summary.

This chapter is on the literature review on the research questions on the perceived leadership style practiced in local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya and how it affects the employees’ intention to quit. It also looks into various theories of perceived supervisor support and the organization-based self-esteem and how they affect masters’ student in USIU- Africa which will be looked into further in the research. There is also sufficient literature on the employee self-esteem that affects the job satisfaction and the perceived supervisor support toward the manager in the organization as it makes them feel valuable and part of the organization.

The next chapter presents the research methodology used in this study. It details the research design, population and sampling, data collection methods, research procedures and how data collected was analyzed. Chapter four presents the results and findings of the study. Chapter five presents the discussion, conclusion, and recommendations for action and further research.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction.
This chapter presents the research methodology. The chapter covers research design, population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures, data analysis methods and chapter summary.

3.2 Research Design.
The research design is meant to guide the research in terms of measurement and analysis of data. Research design constitutes of the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data. The function of a research design is to ensure that evidence obtained enables the researcher to answer the research questions as unambiguously as possible Vaus (2001). The research design for this study was quantitative data and therefore, descriptive in nature. Descriptive studies are concerned with finding out, who, what, where, when or how much and this is a simple descriptive study. According to Gill and Johnson (2006), descriptive surveys address specific characteristics of a selected population of subjects at a point in time, for the purpose of comparing the relationship between variables. They also try to measure the types of activities, how often, when, where and by whom. Descriptive studies look at what already exists, happens in society and also looks at measuring the number of times someone/something does something under certain conditions.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design.
3.3.1 Population.
The study population included 60 USIU- Africa graduate students who are employees of local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations who were willing to participate in the study. The respondents were chosen at random.

3.3.2 Sampling Design.
3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame.
The Graduate program at USIU-Africa were constituted in the sampling frame. A sampling frame is a list of population units/ elements from which to select units/elements to be sampled (McDaniel and Gates,2001). Masters students at USIU-Africa were the sample unit and these students as employees in their local and international NGOs, public and private
educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations were the sample elements.

**3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique.**
In this research, unrestricted convenience sampling was used to generate the sample for employees in local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya that are also Graduate students at USIU-Africa. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method used to maximize the time and effort placed on identifying the exact number of targeted population. In this study, the employees from management to field agents were included as study elements.

Convenience sampling allows the researcher to select a random group of people especially when there is no list of the population available, this way the researcher can control the size of the group selected. It also saves on the time of the research. They can also ensure that the selected groups of people have the appropriate characteristics.

**3.3.2.3 Sample Size.**
Cooper and Schindler,(2014) recommends a sample size of more than 10%- 30% for studies in social science related subjects. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) however, stated that you only 4% of the population. This study will use a sample size of 4% of the total population of the estimated 1450 graduate students.

**Table 3.1: Distribution Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub- Sector</th>
<th>Total Number of Students</th>
<th>Sample Ratio</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA International Relations Development with International Finance.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Data Collection Methods.
In the research, data will be collected using structured questionnaires. These questionnaires will be administered to graduate students who are in employment. A likert type scale will be used to standardize the responses. The participants will be asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement/item from 1(not at all), 2 (if not always), 3 (neutral), 4 (frequently) and 5 (always). However, it is good to note that the likert scale changes according to the variable being measured in the questionnaire.

The preceding advantage of scaled-responses is that it permits the measurement of intensity of respondents’ answers compared to multiple choice responses. The scaled responses incorporate numbers which can be used directly as codes (McDaniel & Gates, 2001) in the imputing of data in the Statistical program that will analyze and interpret the data. The scaling procedure determines quantitative measures of subjective and abstract concepts (Chin et al, 2003) by use of a rating scale known as the likert scale. The questions covered in the questionnaire will address the effects of management leadership style, the employees’ organization-based self-esteem, the perceived supervisor support and organization justice on the employee intention to quit.

The questionnaires contain only closed ended questions. Close ended responses allowed for comparison and statistical manipulation. To enable the analysis the questionnaires; they will have a fixed set of responses which have encoded the requisite measures and thus readily compared and computed as mentioned above. However, this method has a limitation as it leaves no room for further elaborate responses. This can distort response as it limits one response to a particular format.
3.5 Research Procedures.
The research procedure included the preparation of the structured questionnaire for the graduate students who are employees at local and international NGOs, public and private educational institutions, health institutions, faith-based organizations and community based organizations in Kenya. The questionnaire will be pre-tested to ensure that the questions are relevant and promote honesty in responses given hence validity. The questionnaire will also be pre-tested to ensure that it is verifiable. The questionnaire will also ensure confidentiality as they will be administered by the researcher with the help of one research assistant who will be recruited as the data clerk. The enumerators are trained on the research tool so as to minimize data collection errors.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods.
The data collected was stored in an appropriate format that permits statistical analysis. The analysis entailed computer-aided, statistically manipulated. The responses that will be collected from the questionnaires will be imputed for further evaluation and analysis. All the data collected will be entered into the statistical program and data cleaned for missing values and data entry errors. Data analysis is to be done using IBM SPSS 20.0. The quantitative data was analyzed for descriptive statistics which will includes mean, mode, frequency, percentages and standard deviation to profile sample characteristics and view the major patterns emerging from the data. Tables and charts will also be used to show patterns of this data. Interpretation of the statistical outputs was done and discussed in the presentation of results and findings.

\[ Y = 8.10 + (-1.04) X_1 + (-.059) X_2 + (0.50) X_3 + (-0.36) X_4 + \text{error}_i \]

Outcome (turnover intention) = 8.10 + (-1.04) X_1 + (-.059) X_2 + (0.50) X_3 + (-0.36) X_4 + error_i

3.7 Chapter Summary.
This chapter presents the research methodology that was used for this study. The chapter covers research design, determining the population and sampling design, data collection methods, research procedures, data analysis methods. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study. Chapter five will then give a summary of the findings, draw the conclusions as interpreted from the findings and give recommendations for improvement to the beneficiaries of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS.

This chapter presents the findings of the results and findings of the study regarding the effect of leadership style, organizational-based self-esteem, perceived supervisor support and organizational justice on turnover intentions in organizations.

4.1 Presentation of Findings.

4.1.1 Response Rate.

On the response rate, the findings were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (2017)

4.2 Demographic Data.

Demographic data findings for this study are as follows:

4.2.1 Respondent Gender

The study findings indicate that 64% of respondents were female, while 36% of the respondents were male as indicated in figure 4.2

![Figure 4.2](image-url)
4.2.2 Respondents Age
The findings of this study show that most of the respondents (22) were in the age bracket between 26-35 years, followed by the age between 36-45 years (9 respondents). Respondents between the age of 46-60 years (6 respondents), followed by the age between 20-25 years (5 respondents).

![Figure 4.3 Respondents Age](image)

4.3 Reliability.
The Alpha coefficient of the independent variables in this study was higher than 0.7, which is considered as acceptable for social science studies. The Alpha coefficient for leadership was 0.851; organization based self-esteem was 0.929; perception of supervisor support was 0.924 and organization justice was 0.947. However, the reliability test of the employees’ intent to quit was low but still acceptable at 0.695.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics.
Leadership styles held a mean of 3.14 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 0.51 and a number of 42 respondents. Organization-based self-esteem held a mean of 4.17 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 0.73 and a number of 42 respondents. Perceived Supervisor Support held a mean of 3.36 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 0.76 and a number of 42 respondents. Organization Justice held a mean of 3.36 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 0.87 and a number of 42 respondents. (See Table 4.2 below). Turnover intention held a mean of 2.8492 out of 5.0 with a standard deviation of 1.21241 and a
number of 42 respondents.

**Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TurnoverInt</td>
<td>2.8492</td>
<td>1.21241</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.1441</td>
<td>.51273</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgBasedSE</td>
<td>4.1667</td>
<td>.72974</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PercSupSupport</td>
<td>3.3591</td>
<td>.76024</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgJustice</td>
<td>3.3594</td>
<td>.86971</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Correlations Matrix.

In Table 4.3 below the Pearson’s correlations and Sig, two-tailed levels for various variables in the study are presented. Correlational analysis assesses the degree or strength of association between two or more variables. The linear correlation between experience and tenure was found to be statistically significant, $r (43) = +.440, p. < 0.01$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship is positive implying that the variables tend to increase together. Besides the strength of the relationship is moderate at $3 < |r| < .5$.

The findings showed that the correlation between leadership and organization justice was statistically significant, $r (42) = +.377, p. < 0.05$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship is positive and the strength of the relationship is moderate was at $3 < |r| < .5$.

The findings indicated that the correlation between leadership and turnover intent was statistically significant, $r (42) = -.482, p. < 0.01$, two tailed. However, the direction of the relation is negative, whereas the strength of this relationship was low at $3 > |r| < .5$.

The findings showed that the correlation between organization based self-esteem and perceived supervisor support was statistically significant, $r (42) = .620, p. < 0.01$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship was positive; whereas the strength of the relationship was higher at $3 < |r| > .5$.

The findings demonstrated that the correlation between organization based self-esteem and organizational justice was statistically significant, $r (42) = .481, p. < 0.01$, two tailed. The relationship had a positive direction and the strength of the relationship was rather moderate.
at $3 < |r| < .5$. Organizational based self-esteem also has a statistically significant linear relationship with turnover intent, $r(42) = -0.352$, $p < 0.05$, two tailed. The relationship has a negative direction whereas the strength of the relationship is rather low at $3 > |r| < .5$.

The findings show that perceived supervisor support has a significant correlation with organizational justice, $r(42) = 0.688$, $p < 0.01$, two tailed. The direction of the relationship is positive whereas its strength is rather high at $3 < |r| > .5$. Furthermore, the correlation between organizational justice and turnover intent was found to be statistically significant at $r(4) = -0.355$, $p < 0.05$, two tailed. However, the direction of the relationship is negative, whereas its strength was also low at $3 > |r| < .5$.

**Table 4.3 Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Gender</th>
<th>2 Experience</th>
<th>3 Tenure</th>
<th>4 Leadership</th>
<th>5 OrgBasedSE</th>
<th>6 P.S. S</th>
<th>7 OrgJustice</th>
<th>8 TurnoverInt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OrgBasedSE</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>P.S. S</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OrgJustice</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.377*</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.688**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TurnoverInt</td>
<td>Pears. Corr.</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.482**</td>
<td>-.352*</td>
<td>-.206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**4.6 Regression Analysis.**

Table 4.4 below shows the model of analysis of regression, which indicates the strength of the relationship between the independent and the dependent variables in the study. The independent variables in the study were perceived leadership style, the employees’ organization-based self-esteem, the perceived supervisor support and the organization justice; while the dependent variables in the study was the employees’ intention to quit. The R Square in this study was 0.375, which indicated a strong relation between independent
variables on one hand and dependent variable on the other hand. The results also indicate that independent variables share a variation of 37.5% of the employees’ intention to quit.

**Table 4.4 Model Summary**

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.610a</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>1.01087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), OrgJustice, Leadership, OrgBasedSE, PercSupSupport

**4.6.1 Anova**

Table 4.5 below indicates the F-test (F=5.495, p-value (sig) = 0.001<0.05) is significant, thus making the entire model to fit well. It indicates that at least two means are significantly different from one another.

**Table 4.5 ANOVAa**

<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>22.459</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.615</td>
<td>5.495</td>
<td>.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Residual</td>
<td>37.808</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.267</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt

b. Predictors: (Constant), OrgJustice, Leadership, OrgBasedSE, PercSupSupport

**4.6.2 Multiple Linear Regression.**

**Table 4.6 Coefficientsa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.096</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.511</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-1.040</td>
<td>-.440</td>
<td>-3.128</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgBasedSE</td>
<td>-.589</td>
<td>-.354</td>
<td>-2.121</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PercSupSupport</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgJustice</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-1.378</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: TurnoverInt
The leadership style variable was found to have a linearly significant influence on the employees’ intent to quit ($\beta = -1.040$, $p = 0.03 < 0.05$, t-value = -3.128). This means that for one-unit increase in the leadership style, the model predicts that the intention to quit will decrease by -1.040 units holding all other independent variables constant. The organization-based self-esteem variable was found to have a linearly significant influence on employees’ intent to quit ($\beta = -0.589$, $p = 0.041 < 0.05$, t-value = -2.121). This means that for every one-unit increase in the organization-based self-esteem, the model predicts that the intention to quit will decrease by -0.589 units holding all other independent variables fixed.

The perceived supervisor support variable indicated no linearly significant influence on the employees’ intent to quit ($\beta = 0.499$, $p = 0.13 > 0.05$, t-value = 1.547). This means that for every one-unit increase in the perceived supervisor support, the model predicts an increase in turnover intention by 0.499 units holding all other independent variables constant. The organization justice variable also had no linearly significant influence on the employees’ intent to quit ($\beta = -0.357$, $p = 0.176 > 0.05$, t-value = -1.378). This means that for every one-unit increase in organization justice, the model predicts that turnover intention will decrease by -0.357 units holding all other independent variables fixed. Therefore, we can conclude that leadership style strongly negatively relates to turnover intention while organization-based self-esteem and organization justice negatively relates to turnover intention.

**4.5 Chapter Summary.**

This chapter presents the results and findings of the study. The findings are presented through graphs, frequency tables and figures. The presentation is based on the research questions that guided the study in regards to the constructs examined in this study, namely leadership style, organization based self-esteem, perceived supervisor support and organization justice. The next chapter presents the discussion on the findings, the conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.
In this chapter, we present the discussion of the findings that are presented in the previous chapter. The discussion is based on the research questions that the study sought to answer. Besides the summary, the discussion is organized into the themes and subsections that were used in the previous chapter. This chapter also presents the conclusion, recommendations and the suggestions for further research as drawn from the findings of the quantitative study.

5.2 Summary of the Study.
The purpose of this study was to analyze the factors that trigger the employees’ intent to quit in the Kenyan organizations. The study was based on four objectives, which included examining the effects of the perceived leadership styles on the intention of the employees to quit and examining the effects of the employees’ organization based self-esteem on their intention to quit. The other objectives were establishing the extent that the perceived supervisor support affects the intention of employees to quit and finally, establishing how organizational justice affect the intention of employees to quit their organization.

The target population of this study included the estimated 1450 graduate students at the United States International University-Africa in the Chandaria School of Business, School of humanities and the School of Sciences combines that is made up of Masters of Business Administration, Masters of Science in Management and Organizational Development, Master in Arts in International Relations, Master in Arts in clinical Psychology and Master in Art in Counselling Psychology, Masters’ Degree in Information Systems Technology and Master of Arts in Communication Studies.

The convenience sampling method was used to derive a sample of 60 graduate students that were employed in the local and international NGOs, health institutions, community based organizations, faith-based organizations and, public and private educational institutions. Structured questionnaires were pre-tested and then served to the sampled student to collect the quantitative data for the study. The quantitative data was analyzed using the IBM SPSS 20.0 software. The descriptive and statistics analysis was presented in tables as mean and standard deviation, thereby profiling the characteristics of the sample and revealed the emergent patterns in the data of the study.
5.3 Discussion.

5.3.1 The Effects of Perceived Leadership Style on Employees’ Intention to Quit.

Most of the respondents in this study were not certain about the effect of perceived leadership style on the intention of the employees to quit their job as indicated by the mean of 3.1. However, the $R$ of 0.61 of the indicated that there is a strong correlation between the employees’ intention to quit variable and perceived leadership variable. Besides, with a $p$-value of 0.03 the leadership style variable was found to have a linearly significant influence on the employees’ intent to quit. This implied that the leadership style that an organization adopts significantly affects its turnover.

The correlation between leadership and organization justice was statistically significant, $r(42) = +.377$, $p = 0.05$, two tailed. With the direction of the relationship between the variables being positive this indicated in an organization where the perceived leadership is strong the sense of organizational justice is equally strong. In the same vein in organizations where the leadership is weak the sense of organization justice is equally weak. This implies that with sound leadership structure organizations are bound to set up frameworks for guaranteeing their employees a sense of justice in which their interests and welfare are guaranteed, a factor that is highly likely to minimize the chances of making them to want to quit. This concurs with Khuong and Dung (2015) who found out that employees show enthusiasm for work when they are operating in a just environment. In this case, the managers play a role in ensuring that the employees are assigned the tasks in which they are competent; they are accorded equal opportunity for promotion; remuneration and also ensures equity in their reward system. This translates into a perceived sense of justice amongst the employees, which make them more loyal to their organization and be able to post good results.

The regression analysis showed that the linear relationship between leadership and turnover intent was statistically significant, $r(42) = -.1.040$, $p < 0.01$, two tailed. However, whereas the strength of the relationship was low the direction of the relationship is negative. This implied that in organizations in which the style of leadership was sound the intention of the employees to quit is invariably low. In the same vein, in organizations where there is poor leadership the intention of the employees to quit is at a rather higher rate.
This signifies the importance of sound leadership style in organizations as a means for minimizing the employees’ turnover. These findings agree with Gul, et al. (2012) who established that since employees are an invaluable assets of an organization effective leadership are required to enhance their motivation so that they can be able to help the organization achieve its goals in terms of productivity, profitability and growth. They specifically found that employees are more included towards transformational leadership than transactional leadership regarding the cultivation of their commitment and reducing their turnover. This is because, transformational leadership provides employees with an environment where they are able to develop both professionally and personally. This could also imply that the employees may relate leadership to be a product of organization culture and therefore, employees who work under transformational leaders are more committed to their organizations and are less likely to intend to quit their work.

5.3.2 The Effects of Employees’ Organization Based Self-esteem on their Intention to Quit.

Most of the respondents in the study concurred that the employees’ organization based self-esteem affected the intention of the employees to quit as indicated by the mean of 4.1. Besides, the R of 0.61 indicated a strong relationship between organization-based self-esteem and the employees’ intention to quit. This concurs with Branden (1994) and Tennen and Affleck (1993) who argued that the employees that have a high sense of self-esteem are arguably psychologically happy whereas those with low self-esteem psychologically depressed and this invariably affects their productivity at the workplace, the output in their careers and their enjoyment of life in general.

The findings of the study indicated that there is correlation between organizational based self-esteem and turnover intent also has a statistically significant, r (42) = -.352, p. = 0.05, two tailed. However, according to regression analysis there is a linear relationship between organization-based self-esteem and turnover intent, r (42) = -.589, p. <0.041, two-tailed. Whereas the strength of this particular relationship is low, the direction of the relationship is negative. This indicates that in organization where the organization based self-esteem of the employees is higher, the intention of the employees to quit is low. On the other hand, in organizations where the organization based self-esteem of the employees is lower, the intention of the employees to quit is significantly higher.
These findings concurred with Norman et al. (2015) who argued that people with high organization based self-esteem are bound to demonstrate high performance level as doing the opposite would not be consistent to their self-belief about their worth. To such employees the intention to quit is non-existent given that their major objective is to give their organization the best of their efforts. In the same vein, the employees that have low organization based self-esteem are motivated by self-consistency and thus engage in the kind of behavior that tends to reinforce the belief that they are ineffective. This proves the perception of the employee on their self-worth based on their work is a perception that cannot be changed. In this regard, such employee would seek for an outlet from what they consider as a stifling environment and seek other favorable workplaces.

5.3.3 The Effects of Perceived Supervisor Support on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
Most of the employees were not sure about the effects of perceived supervisors’ support in the intention of the employees to quit as demonstrated by the mean of 3.3. However, the R of 0.61 of the regression analysis indicated a strong relationship between perceived supervisor support and the employees’ intention to quit.

The findings also showed that the regression analysis between organization based self-esteem and the perceived supervisor support was statistically significant, r (42) = .499, p. < 0.01, two tailed. Whereas the strength of this particular relationship was strong, the direction of the relationship was also positive. This indicated that in organizations where the employees’ self-esteem was well cultivated there is a higher level of perceived supervisor support. In the same vein, in organizations where the employees’ self-esteem is diminished the level of the perception of the supervisors’ support is also quite low. This indicates that the perception of the employees regarding the support they receive from their supervisors affects their self-esteem and hence their intention to quit given that most respondents in the study concurred that the employees’ organization based self-esteem invariably affected their intention to quit.

These findings agree with Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) who argued that the sense of commitment of employees is largely based on their sense of how their organization is committed towards them. Eisenberger et al., (2002) argues that supervisors are an integral part of an organization and their positive support towards the employees invariably determines the perception that the employees hold regard organizational support
and this goes a long way to eventually retaining them in the organization. This could explain why the perceived supervisor support is associated the supervisor rather than the organization and hence it does not relate to the turnover intention. Eisenberger et al., (2001) and Rhoades et al., (2001) further note that when the perceived supervisor support increases the intention of employees to quit is minimized as the employee feel much more obliged to assist the organization to realize its goals and objectives. Moore (2002) established a relationship between self-efficacy and the reduction of the employees’ intention to quit. Moore found out that the social support that supervisors provided to nurses significantly reduced their burnout and their motivation to quit.

The findings show that perceived supervisor support is correlated with organization justice, $r (42) = .688$, p. < 0.01, two tailed. The direction of the relationship is positive whereas its strength is rather high at $3 < |r| > .5$. This implied that in organizations where the supervisors support was a high the sense of organizational justice. On the other hand, the organizations in which the perceived supervisors support is low the organizational justice was also low. These finding concur with Baumeister (1998) who argued that the people with low self-esteem dislike themselves and tend to have a negative perception of everything that is around them. Such people are therefore, unable to cope with the tough situations around them since they do not believe that other people respect and value their input. Besides, Dalal (2005) established that when employees are treated fairly by their supervisors they tend to respond by making positive contribution to the organization. Contrarily, when the employees are treated unfairly by the supervisors they become unproductive. This is an explicit indication of the relationship between perceived supervisor support and the organizational justice with regard to fairness.

5.3.4 The Effect of Organizational Justice on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
Most of the employees were not sure of how organizational justice affects the intention of the employees to quit as indicated by the mean of 3.3. However, the $R$ of 0.61 indicated a strong relationship between organizational justice and the employees’ intention to quit.

Besides, the correlational analysis showed that the relationship between organization based self-esteem and organizational justice was statistically significant, $r (42) = .481$, p. < 0.01, two tailed. The strength of this particular relationship was found to be string and its direction
was also positive. This implied that in the contexts where the organization based self-esteem is enhanced the sense of organizational justice is high. Conversely, in the contexts where the organization based self-esteem is diminished the sense of organization justice is invariably low. These findings are in line with Colquitt et al., (2013) and Cropanzano, Stein and Nadistic, (2011) who argued that employees are emotionally rooted in their respective organizations and this influences their perception of their organizations’ fairness.

Furthermore, the regression analysis between organizational justice and turnover intent was found to be statistically significant at $r (42) = -0.357$, $p = 0.05$, two tailed. However, the direction of the relationship is negative, whereas its strength was also low at $0.3 > |r| < 0.5$. This implied that in organizations where the sense of organizational justice is higher the intention of the employees to quit is low whereas in organizations where the organizational justice is low the intention of the employees to quit is higher. The findings agree with Phayoonpun and Mat (2014) who found out that organizations’ distributive justice has a significant influence on the employees’ job satisfaction. This means that when the employees lack distributive justice in their organization they become dissatisfied about their jobs. For instance, the perceived workload and fairness of reward are antecedent factors to the intention to quit amongst employees. In the same regard, procedural justice is highly linked to the employees’ turnover. Whenever employees are favored by their organization’s procedures they demonstrate maximum commitment and job satisfaction and this significantly affects their personal intention to quit their jobs.

5.4 Conclusion
5.4.1 The Effects of Perceived Leadership Style on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
The style of leadership that an organization adopts affects the intention of the employees to quit their works. This is because leadership style is directly related to the organizational justice that is extended to the employees. For instance, in a transformational leadership context the employees are provided with the opportunities not just to advance their ideas and careers but also to express themselves freely with the leaders prioritizing their needs. In this context, the employees are more committed to helping their organization to realize its objectives and are less likely to quit as they consider themselves as assets to their organizations. However, in the transactional leadership context, it is the interests of the leaders that rule the day and therefore, employees are not free to express their ideas and
neither are they provided with the opportunities to advance their professional and personal lives. In such organizational environments, the turnover is high since the employees are eager to look for job opportunities in favorable workplaces.

5.4.2 The Effects of Employees’ Organization Based Self-esteem on their Intention to Quit.
The employees’ organization based self-esteem affects the intention of the employees to quit their jobs. The self-esteem of the employees is indicative of the self-worth that they ascribe to their organization. In organizational contexts where the employees’ self-esteem is developed and nurtured, they are highly likely to remain loyal to their company and contribute towards helping it realize its goals and objectives. Low organizational based self-esteem on the other hand, make the employees to feel worthless to the organization and this serves as a motivation for quitting their jobs.

5.4.3 The Effects of Perceived Supervisor Support on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
The perceived support of the supervisors affects the intention of the employees to quit their jobs. The support by the supervisors is essential in ensuring the employees give their best in their work. This support may come in the form of solutions to work-related and assistance in the tasks that employees find difficulty in accomplishing. This makes the employees to find their workplace accommodative and supportive to their professional and emotional needs, which minimizes their desires to leave the organization.

Besides, perceived support is a function of organization based self-esteem and organization justice. With perceived support by supervisors helps the employees to develop their self-esteem in themselves and give their best in their work. Furthermore, perceived support is an indication of the existence of fairness in an organization, which enhance the retention of employees.

5.4.4 The Effect of Organizational Justice on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
Organization justice impacts on the desire of employees to quit their jobs. This is because organization justice affects the self-esteem of the employees, providing them with the capacity to either love or distaste their jobs. In the organizational contexts where the employees are treated with fairness, their financial and emotional needs are given a high priority by the management. They are not for instance, overworked and underpaid without being given opportunities for leaves. In such fair working environments, the employees’
loyalty stops them from looking for other job opportunities but rather focus in giving their best to their organizations.

5.5 Recommendations.
5.5.1 Recommendation for Improvement.

Organizations should encourage the practice of transformational leadership by their managers and any staff that is in a supervisory role. They should be fair and promote eustress in the employees and seek to encourage growth in them. Organizations should create such an enabling environment to all staff and empower them through trainings and reward systems.

5.5.1.1 The Effects of Perceived Leadership Style on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
The transformational leadership style is the most appropriate for organizations as it takes into account not the interest of the leaders but those of the employees. This provides the employees with opportunities to innovate, grow their potential and express themselves freely. In such environments, the employees are able to grow their careers. The transformational leadership styles are thus recommended for organizations that are experiencing high turnover.

5.5.1.2 The Effects of Employees’ Organization Based Self-esteem on their Intention to Quit.
In order to minimize turnover organizations, need to provide environments in which the employees will realize their self-worth and hence seek to demonstrate it through their contribution to the realization of the goals and objectives of the organization. Organizations should therefore seek to give tasks that are demanding and encourage eustress. This will increase organization-based self-esteem and productivity will increase too.

5.5.1.3 The Effects of Perceived Supervisor Support on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
The role of supervisors in organization should be help employees in accomplishing their tasks rather than finding fault in their work. The supervisory role should be an integral part in the development of organizational justice through which the fair treatment of employees should be entrenched as this is bound to boost their self-esteem, which will translate into growth and productivity. In order to boost the perceived supervisor support organizations should therefore, value the contribution of each employee, regard their interests, care about their wellbeing and take pride in their particular accomplishments.
5.5.1.4 The Effect of Organizational Justice on Employees’ Intention to Quit.
The establishment of organizational justice need to focus on the development of organization-based self-esteem as the two is integral ingredients for enhancing employees’ retention. Creating a fair working environment should be the goal of organizations that are especially facing higher levels of turnovers.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies.
This study basically investigated the combination of variables in realizing minimized turnovers in organization. The relationship between leadership style, organization based self-esteem, perceived supervisor support and organization justice was evident as contributing factors towards employees’ retention. This study therefore, suggests further investigation of any other possible factors that affect employees’ turnover in organizations. Further research may also focus on whether the variables tested in this study apply in equal measure in various institutions, such as public and private institutions or whether their effects is determined by the context.
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Dear Respondent,

RE: DATA COLLECTION.

I am a postgraduate student at United States International University- Africa. I am carrying out a research on the antecedents of intention to quit. You have been selected to be part of this study as a respondent. I kindly request you to spare some time and answer the questions to the best of your knowledge. Your identity will be treated with utmost confidentiality and any information provided on this questionnaire will be used for the purposes of study only.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

A.N.M

ANNABEL NDUTA MUNORU.
**APPENDIX II: Research Questionnaire**

**Introduction:** In order to improve the work experience at our organizations in Kenya, we are requesting a few minutes of your time to respond to the questions below. Your honest response will enable us to see how much more is to be done in our organizations to improve the type of leadership practices, supervisor support and increase the retention rate in our organizations.

This questionnaire is strictly confidential so please **do not** write your name or contact. However, if you feel any question will compromise your position in your organization, feel free to return the questionnaire to the researcher/research assistant.

**PART A: General Information.**

Gender

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

Age last birthday

- [ ] 20-25
- [ ] 26-35
- [ ] 36-45
- [ ] 45-60

Years of work Experience; ………………………………………………..

Years of working in current organization; …………………………………..

**Part B: Perceived Leadership Styles.**

**Factor 1: Inspirational Leadership.**

The following statements are related to how you view your manager/supervisor in the work place, their leadership and their influence over you. Please tick in the boxes on how you see them portraying the following behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>If not always</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I have complete confidence in him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) In my mind, he/she is a symbol of success and accomplishment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Engages in words and deeds which enhances his/her image of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Serves as a role model for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Instills pride in being associated with him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Displays extraordinary talent and competence in whatever he/she decides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>I am ready to trust him/her to overcome any obstacle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Listens to my concerns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Makes me aware of strongly held values, ideals, and aspirations which are shared in common</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Mobilizes a collective sense of mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Projects a powerful, dynamic, and magnetic presence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Shows how to look at problems from new angles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Makes me back up my opinions with good reasoning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>Articulates a vision of future opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>Provides advice when it is needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Introduces new projects and new challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>Treats me as an individual rather than just a member of the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor two: Rational-objective Leadership**

The following statements are related to how you view your manager/ supervisor in the work place, their leadership and their influence over you. Please tick in the boxes on how you see them portraying the following behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>If not always</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19) Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from what is expected of me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Keeps careful track of mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Monitors performance for errors needing correction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Points out what I will receive if I do what is required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Tells me what to do to be rewarded for my efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Is alert for failure to meet standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Works out agreements with me on what I will receive if I do what needs to be done,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Talks about special rewards for good work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Demonstrates a strong conviction in his/her beliefs and values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Three: Passive Leadership**

The following statements are related to how you view your manager/ supervisor in the work place, their leadership and their influence over you. Please tick in the boxes on how you see them portraying the following behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>If not always</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28) As long as work meets minimal standards, he/she avoids trying to make improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Avoids getting involved when important issues arise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Problems have to be chronic before he/she will take action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Things have to go wrong for him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C: Organization- Based Self-Esteem.

The following statements are related to your attitude, opinions and feelings about yourself. Answer each statement quickly rather than taking a long time. It’s your first impression about yourself that is most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35) I count around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) I am taken seriously around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) I am important around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) I am trusted around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) There is faith in me around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) I can make a difference around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) I am valuable around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) I am helpful around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) I am efficient around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) I am cooperative around here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part D: Perceived Supervisor Support (PSS)**

I would like to know how your immediate supervisor relates with you and helps you when you face job-related problems. Please answer according to the scale provided.

**ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45)</td>
<td>My supervisor values my contributions to the well-being of our department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46)</td>
<td>If my supervisor could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary, he/she would do so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47)</td>
<td>My supervisor appreciates extra effort from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48)</td>
<td>My supervisor strongly considers my goals and values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49)</td>
<td>My supervisor wants to know if I have any complaints.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50)</td>
<td>My supervisor takes my best interest into account when he/she makes decisions that affect me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51)</td>
<td>Help is available from my supervisor when I have a problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52)</td>
<td>My supervisor really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53)</td>
<td>If I did the best job possible, my supervisor would be sure to notice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54)</td>
<td>My supervisor is willing to help me when I need a special favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55)</td>
<td>My supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56)</td>
<td>If given an opportunity my</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisor would take advantage of me.

57) My supervisor shows a lot of concern for me. 1 2 3 4 5

58) My supervisor cares about my opinions. 1 2 3 4 5

59) My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5

60) My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible. 1 2 3 4 5

**Part E: Organization Justice.**

**Procedural Justice**

The following items refer to the procedures used to arrive at your (outcome). To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61) Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62) Have you had influence over the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63) Have those procedures been applied consistently?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64) Have those procedures been free of bias?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65) Have those procedures been based on accurate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
information?

66) Have you been able to appeal the (outcome) arrived at by those procedures?

67) Have those procedures upheld ethical and moral standards?

Distributive Justice

The following items refer to your (outcome). To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68)</td>
<td>Does your (outcome) reflect the effort you have put in your work?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69)</td>
<td>Is your (outcome) appropriate for the work you have completed?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70)</td>
<td>Does your (outcome) reflect what you have contributed to the organization?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71)</td>
<td>Is your (outcome) justified, given your performance?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpersonal Justice.**

The following items refer to the authority figure who enacted the procedure. To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) treated you in a polite manner?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) treated you with dignity?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) treated you with respect?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) refrained from improper remarks or comments?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Informational Justice.**

The following items refer to the authority figure who enacted the procedure. To what extent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) been candid in(his/her) communications with you?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has(he/she) explained the procedure thoroughly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were (his/her) explanations regarding the procedures reasonable?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has (he/she) communicated details in a timely manner?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has (he/she) seemed to tailor (his/her) communications to individuals’ specific needs?

**Part F: Turnover Intention.**

The following statements are related to your job performance and turnover rate of your current organization. Tick in the box how often these statements cross your mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>Rarely/Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81) I plan to stay with my current company for a long time to advance my career.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) I often think of quitting my current job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83) It is very possible for me to leave for another company next year.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation.