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ABSTRACT

A company is comprised of buildings, processes, policies, structures, machines and people. People are the engine that drives the organization. Financial institutions, like many other organizations, focus on turnover, profit and overall growth and tend to view people as an expense item in their financials. This therefore leads to poor management and development of people; which then leads to low staff engagement and commitment levels and eventually a high staff attrition rate. It is against this background, that this research was conducted; seeking to determine the effect organizational perceptions have on organizational behaviours in Kenya’s SACCO industry. The specific objectives were: The effect of organizational perceptions on team cohesion and organizational commitment, the effects of team cohesion and organizational commitment on organizational behavior, the effect of organizational perceptions on organizational behaviours and the mediating effect of team cohesion and organizational commitment on the relationship between organizational perceptions and organizational behaviours.

The study adopted a descriptive research design and the sample size of about 200 employees working in Kenyan SACCOs was selected conveniently. A 98-item questionnaire was developed using Rosenberg’s Self Esteem’s scale, Pierce et al’s Organizational Based Self Esteem Scale, Bass and Avolio’s Management Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), HERO’s team cohesion scale, Allen and Mayer’s Organizational Commitment Scale, Lee and Allen’s Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Scale and Mobley’s Intention to Quit Scale. The data collected was analyzed using SPSS and MPLUS software and presented using descriptive tables and figures.

The findings of the research found that organizational perceptions (OBSE, Leadership Styles and Job Autonomy) have an impact on organizational behaviours (Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Intention to Quit) but the mediating variables in review, Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment, did not have a mediating influence on the model in the industry. It was also noted that the organizational perceptions did not have an influence on the mediating variables, but the mediating variables had a significant relationship to the organizational behaviours. The research also found that the respondents had very strong organizational perceptions but these in isolation did not quite have a significant influence on the mediating variables.
This research recommends that the same research is conducted in different industries in Kenya to establish if the effect of organizational perceptions on team cohesion and organizational commitment are the same. It would be prudent to conduct a research to determine if job related factors like skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback as defined by Hackman and Oldham have a more significant relationship to organizational attitudes and behaviours than the reviewed individual organizational perceptions.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Different organizations hold different opinions as to whether employees are their greatest asset. Some organizations consider people, especially their key talent, to be of greatest value to them and as such they put in time and effort to ensure that they accrue value from their employees through their rewards systems. For many years, employers assumed that monetary rewards are the biggest concern to employees but over time and through the cultural changes in the working world, money has been noted to be a key factor but not the sole influence of how employees commit to an organization or how they behave towards their employer and their colleagues. The time spent in the office for a normal 8-5 organization can be about 40 hours per week which is even made worse in cities that experience heavy traffic jams and individuals spend almost 50 hours a week around their office space. Employers ought to determine the factors that would make individuals choose to keep working for their employer, staying committed to the employer and exuding positive organizational behaviours. These factors could therefore help an employer to ensure they are aware on how to best ensure that their employees are their greatest asset and not their greatest problem (Sands, 2017; Ridgley, 2013).

There is a considerable shift in the demographic composition of employees in the workforce with the total number of millennials expected to rise to about 50% by year 2020. Kian & Yusoff (2012) noted that the most distinct variation between Generation X and Y was Work in itself as Generation Y (Born between 1966-1976) found work to be highly satisfying while Generation X (Born between 1980-2000) found it to be less satisfying. Organizations should consider the variations of the design and type of work while allocating individuals in order to obtain maximum value from various generations. Another research on the factors that influence organizational commitment of Generation Y found that job satisfaction, job type and work life balance had the greatest impact on the overall job commitment of individuals determined that the latter had the greatest influence thus proving that various factors affect the overall organizational commitment for various generations (Yi, 2014).

The current workforce is filled with a new and different generation: The Millennials. This is a generation that is well educated and has high aspiration for themselves and only want to
be involved in work they believe matters. They want to have clear work expectations and clearly see how their jobs relate to the mission, objectives, goals and core values of the organization. This then poses an interesting challenge for their superiors as they have to involve them in decision making, allow some level of autonomy, continuously involve them in training and development that correlates with their personal career goals and paths. They largely prefer working in teams as they are more social and peer-group oriented (this is largely the generation that has grown up with Facebook, Twitter, Tinder and Myspace amongst other social media platforms). This generation has an innate need for constant praise and often focussed on obtaining likes to their posts and follows to their social pages. Millennials are thought to want to make money quick and they expect their rewards to be creative, varied and personalized and not just money oriented or award of certifications (Nelson, 2017; Hannus, 2016). Owing to the millennial generation rise in the workplace, HR professionals and the management teams should have a clear strategy that is suited to the generations represented in the office and ensure that they have employees that are committed to the organization (Perryer & Jordan, 2008).

In addition to the changes in the age and generation of workers, there is also a lot of technological changes through the use of Artificial Intelligence, big data initiatives like data warehousing and data mining, innovation, growth of the capitalistic world and move towards a green world where companies also care for their environment (PWC, 2018). This further promotes the new wave that is pushing for employers not to think of people as jobs but as people has led to the push towards shaping a future that is considerate and fair to the needs of the employees. Employers have made sure of this by ensuring that the personal needs of their employees are met to helps grow their careers and have jobs that are impactful to the organization consequently having adequate mutual benefit. This can be through the use of policies like flexi-hours, working in teams and having project-based jobs, focus on training and development that ensures that all employees are able to use the new inventive tools that are being developed to make work easier whilst also ‘caring for the environment’ (Deloitte, 2018).

Various companies have come up with more targeted approaches to trying to give their employees the confidence that they matter to the organization with organizations like Google, Facebook and Apple taking care of employee concerns through the various stages in life e.g. loss of a family member, pregnancy and health concerns amongst others. Arianna Huffington in her book, ‘Thrive’ has been a key advocate to how individuals redefine success
as just money and power but goes ahead to speak towards the health and well-being of individuals as an important measure that she is putting place at her company, ‘Huffington Post’ (Huffington, 2015).

Perception is the reaction an individual has to a situation or a stimulus in their environment. This is because of attaching meaningful based on their prior experiences which at times can be different from reality (Borkowski, 2005). Organizational Perceptions have to do with the reaction that employees have based on individual factors, team or group factors and organizational factors which have an influence on organizational behaviours. Attribution theory was first introduced by Heidler (1958) as “naive psychology” to help explain the behaviours of others by describing ways in which people make casual explanations for their actions. Causal relationships have been developed to identify the influences of organizational perceptions on organizational attitudes like organizational commitment and how the levels of commitment affect organizational behaviours like turnover intentions and organizational citizenship behaviours.

Savings & Credit Co-operative Societies (SACCOS) in Kenya have experienced exponential growth in the recent years as individuals either with businesses or working for a specific organization have opted to start taking saving with SACCOs and reduce their savings in bank accounts. This has led to the increased need for SACCOs ensuring that their quality of service is superior in order to increase their client base and thus have higher deposits coming in from their clients. To ensure that this quality of service is maintained, there is a need for employers to ensure that they have highly skilled and motivated employees thus reducing their turnover rates through establishing positive practices in their organizations.

The Kenyan SACCO industry was formalized over the years through the setting up of bodies that manage the licensing and management of SACCO activities. One such body is Sacco Societies Regulatory Authority (SASRA), a statutory state corporation established under the Sacco Societies Act (Cap 490B) of the Laws of Kenya (the Act) which ensures that they notify the public of SACCOs mandated to operate in Kenya. As of July 2017, there was a total of 167 fully licensed SACCOs in Kenya which is evidence of the amount of competition in the industry with a total membership of licensed deposit taking SACCOs stood at 3.6 million in 2016 and the total asset base in the sector grew by 14.8% from 393.5B to 342.8B largely funded by members’ deposits. Various SACCOs may take various strategies to try and ensure that their growth is supported by talent and one major strategy is through their
employees thus leading to high push for job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Mercer’s 2015 turnover trends report says there was a global increase in voluntary turnover intentions in 2014 especially in medium and high organizational performers. This leads to loss of key talent thus losing critical organizational knowledge and affecting the flow of work performance of an organization (Elkajaer & Filmer, 2015). Affecting performance of work subsequently leads to poor organizational performance and lack of achievement of corporate goals and strategies which raises the concern on turnover levels. Turnover is a key concern for all organizations and particularly for Human Resource (HR) Managers professionals who may find themselves spending too much work on one aspect of their work recruitment and selection and may not have time to create a positive working environment that plays a huge role in overall motivation levels and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) exuded by employees towards the organization and also to other colleagues (Netemeyer, 1997). These organizational behaviours are largely affected by the working environment, engagement levels and organizational commitment amongst other factors, which leads to their overall behaviour.

The effect of monetary and tangible elements that affect turnover levels has been extensively reviewed in the past, but research is currently looking to establish how people centric factors can be influenced and positively improved to help organizations in their quest to help retain their employees. The complexities of the different generations especially millennials where only one in five do not intend to continue working for their current employer in the next five years has further made it clear to employers, especially HR executives, that times are changing and the levels of voluntary turnovers are also increasing despite the continued need for more employees in their organizations (PWC, 2012; Elkajaer & Filmer, 2015). Organizational perceptions and attitudes have been researched over time to identify how they affect organizational behaviours through various research papers and have established that employers ought to be cognizant of much more than the traditional two factor theory put across by Herzberg (Robbins & Judge, 2007).

Owing to the fact that organisations operate in environments that are complex, dynamic, highly competitive and extremely volatile, it is advised that people managers are systematic in their approach to human resources (Tarique & Schuler, 2016). People managers need to
be keen on what they do and not do as everything impacts the working environment which can further go into affecting employee motivation, organizational commitment and engagement levels amongst other behaviours. This is the background against which this research is founded on, trying to establish how various perceptions employees may have about an organization, the team they work in or themselves and how these affect their attitude and eventually the impact various organizational behaviours are likely to experience as a result. Similar research based on organizational perceptions, attitudes and behaviours has been conducted in the more affluent markets but there is no research that specifically combines the variables conducted locally and neither has this research been based on Kenya’s Financial Industry with a bias on SACCOs.

1.3 General Objective

The study sought to determine how organizational perceptions affect organizational behaviours in Kenya’s Sacco Sector.

1.4 Specific Objectives

The study specifically sought to determine:

1) The effect of organizational perceptions on team cohesion and organizational commitment.
2) The effects of team cohesion and organizational commitment on organizational behaviour.
3) The effect of organizational perceptions on organizational behaviours.
4) The mediating effect of team cohesion and organizational commitment on the relationship between organizational perceptions and organizational behaviours.

1.5 Significance of the Study

1.5.1 People Managers and Human Resource Managers

This study has made sure that various managers are more aware of how employees form perceptions and how these perceptions affect their commitment to the organization and the quality and quantity of their work. The research also gives Human Resource Managers in the Financial Industry tangible evidence that they can use in their development of relevant policies and procedures that can subsequently inspire a change leading to higher levels of employee commitment.
1.5.2 Researchers and Academicians

This study has built into the local body of knowledge to help future researchers understand what factors or corporate elements that have an influence on whether employees are committed to an organization and the consequences of positive and/or negative organizational commitment. The gaps and limitations noted in this study will also help researchers in their development of research areas in an attempt to fill the gaps.

1.5.3 Employees

This research allows employees to gain more awareness into the various elements that affect how they behave in an organization. It also helps them think through their choices in choosing employers and how their choices can affect their individual performance and opinion of their employer.

1.5.4 Policy Makers and Consultants

National and especially sectorial policy makers in the financial industry have useful information that they can use to develop human resource policies and procedures that can be adopted by various organizations in their quest to build a committed workforce with lower turnover rates. This research also helps consultants identify gaps while performing work in various client premises that can create more value to their clients.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study sample is 200 employees of Kenya’s financial industry. It was conducted between February and June 2018. These employees were picked at random from the organizations and administered with the research questionnaire.

1.7 Definition of Terms

**Organizational Commitment:** The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

**Autonomy:** People’s capacity to be authors of their own lives, to exercise self-determination and self-government (O’Neil, 2009).

**Millennials:** Generation born between 1980 and 1995. They are the technologically savvy, well rounded, creative, multitasking and confident generation and push for work-life balance making HR management of this generation unique (Deloitte University Press, 2015).
**Organizational Citizenship Behaviour:** Behaviour displayed by employees which is above and beyond that formally prescribed by a person's organizational role, and are not directly or explicitly rewarded in the organization's formal reward system but are behaviours that are important for the effective and successful functioning of the organization (Netemeyer, 1997).

1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter outlined the background of the problem, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study and definition of key terms referred to. It adequately addressed the research objective and introduces the reader to the intention of the researcher for this review.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a review of literature on how organizational perceptions would affect organizational behaviours that employees exude. The specific scope of the perceptions in review are individual job autonomy, self-esteem, organizational based self-esteem and leadership styles and how they affect organizational behaviours like intention to quit and organizational citizenship behaviours. We also reviewed the effect of mediating factors like team cohesion and organization commitment and see their relevance between organizational perceptions and behaviours.

2.2 The Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

2.2.1 Individual Job Autonomy

Job Autonomy is one of the dimensions included in the Job Characteristics theory developed by Hackman and Oldham. The other dimensions include skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) which is believed to have an impact on employees’ responses to work. Autonomy is also defined as people’s capacity to be authors of their own lives, to exercise self-determination and self-government (O'Neil, 2009). Based on this background, autonomy is considered a key factor in how individuals perceive their jobs and how they end up performing their tasks and eventually their level of job satisfaction. It refers to how empowered individuals are to make decisions about how they perform their work within the set goals and objectives pre-defined either as part of one’s job description or at the beginning of the task or project.

As Industrial Democracy in Europe International Research Group (1993) and Jackson (1983) assert job autonomy is an important norm that requires sharing in the society as once shared it enhances social trust thus creating social capital that may spare the society from high costs of spontaneous work relationships (Cheung & Au, 2004; Saragih, 2011). Individual job autonomy then should be shared amongst different ranks of employees based on their experience, responsibility and accountability. It helps employees understand the level of trust accorded to them by their superiors which can go ahead and inspire motivation and output in the organization.
When autonomy is increased, individuals gain freedom, independence and discretion in scheduling work and in determining procedures for task accomplishment (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). Low autonomy levels at work implies that individuals have limited discretion in scheduling work and determining work procedures but is associated with highly standardized jobs/tasks in highly structured organizations. It is expected that individuals would prefer high autonomy cases which requires higher cognitive levels. It was not the case as individuals do not necessarily perform better with higher autonomy levels (Niessen & Volmer, 2010). Too much autonomy can lead to poor performance in instances where individuals are not very well vast with the work they perform daily. In such cases, managers should ensure that autonomy is given to individuals based on experience levels and type of work. Work especially highly creative jobs require more autonomy than highly specialized and mechanical work. Autonomy should be handled by management keenly and sparingly amongst different individuals and teams in the organization as it can be detrimental to the performance of high quality and high quantity work. As individuals rise in rank, there is need for adaptation to increased autonomy which should be handled sensitively as is limited by one’s cognitive capability. Research is therefore differing in results as to whether they accrued value from increasing job autonomy or is this subject to more research. In similar research, high levels of autonomy were reviewed in self managing teams and it was determined that too much trust and high levels of individual autonomy were found to be harmful in self managing teams (Langfred, 2004). The assumption is that self-managing teams are aware of planning, directing and controlling their work deliverables but at times too much freedom is detrimental as employees may not deliver their objectives.

In his book, Outliers, Malcolm Gladwell quips that work must have at least three main things, autonomy, complexity and a connection between effort and reward for it to be satisfying. It is not necessarily about how much money we make that ultimately makes employees happy between nine and five (Gladwell, 2008).

### 2.2.1.1 Job Autonomy on Team Cohesion

The value accrued from individual job autonomy on team cohesion is highly dependent on the level of task interdependence involved in achieving the goal. Teams with lower task interdependence benefit from high levels of individual autonomy whilst in the case of high task interdependence. Team autonomy according to Cordery (1996) refers to the level of discretion afforded to groups of interdependent employees who are responsible for the
management of some work in the organization (Leach, Wall, Rogelberg, & Jackson, 2005), is beneficial whilst individual autonomy can be harmful. The effectiveness of a team can be affected by other factors like complexity of tasks, level of expertise, poor communication etc but numerous studies have found that teams with greater autonomy have better overall performance and lower member strain.

Based on work carried out on the seven practices of a successful organization (Pfeffer, 1998) and an additional three practices to make ten were theoretically and empirically associated with occupational safety (Zacharatos, Barling, & Iverson, 2005). Ten factors are employment security, selective hiring, extensive training, teams and decentralized decision making, reduced status distinctions, information sharing, and contingent compensation, transformational leadership, high-quality work, and measurement of management practices. Of interest is self-managed teams and decentralized decision making i.e. autonomy and its benefit on employee performance. Teamwork fosters familiarity and demands greater cohesion which leads to higher job performance and subsequently job satisfaction. From this research, it was noted that the safest teams were those who had the most control over their work which could be because of promoting the sharing of ideas that will result in better solutions to the various challenges or assignments that the team is faced with.

Similar research also determines that team performance is influenced by the combination of individual and team level autonomy and the effects are further influenced by the mediating effect of task interdependence and its level (Langfred, 2005). Organizations ought to ensure that if there is a high level of task interdependence between teams working together or in different elements of a task, there ought to be lower levels of team and individual autonomy for success of the project. The reverse is true in the case of low level task interdependence. In another study on the influence of autonomy, it was determined that group autonomy had a positive influence on group effectiveness whilst individual autonomy had a negative influence on group effectiveness (Langfred, 2000).

2.2.1.2 Job Autonomy on Organizational Commitment

Increasing job autonomy to lower hierarchy groups does not necessarily improve job commitment of said employees (Shalini & Ira, 2013). The influence of job autonomy varies with rank and the type of job that individuals are engaged in. Middle level management and above consider the freedom to plan their work day and the tools and technics they use to perform their duties as important in how they feel committed to the organization which could
be because of increased skill and mastery of their jobs over time, however, lower rank employees may consider that freedom as having leaders or working for an organization that do not consider the quality of their work as important and therefore may not feel taken care of. This can conversely affect their commitment levels and they may opt to go look for employment where their talents and skills are grown through constant and consistent guidance. There is also significant impact on organizational commitment in organizations with high job autonomy, this was noted in employees across all different job ranks in an organization. However, there is more significant effect on employees’ hierarchical level upon their organizational commitment thus leading to higher ranked employees having a higher level of commitment in comparison to lower ranked employees.

Job autonomy, although a strong predictor, does not necessarily mean that individuals will have high commitment levels and subsequently stay with an organization for longer (Lin & Ping, 2016). Management ought to actively put in place policies that inspire practices that will engage juniors in making corporate decisions and having higher levels of responsibility and accountability. Through such practices, there is better two-way communication between the top-level management and lower levels which allows management to make the necessary decisions to allow juniors to be more engaged in performance and as such are more committed to the organization. Given to the varying opinions of job autonomy, it is important for the management of an organization to be clear and aware of where they fall in as far as their employees to give the right amount of attention and freedom to the various individuals or teams. They should also find a clear yet delicate balance between freedom given to individuals in different levels, teams, skillset, industry and specializations.

2.2.2 Leadership Styles

Scholars have tried to determine the differences and similarities between leadership and management to explain the concepts. They also agree that one can be a manager without necessarily being a leader, but all leaders are managers (Algahtani, 2014). This section will present the concept of leadership, different theories that scholars have come up with, leadership styles and the characteristics of the various leadership styles in focus.

According to Peter Drucker, a leader is someone who has followers and followers make one a leader while John Maxwell considers leadership as influence (Bariso, 2015). Peter Drucker, who is considered the father of management, defines management as a multi-purpose organ that manages business and manages managers and manages workers and work (Shaker,
A lot of scholars and researchers have tried to establish whether management is a science or an art and whilst most agree that there are elements of management being either, the conclusion is not as important as its end is to ensure that the organization achieves the goals it has set out to achieve. However, according to Kotterman (2006) the best scenario is for an organization to have the right mix between leaders and managers to succeed, and in fact, what they really need is a few great leaders and many first-class managers (as cited in Bohoris & Vorria). This study explores transformational, transactional and laissez faire styles of leadership and understand its impact on team cohesion and organizational commitment in the Kenyan financial sector.

Jim Collins (2001) defines the concept of a Level 5 Executive who builds greatness in an organization and productivity in teams through a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will. These leaders are driven and have a need to produce great but sustained results by displaying workmanlike diligence but eventually attribute success to factors other than themselves whilst taking full responsibility in the case of failure.

Leadership styles is the relatively consistent pattern of behaviour that characterizes a leader (Dubrin, 2001). Different researches have been conducted to determine the specific influence the various leadership styles have on individuals and it was noted that transformational leadership has significant positive impact on effectiveness and job satisfaction whilst laissez-faire leadership style had a negative influence on effectiveness and job satisfaction (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2014). Another research was conducted to establish the influence of leadership styles in the manufacturing industry in Iran which also established that transformational leadership style can guide the organization through the development of new products, more profitability and better performance (Pejman, Moosavi, & Chirani, 2016).

According to Max Weber (1958), there are three types of leaders that is rational, legal/traditional and charismatic but he also recognized that leadership is situational in nature and leaders either work in transactional and transformational leadership (as cited in Williams, 2003). It is assumed that Weber favoured the charismatic type of leader who inspire mission and vision in others and is based upon the extraordinary characteristics that an individual is perceived to espouse. Some of the main characteristics of a charismatic leaders are possessing and articulating a vision, willing to take risks to achieve a vision,

James MacGregor Burns (1978) initially introduced the concept of transformative leadership in his research on political leaders but this is a term that has evolved and is used in business and organizational psychology. According to Burns, transformative leadership is a process in which "leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation". He went further ahead to establish two concepts of "transforming leadership" and "transactional leadership". These two concepts have been built upon by other researchers to bridge gaps that may have been noted which is evidenced by 'hands-free’ leadership styles.

Transformational Leadership has been defined using different terms by various leadership scholars and researchers to refer to the charismatic traits of leaders as they deal with their subordinates to inspire change and ensure that the goal and vision is met through working together and motivating each other whilst sustaining a higher level of morale. The overall aim is for the leader to motivate performance to be higher than the minimum requirements (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman, & Richard, 1990).

MLQ defines the four components transformational behaviours as idealized influence is ‘walking the talk’ which indicates whether you hold subordinates’ trust, maintain their faith and respect, show dedication to them, appeal to their hopes and dreams, and act as their role model. Inspirational motivation measures the degree to which you provide a vision, use appropriate symbols and images to help others focus on their work, and try to make others feel their work is significant, this is often done by exciting the masses and sharing the vision leading to mutual interest in achieving the goals set out. Intellectual stimulation shows the degree to which you encourage others to be creative in looking at old problems in new ways, create an environment that is tolerant of seemingly extreme positions, and nurture people to question their own values and beliefs of those of the organization by essentially ‘thinking outside of the box’. Individualized consideration indicates the degree to which you show interest in others’ well-being, assign projects individually, and pay attention to those who seem less involved in the group and is largely compassionate leadership. Leaders who can consider the transformational behaviours are able to accrue more value from their employees in as far as productivity and effectiveness is concerned as the employees experience higher satisfaction levels (Bass, 1985; Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007).
Transactional Leadership according to Bass and Avolio (1994) is when leaders discuss requirements with their juniors and give rewards and/or punishment based on their performance of given expectations. Contingent Reward shows the degree to which you tell others what to do to be rewarded, emphasize what you expect from them, and recognize their accomplishments which is seen as making a deal between seniors and juniors. Management-By-Exception assesses whether you tell others the job requirements, are content with standard performance, and are a believer in “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”. Management by exception can either be passive or active and consists of a lot of putting out of fires (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Burns (1978) who first developed the concepts of transformational and transactional leadership considered both styles as having some level of interactions between leaders and their subordinates but whilst they both have similar objectives they each have different motivations and the level of power affecting interactions. Laissez-faire is hands-off leadership where there is an absolute absence in leadership, avoiding taking a firm stance on issues and the leader doesn’t care what you do or you don’t. This type of leader does not inspire the team in any way and the team members would have to have their own intrinsic motivation to see results (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007).

From research, there is a significant positive and strong correlation with job satisfaction in comparison with transactional leadership and therefore organizations should place a lot of consideration in the type of leader during selection, recruitment and placement of executives (Fareena & Mahmood, 2016). This is because there is more to leadership than just meeting goals and responsibilities and the employees in an organization ought to be considered by their managers. Leadership should also be attuned to the employees being managed as in some instances, employees may start taking advantage of leaders who are highly considerate of circumstances that may influence people and their performance of the duties.

2.2.2.1 Leadership Styles on the Mediating Variables

Research on the influence of leadership styles on team cohesion have largely been carried out in the sports field to review the influence team coaches have on the success of teams. Coach leadership styles have a great effect on team success and team cohesion, the coaches of successful teams offered higher levels of democratic and social support behaviour thus team cohesion is a necessary factor for team success (Ramzaninezhad & Keshtan, 2009).
Less authoritarian leaders help teams to work together to meet their goals and their benevolence makes communication between team members and the coach and the team easier by allowing for top-down and bottom-up communication leading to more feedback. Delving further in, research shows that coaches that exhibited higher traits in training and instruction vis-à-vis coaches that are more autocratic in their leadership styles often find that there is a positive impact on the cohesiveness of a team (Faunce, 1993; Vahdani, Sheikhyousefi, Moharramzadeh, Ojaghi, & Salehian, 2012). Development of leadership in the right context leads to the development of task and social cohesion.

Studies have been carried out to ascertain the impact the various leadership styles (transactional, transformational and laissez-faire) have on the organizational commitment types (affective, normative and continuance). A Turkish study on Organizational culture, leadership styles and organizational commitment determined that the certain aspects of either transactional leadership or transformational leadership had direct positive or negative impact on organizational commitment. The analyses indicated that inspirational motivation and individualized consideration behaviours have positive effect on Affective Commitment which is attributed to giving employees strength for future challenges and the confidence that their goals and vision aligns with that of their leaders. On the other hand, in regard of transactional leadership, it is found out that contingent reward and management-by exception have positive effects on Continuance Commitment and contingent reward also has positive effect on the Normative Commitment (Zafer, 2012). A study in the Kenyan banking industry that utilized the MLQ and OCQ indexes whilst comparing with a study of employees from banks in the USA had positive relationships between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Walumbwa, Orwa, & Lawler, 2005; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

A local study on the effect of leadership styles on employee organizational commitment was carried out in 2016 on Christian Aid and concluded that the organization utilizes directive, supportive, participative and achievement leadership styles through giving rules, regulations and task expectations to employees, support their performance of tasks and responsibilities adequately, actively involves employees in decision making and considers their opinions and suggestions. This has inspired employees’ confidence in the organization thus inspiring employee commitment as evidenced by how they talk about the organization to people outside their organization and their understanding how their individual work impacts on the organization’s goals and objectives (Githuka, 2017).
2.2.3 Self-esteem

Becker (1993) defined self-esteem as, “the emotional valuation individuals have of themselves and the degree of certainty of this valuation”. It is also defined as the estimate one passes on themselves. This estimate is in the form of a feeling that can be hard to isolate and identify because it is experienced constantly (Branden, 2001).

According to Korman (1976) employees will develop attitudes and behaviours based on their level of self-esteem. Employees with higher self-esteem will foster more positive work attitudes like job satisfaction and perform at higher levels because attitudes and behaviours are consistent with the attitude that they are highly competent individuals (as cited in Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989). From research, the alternative is also true as individuals with lower self-esteem are found to perform at lower levels because their attitudes and behaviours are also consistent with their own belief that they are low competent individuals.

Self-esteem in the organizational context has also been found to be stronger and more consistent in intrinsic job characteristics like learning, varied job roles, participation in decision making, role stressors than in extrinsic job characteristics like job level and pay (Becker, 1993). Managerial implications of self-esteem are also based on several factors like an individual choosing to cope with an issue as opposed to avoidance who are more likely to have higher feelings of self-esteem. It is also noted that self-esteem appears to be especially important in non-routine, unstructured tasks require that require a certain level of coping (Becker, 1993). It helps individuals deal with both negative and positive influences around them thereby allowing them to function meaningfully and effectively from one day to the next in their environments (Cast & Burke, 2002) which helps them perform their roles within their social networks.

These beliefs also led to the development of the Organizational Based Self-esteem construct by researchers as they sought to identify that these elements have an impact on working environments. Individuals with high levels of self-esteem are more likely to feel social integration and the individuals are more satisfied and committed to the group task (Kaymak, 2011). When people managers are looking to create teams for specialized assignments it is best for managers to put together teams that have individuals with high self-esteem as they are more likely to perceive the team positively and feel more satisfied and committed to the task at hand. There is also a possibility of reverse causality where low levels of team
cohesion affect how individuals perceive themselves and their overall outlook may change due to low team cohesion. Group conflict also affects organizational commitment levels as a mediating variable where high individual self-esteem levels can lead to lower commitment levels and affect the delivery of assignments.

Collective self-esteem also has an influence on both team cohesion and organizational commitment as individuals in a team working together can affect each other and their cohesiveness and commitment levels can either increase or decrease (Lecomte, Leclerc, & Wykes, 2018). Self-esteem is sometimes deemed to have insignificant influence on highly cohesive teams as it will get considerably reduced because individual effort is not as relevant as group effort is. The same is true for social loafing, tendency to reduce individual effort in a group (Latane & Jackson, 1981), which is generally reduced in teams that are highly cohesive as each individual is organically expected by the system to relate accordingly and make their contributions to the overall team (Divine, 2012).

### 2.2.4 Organizational Based Self-esteem

The concept of Organizational Based Self-esteem (OBSE) was introduced in 1989 by some researchers work sought to understand how self-esteem affects various organizational models. OBSE is defined as the degree to which organizational members believe that they can satisfy their needs by participating in roles within the context of an organization. It is the perceived value an individual has of themselves in the context of the organization they work for by considering themselves having high value, meaning and worthy of that organization (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989). People with high OBSE are proud to be associated with the employer and believe that they are relevant and valuable to the organization. From various researches, these individuals are more productive and have a higher job satisfaction level. High job satisfaction levels often depict high organizational commitment levels in the organizations.

OBSE has been found to moderate the relationships between known organizational constructs, such as role uncertainty and outcomes (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1993). Several factors affect an employee’s OBSE, e.g. burnout has been found to have a signification negative impact on OBSE (Elloy & Vivek, 2012), higher intrinsic motivation has a positive influence on OBSE (Hui & Lee, 2000; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1993) and considering there is a positive correlation between OBSE and Positive Organizational Behaviours (POB) (Pan, Qiwen, & Gao, 2014; Uwe & Anka, 2012) and as
such if an employee is given an opportunity to utilize their talents and capabilities and give suggestions which is subsequently recognized by their organization they will not only exude a sense of belonging but also show more POB. Negative OBSE leads to a lot of negative organizational behaviours exuded by employees either as a result of their own opinion or influence from their work groups through office discussions amongst employees, this leads to high Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWB) which are as a result of low job satisfaction levels. Job Satisfaction levels are an important influence in research on OBSE, ITQ and Organizational Commitment and since it is the more popular variable in conducting research on turnover levels amongst employees, most papers relate it to organizational commitment. Gardener & Pierce (2004) in his subsequent works on OBSE also found evidence that organizational size, adverse role conditions, organizational change, job security, discrimination and harassment have a negative relationship with OBSE. These factors undermine the value of one’s self-esteem in the organizational context.

2.2.4.1 OBSE on Mediating Variables

Individuals who have a positive perception of themselves are likely to have a positive perception of work group colleagues being effective teammates in comparison to employees with low self-esteem. In their updated work Pierce et al reviewed the impact of OBSE on work teams and established there is a positive relationship between individual OBSE and ratings of team member effectiveness and team involvement (Gardner & Pierce, 2016). It is also prudent to recognize that the premise of involving employees in major decisions communicates to them that they are valuable to the organization thus creating a positive working environment that affects their output and their OBSE.

People with high levels of OBSE in organizations may be less reactive to negative information or factors in comparison to individuals with lower levels of OBSE. When the individual’s position in the organization or their perception of their relevance to the organization is affected negatively, their perceived organizational uncertainty is threatened which can lead to employees with low OBSE coping more passively with negative stimuli than employees with higher OBSE. Employees with low OBSE are likely to react by increasing absenteeism thus significantly lowering their overall commitment to the organization (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1993). As such, an organization that has low OBSE should look for ways to improve overall OBSE of their employees especially when faced with role uncertainty or changes in the organization that impacts on job security.
which could include better communication and superiors attaching more positive value on employees. According to Hui & Lee (2000, pp. 215-232) employees with lower levels of OBSE displayed lower Organizational Commitment and higher absenteeism relative with employees with higher levels of OBSE. This research reiterates the assertions made by Pierce et al in that when the organization threatens an employee with job insecurity or uncertainty in future changes, employees are unlikely to perceive or develop higher levels of organizational commitment.

2.3 The Effects of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviour

2.3.1 Team Cohesion

Festinger, Back, Schachter, Kelley, & Thibaut (1950) define cohesion as, ‘resultant of all forces acting on the members to remain in the group’. These forces could either be positive or negative leading to an effect on the attractiveness of a group. This in turn affected the effectiveness and efficiency of employees. Often there were few studies that were carried out to determine the influence of work engagement on teams as most of the focus was on an individual’s engagement to their work. This study was based on three factors of work engagement i.e. vigour, dedication and absorption as developed by Salanova and his colleagues on the effects team work has on work engagement (Salanova et al., 2012).

The HERO model is used to determine the efforts involved in improving the work environment and were related to the task, interpersonal relationships and the organization. It refers to if there is task independence, the type of relationships between all the individuals allocated a task and the practices of the organization respectively (Salanova et al., 2012).

The concept of HERO is largely used in business management to try and identify the ability of an organization to survive and adapt in the event of a crisis and during a change management initiative. This is especially relevant in the context of organizations that are particularly able to bounce back bigger and better (Salanova, Llorens, Cifre, & Martínez, 2012).
Various factors like size, similarity of team members, reward, communication, work tenure etc influence team cohesion. Festinger et al (1950) are largely credited with developing the initial concept of cohesiveness in teams performed an experiment to try ascertaining the sources of attraction to a group which included liking the group members, prestige attached by team members by belonging to a group and the possibility of getting a reward from performance of assigned group activity. Cohesive teams were noted to perform more efficiently than less cohesive teams except in the case where there is a promise of a reward to the team. Rewards of performing the activity which thus forces the team members to be more dedicated and work faster to achieve set tasks or goals (Festinger et al., 1950). Soboroff (2012) reports that, “larger groups reported lower trust, shared awareness, and inclusion of fellow group members in future task groups than participants in smaller groups”. Research shows that several factors affect the trust of team members in different ways which subsequently influences team cohesion and size is one such factor. Big teams have lower team cohesiveness and opinions of individuals of the rest of the team i.e. collective efficacy which also impacts on team cohesiveness. Teams that believe they are in a capable team generally are more successful than their counterparts who may perceive the task to be challenging for the team (Torrente et al, 2013; Soboroff, 2012).

Other factors that influence team work engagement is the similarity of the team in as far as gender, work tenure and rank in the organization are concerned. Teams that are more similar e.g. gender, work tenure, capabilities etc. have a more positive influence on overall team work engagement whilst in teams with a superior and junior in the same team it is known that work engagement is lower as juniors look up to superiors for information thus affecting
their overall motivation to their performance and productivity. This is evidenced in the ease by all team members’ will to listen to their team members and convince their partners (Torrente et al 2013; Sanchez & Yurrebaso, 2008). Contrasting research on trying to accrue value from having diverse teams shows that whilst teams may have growing pains, once they move past the initial team development stages (forming and storming stages), team members learn how to listen to each other (norming stage), examine their perceptions in new light and find a ‘better’ way to deliver in terms of efficiency or effectiveness (performing stage) (as cited by Smith M. K.).

Cross boundary teams are teams that involve people with different demographical traits e.g. personalities, age and gender but also having diverse knowledge skills due to working in different departments or having different technological expertise. Such teams are likely to have a collision in how they carry out tasks, timelines, tools and methodologies that they may use to reach a given target. Different ways of mitigating the effects of diverse cross boundary teams would be to involve an objective party e.g. Human Resources department whilst picking teams to give perspective on how best to pick team members based on varying skills beyond rank and technical know-how. Edmondson & Harvey (2017) cites that, “pursuing these advances is both daunting and worthwhile” to avoid processes for being dragged out longer than would be necessary and causing friction within the team.

According to the 2012 HERO study (Salanova, Llorens, Cifre, & Martinez, 2012), it was determined that if there is a healthy team in the organization with a positive relationship with the organization, its practices, rules and regulations, reporting and communication lines there will be a positive impact in how the team relates and subsequently performs in the roles or jobs assigned to them. In specific this also impacts on the flow of work and information, the relationship between team members, their willingness to deliver expected outcomes thus positively impacting the organizational commitment of the employees.

2.3.1.1 Team Cohesion on Organizational Commitment

Team cohesion has to do with how well a team works together (effectively and efficiently) to achieve set goals. Highly effective teams have higher cohesion and as such report being more committed to their organization and subsequently have lower levels of intention to leave. This proves that team experiences influence team attitudes towards the firm (Greenberg, Sikora, Grunberg, & Moore, 1994). (Hanaysha, 2016) quotes that teamwork has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment. This can be contributed by
teamwork creating a favourable environment for individuals supporting each other and communicating with thus facilitating knowledge and informational exchange and subsequently having a positive influence on organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

Several similar researches have not been able to get significant results on the impact of team cohesion on organizational commitment. This could be due to influences on team cohesion like team size, team perceptions, task interdependence etc which significantly hinders results that can be adequately relied upon (Ogunbamiila, Ogunbamiila, & Adetula, 2010; Wong, 1992). As far as team size is concerned, teams with more members are less positive about the work place and this can be attributed to smaller personal working spaces. This can also be due to other perception factors that individuals like leadership styles, Organizational based self-esteem and organizational trust. However, all these factors interactively (team cohesion, leadership styles, organizational commitment etc.) influence organizational performance.

2.3.1.2 Team Cohesion on Organizational Behaviours

In this research, we have focussed on the influence of team cohesion on individual organizational citizenship behaviour which is the wider level citizenship behaviour considered in research, however, performances of team members can influence team citizenship behaviours (Raver & Gelfand, 2005). Group Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (GOCB) is defined as "the overall level of group members' behaviour that contributes to the maintenance enhancement of the social and psychological context of the group that facilitates its task performance" (adapted from Borman & Motowidlo et al., 2000). Empirical studies have shown that GOCB is significantly related to the quantity and quality of group performance, including efficiency of operation, profitability, and customer satisfaction (Podsakoff et al. 2009) which shows that positive group behaviours had a positive influence on corporate transactional aspects of performance.

Team cohesion is positively and significantly related to OCB-I behaviours as the effects of team members working well together leads to individuals offering to be helpful to other members of the team and consider their activities to work together towards the greater good (Martinez, 2013). Employees perceiving that they have good relations within the team members also further leads to their being considerate of individuals in their team and are often concerned about other team members who may be going through rough patches in their personal lives. Not only will they have compassion on their colleagues but also help them
perform their work whilst they are incapacitated for one reason or the other thus exuding positive work behaviours that are necessary for all individuals to participate in good team relationships (Ngukumeshe, Smith, & Mazibuko, 2016).

The general assumption is that employees who have high group cohesiveness will want to continue working for an employer but over time, individuals that form strong bonds and relationships in the workplace would tend to continue these relationships post-employment and therefore do not necessarily intend to stay for the bond they form with colleagues (Honda & Takamizawa, 2017). (Wu, Wen, & Ming, 2015) asserts that group cohesion does not directly affect individual job satisfaction which also does not directly affect turnover intention but indirectly affects it through group task satisfaction which eventually has an influence on job satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, group cohesion levels do not necessarily affect intention to quit but group task satisfaction has a positive mediating influence. This could be because team members are not accruing value and contentment from the task/job in itself can cause a lot of frustration which can move from one person’s frustration being spread and shared out amongst the rest of the group.

Negative group cohesion can also increase group conflict levels in an organization which can emanate from task conflict which subsequently affects relational conflict (Pyne, 2007). Disagreements between teams or within a team that is charged with a responsibility in an organization can cause a lot of frustrations in how or when a task would be performed thus leading to individuals having conflict amongst themselves based on their perception of task elements. Conflicts on job or task elements can arise and lead to conflict based on personalities that can lead to strain in performance of assigned job roles and tasks. Instances where both task and relational conflicts arise often lead to individuals getting frustrated with reporting to work as the environment becomes unbearable with in-fighting amongst various functions. Over time and with poor conflict management strategies, employees opt out of the organization in search of better working conditions and especially team relationships.

### 2.3.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization. It can be characterized by at least three related factors: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).
Peter Drucker (1909-2005) intimated that unless commitment is made, there are only promises and hopes but not plans whilst Porter defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter et al., 1974).

Organizational commitment is considered somewhat more stable than job satisfaction as it goes beyond the emotive feeling that is related to specific job or job-related issues and looks at a more wholistic response to teams and the organization. Research however shows that there is a positive influence on organizational commitment (either affective, continuance or normative commitment) from job satisfaction which could be due to favourable working conditions personal relationships, promotions etc. (Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012; Fu & Deshpande, 2012).

There is a three-component model of commitment that was developed by Mayer et al. It distinguishes commitment as affective, continuance and normative. The types are not mutually exclusive, which this research is largely be based on (Allen & Mayer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Mayer and Allen (1991) have proposed a model of OC that links each component of commitment to a specific work outcome e.g. employee retention and on-the-job behaviours (performance, absenteeism and citizenship) etc.

Affective commitment refers to an employee’s emotional attachment to an organization, identification with and involvement in an organization (Allen & Mayer, 1990). This is further promoted by the theory, which holds that individuals’ emotional attachment to their employing organization is a function of their perceived interpersonal treatment. Positive treatment enhances one’s affective commitment whilst the converse is true (Taylor et al., 2012). Research has put in a lot of emphasis on affective commitment in comparison to the other remaining components of commitment and it was established that it is a predictor of turnover and absenteeism in an organization (Somers, 1995). Considering this strong influence of Affective OC on organizational behaviours, it is important to note some non-work related issues significantly complicates an organization’s efforts to create a conducive environment that is considered fair by all employees as these traits are highly subjective and largely affected by cultural dispensations (Mohamed et al., 2006). This places an immense amount of responsibility on seniors to create a fair and healthy environment in which all staff perceive to be adequate for their continued commitment to the organization.
The continuance component refers to commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization which could be due to gaining tenure after staying with an employer over an extended period e.g. opportunity costs that are likely to be sacrificed or damaged due to separation e.g. company shares, familial ties and un-transferrable job skills. The same costs can be due to a lack of alternative job prospects (Allen & Mayer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). In the Kenyan context, public sector workers find it difficult to change employers due to benefits like amounts in pension that they have accrued over the years. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), both affective and continuance commitment represent psychological states that have an implication on whether one stays in an organization.

Finally, the normative component refers to employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization and may be influenced by social norms or an individual’s culture or work ethic (Allen & Mayer, 1990). In contrast to Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment was related only to withdrawal intentions (Somers, 1995) and was the last of all the three components to be developed. These three dimensions suggest that people stay with their organization because they want to (affective commitment); because they need to (continuance commitment) and feel they ought to (normative commitment).

2.3.2.1 Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviours

Organizations consider increasing hygiene factors like salary as defined by Fredrick Herzberg in deciding employees’ working attitudes and levels of performance (Robbins & Judge, 2007). This approach is limited in reducing ITQ but what seems to have more influence is strengthening OC. Mowday et al (1982) lists the following ways can be used to improve OC; create clear and realistic job and organization previews, improve the quality of early job experience, provide opportunities for committing acts which are observable and volitional, provide jobs that maximize "felt responsibility" for what is happening in and around the organization, integrate employee into the social fabric of the organization and demonstrate genuine concern for employees' welfare. These suggestions are in line with the theories that were advanced by both Maslow and Herzberg seeking to address the subject of motivation at the workplace. There are three main types of commitment that have been referred to in the literature above, affective commitment indicates that there is a strong emotional attachment to the organization thus significantly reducing turnover intention levels within the team members (Honda & Takamizawa, 2017). Based on the extent of
emotional attachment individuals and groups attach to their jobs, employers should ensure that the emotional element of the job and the stability of such feelings are ensured amongst employees.

Organizational Commitment is a key variable in reviewing organizational behaviours and outcomes like performance, positive organizational behaviours and intention to quit (Khan & Rashid, 2012). Higher levels of commitment lead lower levels of negative behaviours like intention to quit which can lead to lower turnover levels in organizations if not adequately handled by management. To increase commitment levels, organizations should be open and transparent with their employees about the reality on the ground as it helps them become more aware of the decisions that are being made from the top and the expected outcomes in line with corporate strategies. For example, in order to engage marketing staff in an organization, they ought to be made aware of corporate resources that are available at any given point in time in order to avoid disgruntlement among employees when certain budgetary decisions affect the performance of the roles and responsibilities. Through the timely sharing of information, employees gain feelings of belonging and being a part of the family of their employer which therefore reduces their intentions to look for other job opportunities as they believe that remaining loyal to their employer has a beneficial impact on them (DeConnick & Bachmann, 2011). Information sharing also gives juniors and opportunity to feel like they are involved in discussions that shape the company into what the organization is looking to achieve. This can be facilitated through communal information gathering and sharing sessions that the company allows for open communication from all employees. Communication allows for all individuals to feel that they are involved in propagating the company both in its current decisions and its future goals leading to a sense of pride in the organization and a sense of belonging and trust in the organization.

Organizational commitment also has a partial and impartial influence on OCB since mediating factors influence the effect of OC on OCB (Paul, Bamel, & Garg, 2016). For example, with organizational resilience which is a factor when employees are affected negatively with factors within their environment like poor interpersonal relationships, lack of resources, stressors and other day to day influences it has been noted that resilience has a direct influence on OCB but even more so influenced with the mediating effect of organizational commitment.
Affective, continuance and normative commitment affects OCB in most institutions with affective commitment having the highest positive influence on organizational behaviours and specifically OCB (Sarmawa, 2015). Human beings are emotional and feeling people and often do not disassociate how they feel to rationally believe that the workplace and their being is separate. With this, positive treatment of employees creates the excitement of being associated with an employer and putting a conscious effort to propagate a more thoughtful and considerate culture especially towards workmates.

There is a positive and significant relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour and organizations ought to put in place measures to increase the influence which therefore has a more positive impact from individuals who have a higher level of commitment. The influence of the various components of organizational commitment is however not proportional across the components, affective and normative commitment has a positive and significant influence, but continuance commitment does not have a significant relationship (Khaleh & Naji, 2016; Saxena & Saxena, 2014). This therefore means that organizations ought to put in adequate measures to promote the levels of these types of commitment e.g. through policies like flexi time and ensuring that the organization has a strong people brand that is un-matched with other organizations of the same calibre. Such policies inspire confidence in an employer thus making the employee to exhibit behaviours that are in line with how they feel and perceive the employer leading to positive behaviours thus lead to achievement of corporate goals and strategies.

Huffington (2015) describes that most companies have employees that manifest the burnout disorder due to a culture where individuals are obsessed with profits, growth, recognition and power but do not realize that workplace stress has a significant yet disastrous impact on all company’s bottom line. The costs companies waste in medical insurance for their employee, late reports due to hospital runs and the aggression that is manifested by employees who are stressed and sometimes depressed with their work has a greater impact on harmonious and fulfilling work places. Organizations should put in more focus in setting up safe and secure work place cultures where teams work together to achieve both personal and corporate goals. Putting in place facilities like gyms and lounges, team building activities and nursing rooms for employees promotes a healthier working environment with employees who become more productive and helpful to each other. All these factors work together to make the organization more competitive and lucrative to potential employees and customers.
2.4 The Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Organizational Behaviours

2.4.1 Intention to Quit/Turnover Intention

Intention to quit refers to an individual's perceived probability of staying in an employing organization or terminating employment (Werbel & Bedeian, 1989). Intention to Quit (ITQ) has to do with the motivation to leave the employer out of an employees’ own volition. It also does not refer to accidental reasons for leaving or being fired by the employer (Nicholson, N., Wall, T. and Lischeron, J., 1977). Bowen (1982) in his review on unintended intentions to quit proposes that there is a positive correlation that affects individual job performance once employees intend to quit which can lead to on getting fired. Additionally, employees who intend to quit often yet conveniently find themselves in situations where they abscond duty or have an ‘excuse’ not to report to work which can therefore lead to the organization terminating their contract on the account of missed working days. When employees leave an organization, they take with them corporate secrets and organizational investments. Training and experience make it prudent for organizations to figure out ways to retain key talent thus avoiding a negative influence on corporate productivity.

All actions and behaviours have a cause and an effect reaction which can be because of organizational perceptions leading to individuals in the organization exhibiting certain habits and reactions. This can be explained through the social exchange concept. Homans (1961) defined social exchange as the exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and rewarding or costly, between at least two persons. Homans explained social behaviour and the forms of social organization produced by social interaction by showing how A's behaviour reinforced B's behaviour (in a two-party relation between actors A and B), and how B's behaviour reinforced A's behaviour in return (Cook & Rice, 2003). The social exchange theory supports the theory that there must be some triggers that lead to employees’ intention to leave. These factors can either be due to the organizational environment, leadership traits, group or task issues that cause individual organizational commitment or employee engagement amongst other factors to lead to an employees’ intention that eventually translates into negative actions or behaviours.

Various factors affect actual turnover which is generally of greater relevance to employers over the intention to quit. However, this intention can help the organization resolve issues that may be causing employees to look out for new jobs, which is generally the main reason
why employees who intend to leave, keep staying in environments they consider less than ideal.

Organizational commitment has a substantial positive influence on intention to quit (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982) which can be influenced by organizational or individual perceptions and characteristics like education, tenure, position, pay grade, in-role behaviours, job autonomy and leadership skills amongst others (Balfour & Wechsler, 1996). In this case, organizational commitment plays a mediating role between individual characteristics and perceptions against the outcome of intention to quit where it has a substantial effect. In addition, there is also a significant relationship between intention to quit and organization commitment which can be influenced by environmental factors like high unemployment rates (Stumpf & Hartman, 1984). Dougherty et al., (1985) quips that, ‘a model which positions both job satisfaction and organizational commitment as obtaining causally independent influence on intention to resign provides the best fit for the data in that they would both lead directly to intention to leave. However, job satisfaction offers more clarity in the analysis of organization commitment’. In conflicting research, it was noted that job satisfaction in itself does not fully explain the influence on ITQ due to some facets not being directly related to OC and would require OC to enhance ITQ results. This research therefore claims that OC contributes to ITQ more than satisfaction alone (Balaji, 1988). It is common for individuals to be satisfied with their job in as far as their position and influence in the organization is concerned without being committed to the organization. Organizational commitment is therefore a more conclusive measure of an individual’s commitment as factors beyond one’s job influence their wish to work for their employer.

Organizational silence (behavioural issue where individuals do not express their thoughts, opinions and suggestions that will help revealing the disruptions, improving the organizational activities) leads to higher intentions to quit amongst employees (Meral Elçi et al., 2014).

Employee dissent is an indicator of turnover intention with employees who express constructive feedback to managerial audiences are more likely to remain in an organization while latent dissent (dissent directed to co-workers) and questioning upward dissent (aimed at challenging organizational management and practices) leads to higher ITQ. Thus, organizations should aim at encouraging employees to give feedback that they will action on to help decrease their motivation to leave (Cenkci & Ötkenb, 2014).
2.4.1 Organization Perceptions on Intention to Quit

Research shows that higher individual autonomy leads to a lower level of turnover intention thus the two variables (individual job autonomy and turnover intention) have a negative relationship (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2012; Shahzad, 2016). This assumption was put to test with various mediating variables; one mediating variable was high supervisor support which revealed that this assumption is only true in situations of high supervisor support who help quell confusion and provide affective care, recognition and consideration (Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2012). This therefore allows for the employees to have freedom within a frame since approaching their supervisor in instances where they require guidance and motivation in performance of work.

Another mediating variable put to test was distributive and procedural justice which both amplified the effect of individual job autonomy on turnover intention. In cases where individual job autonomy levels were higher and justice was considered, the effect on turnover intention was even lower (Shahzad, 2016). This shows that giving employees a reasonable level of freedom in how they perform their work is both necessary and important to keep the employees committed to the organization for longer periods thus reducing their want/need to terminate their employment with the organization. Managers should put in place a policy to give employees autonomy whilst also being available to support them as they face challenges in the performance of their work thus providing the necessary knowledge they may require which would therefore help increase their skill set through training and development initiatives, both direct and indirect.

Self-esteem is at the heart of all interpersonal relations in the society, a phenomenon that is not taken very seriously in the corporate world. Low self-esteem can cause a lot of issues in companies as individuals working together in teams have trouble resolving conflicts due to fear of exposure. Leaders may get intimidated by their juniors, who may have higher self-esteem or academic knowledge, that can lead to poor decisions being taken as they do not want to leverage on the strength of their juniors in light of their own weaknesses (Schutz, 2009). A person with high self-esteem is adaptive and functional in comparison to other individuals as they estimate their self-worth to be higher which allows them to create better teams and have higher faith in their abilities and capabilities.

Pierce et al. (1989) concept on OBSE related to the level at which an individual believes him/herself to be competent, important, and admirable as part of an organization and this
perception of themselves will have a high influence on their intention to quit. This particularly relates to the prestige and relevance one attaches to themselves just because they have the option to say they work for one ‘suitable’ employer over the next one, high levels of OBSE leads to lower levels of ITQ and the converse is true. The elements that lead to this pride can differ in factors for example good pay, good working conditions, global brand known for its expertise, organizational annual financial and growth performance amongst other factors that enable individuals to feel proud to be associated. Increasing employees’ level of OBSE helps improve organizational outcomes like job performance, job satisfaction and lower levels of turnover intentions (Haar & Brougham, 2011; Cenkci & Ötkenb, 2014). Organizations ought to work towards improving employee feelings and perceptions of their organization to help increase their confidence in the organization they work for, this will help decrease intention to quit to help. Individuals with higher levels of OBSE have the feeling that they are competent to perform their work and the organization is lucky and privileged to have them working for them as their contribution to the overall growth of the organization is clear to them.

Leadership styles have a significant influence on whether employees intend to leave their employer or whether they are willing to stay on. This is also evidenced by the influence of leadership styles on employee’s organizational commitment levels. Autocratic leadership styles that put more emphasis on performance and low emphasis on people leads to a higher intention to quit level (Puni, Agyemang, & Asamoah, 2016). This can be explained by autocratic leaders and how they rely heavily on authority, control, power manipulation and hard work to get work done despite the personal challenges that individuals may be going through in their day to day living. This often causes autocratic leaders coming off as impersonal. Democratic leadership style has a negative relationship with intention to quit (Puni, Agyemang, & Asamoah, 2016) due to the nature of the leaders and their interactions with their juniors. Democratic leaders have a decentralized system of making decisions in an open and participative working environment where juniors feel empowered in their contributions to corporate goals and their growth in the organization since the leaders involve them in various responsibilities and duties. Juniors reporting to democratic leaders have an easier time approaching their superiors when they face glitches in line of work or with other personalities and departments which leads to a better turnaround time in conflict resolution in comparison to juniors who are afraid of their leaders and take a lot of thought and planning before presenting their grievances to their leaders for guidance and eventually resolution.
In the laissez faire leadership style, leaders are not involved in the day to day operations and does not obsessively control their juniors in their performance of their jobs which subsequently gives them a lot of freedom thus causing lower levels of intention to leave (Puni, Agyemang, & Asamoah, 2016). Whilst ITQ levels are lower, the approach to it is not the best as juniors do not gain knowledge through learning from their leaders how to perform their work and potentially making informed decisions in their line of work thus laissez-faire leadership style is akin to poor control and direction in the organization.

Similar research on leadership styles but with a focus on transformational and transactional leadership styles has shown that transformational leaders considerably reduce the intention to leave levels amongst staff and organizational commitment is a positive mediating variable in the same study (Ahmad, Rehman, Shabir, & Razzaq, 2012). This is because transformational leaders are not just concerned with the bottom-line and how well transactions have been done but also make concessions with consideration of the people in the organization who are their most important asset. In a similar research on transformational and transactional leadership styles and their impact on ITQ, it was found that there is a negative correlation with both styles which is contradicting with the study just discussed (Long et al., 2012). This is a case of the working environment influencing the perception since this study was conducted in a university where the respondents usually work independent of their supervisor and have very minimal interaction with their superiors.

2.5 Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)

Organ (1988) defined OCBs as "behaviour(s) of a discretionary nature that are not part of the employee's formal role requirements, but nevertheless promote the effective functioning of the organization". Another definition of OCB uses the characteristics it displays like behaviour which is above and beyond that formally prescribed by a person's organizational role, discretionary behaviour on the part of the employee, behaviours not directly or explicitly rewarded in the organization's formal reward system, and behaviours important for the effective and successful functioning of the organization (Netemeyer, 1997). Examples of organizational citizenship behaviour include fruitful activities such as assisting co-workers in performing work-related tasks, checking in on co-workers when they miss work, working extra hours without pay, going the extra mile in making a newly appointed employee feel welcome, and even small acts like switching off unnecessary rights in the office.
Williams & Anderson (1991) identified the existence of two kinds of OCBs i.e. OCB-O and OCB-I. OCB-O refers to Organizational Citizenship Behaviours that profit the organization by upholding corporate values, preserves and safeguards company’s resources and engaging in activities that enhance the organization’s image. OCB-I refers to Organizational Citizenship Behaviours that profit an individual by serving employees thus enhancing the functioning of a team (by becoming more effective and efficient) and by large influencing the organization. Several variables especially perceptions employees have like leadership styles, job autonomy, organizational support, elements of self-esteem both individual and organizational based may influence if employee behaviours are positive or negative.

Basic foundational research on the influence of demographic factors like age and gender on OCB determined that age has a huge influence on OCB and by extension on Counterproductive Work Behaviours (CWBs) (Diricana & Erdilb, 2016). It is therefore important for organizations to focus on younger employees to help ascertain the individual, organizational and managerial factors that may affect their behaviours in the organization. Elements like tasks, reporting structures, responsibilities, working environment, job autonomy and the like should be considered carefully to ensure that they inspire positive work outcomes and not counterproductive behaviours. From the paper, rewarding extra role behaviours is likely to encourage OCB.

Perceived Organizational Support has a positive impact on OCBs as the employees feel like there is a quid quo pro relationship with the employer thus having a symbiotic relationship (Muhammad, 2014; Raineri, 2013). Similarly, in a different study, management efforts to enhance the perception and reality of organizational support led to higher OCB levels which subsequently affects In-Role Behaviour positively (Piercy et al., 2006). This prompts that management ought to ensure that they continuously support employees in their work related endeavours through training and development, good working environments and also some level of job autonomy amongst other strategies to improve OCB. It also helps in performance of work in the organization thus meeting corporate goals.

OCBs are related to work-group performance, although they tended to predict the quantity of output somewhat better than the quality of output (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & Mackenzie, 1997). In this paper, the focus was on helping behaviour, sportsmanship and civic virtue features that are used to define OCB. Helping behaviour and sportsmanship were positively related to the quantity of work crew performance while civic virtue had no influence on both
quality and quantity. OCB has various components, one is the OCB-I and OCB-O metric while there is also a seven-component metric. Organ (1988) originally identified the following seven OCB components: altruism, courtesy, peace-making, cheerleading, sportsmanship, conscientiousness and civic virtue. 

Job attitudes, task variables and leader behaviours are strongly related to OCBs and this is due to their direct influence on job satisfaction which is a positive mediating variable to OCB. (Podsakoff et al., 2000). Other factors that may have an influence on OCB include personality traits where those orientations may influence how various characteristics of an organization, team or individual trait are perceived by a subject. Leaders may inspire individuals and teams as they perform their roles on a day to day basis which can affect job attitudes, task variables also have an influence in how easily individuals perform their work in an organization which can therefore affect job attitudes which can positively or negatively affect behaviours of people in an organization. It is also possible that individuals in a team can influence each other’s perception which can overall have a detrimental effect on work performance.

Of interest is research that was conducted to understand the influence of various generations to OCB where GenXers (early-to-mid 1960s to the early 1980s) did not appear to make voluntary extra efforts on behalf of their employer as a consequence of their adherence to the company’s goals and values in comparison to Baby Boomers (Raineri, 2013). Workers in GenX manifest their attachment to the company through alternative outcomes such as work satisfaction, intention to stay or job performance while baby boomers (born 1954-1964) are keen on extrinsic motivation factors like salaries and are more loyal to an organization.

2.5.1 Organizational Perceptions on Organization Citizenship Behaviour

Leadership styles have a significant influence on employee behaviours in the organization based on whether the leader is democratic or dictatorial in their management of their juniors. Autocratic leadership style has a negative relationship with OCB whilst Laissez faire has a weak relationship in comparison to democratic leadership which is significantly influential on positive Organizational Citizenship Behaviours (Malik, Saleem, & Naeem, 2016). Leaders should adopt leadership styles that inspires a democratic environment in the organization, it should positively influence employees to engage in positive behaviours both towards the organization and other individuals in the work place. In a similar study based on
the transformational and transactional leadership styles revealed that transformational leaders have a positive influence on OCB whilst transactional leaders do not have a significant influence on OCB (Vigoda-Gadot, 2006). This therefore means that leaders should strive to add more value to both individuals and the organization at large by engaging in traits that are people-centric. This motivates positive performance and reduce the number of counterproductive work behaviours. In the latter study, organizational politics was considered as a mediating variable and it was noted that whilst it had an effect between leadership styles and OCB, the indirect effect was less than the direct effect between the two variables. This ascertains that democratic leadership styles often inspire more positive behaviours amongst staff.

Yukl (2002) proposed a three-dimensional leadership behaviour model that includes “change-oriented leadership”, “task-oriented leadership” and “relationship-oriented leadership”. A review of this leadership style against OCB noted that change-oriented leadership had a mediating effect on organizational citizenship and innovativeness relationship (Ozsahin & Sudak, 2015). Change-oriented leadership is directed towards making strategic decisions, adapting to surrounding change, increasing flexibility and innovation, making drastic changes and innovations in products, services, and processes. It covers the following behaviour sets; intervention to organization culture, formation of vision, implementation of changes and boosting innovation and learning (Yukl, 2002). This further asserts the influence that democratic leadership styles have on OCB but goes a step further to show the value of leaders that are keen on invention and innovation. Such leaders are keen to keep communicating with the juniors on what the value of the change is to the organization whilst ensuring that they are valued and considered in the decision-making processes. This also helps the juniors see the value of the change in as far as meeting the corporate goals and vision of the company is concerned thus leading to adequate positive citizenship behaviours.

Research and studies have been carried out to determine the effect of Hackman and Oldham’s Job Characteristics model on various organizational behaviours. One of the characteristics is Job Autonomy which is reviewed in this section of the research against OCB. Autonomy has a substantial positive connection with OCB (Jinyue, 2010) as ones’ opinion of their own freedom and independency to decide how to perform their work in terms of the order of things and timelines gives one positive feelings that will be observed
in their behaviours whilst performing their job roles and their actions over and above what they are mandated to engage in.

Research has linked both the influence of individual self-esteem in a general sense and their self-esteem as far as their organization is concerned and the effect on their behaviours over and above what they are mandated to perform in the organization (Royle, 2010). Positive self-esteem has a higher and positive effect on OBSE whilst negative self-esteem considerably influences OBSE. Individuals with a positive outlook on themselves are likely to go into an organization with a positive perception of how well they would do in that environment and may believe that the organization requires their capabilities in the organization. High self-esteem individuals are motivated to maintain a positive self-perception and therefore engaging in a high level of performance of their assigned roles and duties as a way in which they can maintain their behaviour consistent with their self-concept (Pourkiania & Askaripoorb, 2015). Individuals with high levels of self-esteem are more likely (in comparison to individuals with lower esteem to engage in positive organizational behaviours due to how they perceive themselves as ‘good-enough’ and ‘better-than’ therefore act positively due to their own perceptions.

Researchers have explored the influence of OBSE on work place behaviours and there is a popular accord that employees high in OBSE exhibit positive behaviours in the workplace. OBSE has a significant and positive effect on OCBI and OCBO (Pourkiania & Askaripoorb, 2015; Qureshi, Shahjehan, Zeb, & Saifullah, 2011). Which is evidenced by employees feeling or perceiving that they are taken seriously, are important and valuable to the organization and they believe they can make significant differences in the performance of the goals and objectives of the organization. This confidence is exuded by the organization striving to ensure that their employees are motivated and maintain a positive self-perception of their contribution and relevance to the organization. Through such perceptions employees are keen to act in favour of their workmates (OCB-I) and the organization (OCB-O) through their actions to support each other especially when some workmates are faced with personal challenges in performance of their work and engaging in activities and discussions that help improve the overall ‘brand’ of the organization to the general public. This shows that employees value more than just monetary compensation in their consideration of work and their work behaviours in the workplace which further affirms the responsibility of employers to ensure that employees feel that they are working for the right organization and in the right
job evidenced by the affirmations they receive in the office and their hope for the future (Rotich, 2016).

2.6 The Mediating Role of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Perceptions and Behaviours

2.6.1 The Mediating Effects of Team Cohesion

There are a broad range of factors that can mediate the effects of team inputs on outcomes, one major mediating variable is team cohesion which we will delve into further in this section of the review. Leadership styles impact on team cohesion leading to various behaviours. One such behaviour is group potency where transformational leadership is influenced by group potency but is influenced by group cohesion (García-Guiu, Moya, Molero, & Moriano, 2016). The traits in transformational leadership that inspire such effects have to do with leaders who inspire the members of a group to identify with a team and to take ownership of their own tasks and responsibilities whilst working with the rest of the team through effective communication to ensure delivery of the various elements of a group task (López, Alons, Morales, & León, 2015). Transformational leaders should ensure that there is a strong leader-follower relationship in addition to follower-follower relationship which can be promoted through open and transparent communication amongst all team members. Another key trait that leaders should possess in leadership is trust and its traits of ability, benevolence and integrity to inspire adequate positive traits leading to team cohesion. Team trust and team cohesion jointly and fully mediate the relationship between various team factors to ensure overall team satisfaction and subsequently team performance (Lu, 2015). Perceptions of trust of team members inspires them to get motivated and do their part to withhold the team spirit which leads to positive work behaviours.

OCB-I has a strong predicting effect on group cohesion but in a research to review the relationship between OCB-I and team performance, it was noted that group cohesion fully mediated the influence of OCB-I on team performance (Lin & Peng, 2010). It is therefore prudent for organizations to ensure that the teams work effectively and efficiently together to leverage on behaviours that individuals have towards each other like showing concern when one team member is unwell and helping them with their work if necessary to ensure that the overall team performance is upheld. Other factors that lead to positive group cohesion amongst group members is task interdependence and group interdependence which play a huge role in inspiring group cohesion among group members (Chun-Hsi Vivian Chen,
These factors, task and group interdependence, create a work environment that is favourable for positive interaction and strong group identity which therefore inspires positive group cohesion. Positive and high group cohesion leads to high team performance and positive OCB traits thus this research supports the former research on the influence that group cohesion has on team performance.

### 2.6.2 The Mediating Effects of Organizational Commitment

The importance of Organizational Commitment as a mediating variable in this study is to determine the influence organizational perceptions and behaviours have on organizational commitment and how behaviours are impacted. Committed employees take pride in working for a certain employer and believe in the goals and objectives, values and mandate of an organization leading to have higher levels of performance and productivity. With that, a company will focus on the bottom line and corporate strategies as opposed to wasting corporate resources on disciplinary issues coming from uncommitted employees (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

As mentioned earlier, OC is largely researched against job satisfaction, research has also been conducted to determine if the relationship still holds between work related antecedents like job satisfaction have an important impact on organizational outcomes like intention to leave. Results show that there is a partially mediating role, where one of the multidimensional components of OC have more influence on the outcome than a fully mediated (with all components) and a non-mediating review (Clugston, 2000).

The mediating effect of Organizational Commitment was reviewed to establish the impact of Perceived Organizational Support (POS) on job satisfaction and OC and it was noted that affective organizational commitment had more influence than OC as a whole which in turn leads to positive work outcomes (Muhammad, 2014). This research is evidence that employees’ attitudes and behaviours is directly affected by the support they receive from their superiors and the organization to perform their work effectively and efficiency thus making it a social exchange process. Organizations should strive to set up policies and procedures that foster an environment that gives employees the perception that they are supported by the organization.

A research was carried out to review the mediating effect of organizational commitment on variables like organizational justice, culture and leadership style and it was noted that organizational commitment had the most significant effect on OCB among employees.
against the other aforementioned variables (Khan & Rashid, 2012). The impact of organizational commitment is undeniable in as far as work behaviours exhibited by employees is concerned and it is the importance of the organization to review various individual, team and organizational constructs to help determine their effect on organizational commitment as well as on work behaviours to help ensure that they are not missing the mark in as far as inspiring high levels of commitment in the organization are concerned.

Commitment is influenced by experiences at work, the impact of organizational arrangements, and characteristics of the job itself more than individual factors (Balfour & Wechsler, 1996). Personal characteristics play an important role, nonetheless, as determinants of the outcome variables like turnover intent. Ergo, the organization has more influence on organizational commitment than individual factors like self-esteem and should strive to ensure that there is constant and consistent genuine motivation by the organization to have highly committed employees which in effect positively influences work behaviours.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

A summary of the literature review present above giving the relationship between the variables in review for this research is given below in the conceptual framework.
2.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter is on the literature review that answers the research questions on the influence organizational perceptions have on organizational behaviours in firms in Kenya’s Financial Industry, particularly SACCOs. It also delves into the effects of mediating variables like Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment and how these variables influence the Organizational Behaviours, this research has limited its research on Intention to Quit and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Through this research, we gain an understanding on what factors affect employees and to what extent these factors influence their behaviours.

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 focussed on the methodology used to perform the research. It elaborates the analysis method adopted to compete the study. It offers a description and express justification of the analysis method applied and includes the following subsections: Research Design, Population and Sampling Design, Data Collection Methods, Research Procedures, Data Analysis and finally a chapter Summary.

3.2 Research Design

Research design is the determination of the analysis approach or strategy adopted for the actual project and helps answer the research question(s), specifying the sources from which you intend to collect data, proposition of how to collect and analyse ethical issues and the constraints one is likely to encounter (Cooper & Schindler, 2008; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016).

This research adopted a descriptive design approach as this approach helps gain an accurate profile of events, persons and situations (Saunders et al., 2016). This design helped the researcher to review observations in the study which helped form a decent sample that were used to make inferences on the whole population.

3.3 Population and Sampling

3.3.1 Population

According to (Sekaran, 2003) a population refers to an entire group of people, events, or things of interest that the researcher wishes to investigate while the target population is a subset of the population (Saunders et al., 2016) that the researcher looks into to make inferences on the whole population. The population was made up of employees of Saccos operating in Kenya. To help identify the respondents of the study, simple random sampling was used considered and convenience was a major factor used to identify specifically identify the specific respondents. Primary data was collected through administering questionnaires.
3.3.2 Sampling Design

Sampling is the process of selecting items from the population so that the sample characteristics can be generalized to the population and factors in the design choice and sample size decisions (Sekaran, 2003). According to (Gill & Johnson, 2010) it is impractical to involve all members of the population thus selecting who participates in the survey is a critical issue that researchers should carefully consider ensuring validity and reliability of information. One key consideration in the individuals involved in the data collection was convenience.

3.3.3 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame is a complete list of all the cases in the target population from which your sample will be drawn (Saunders et al., 2016) which is essential while using probability sampling. However, since this research is using non-probability sampling there is no need for a sampling frame.

3.3.4 Sampling Technique and Size

Non-probability sampling technique was used in this research study as elements of population do not have a known or predetermined chance of being selected as subject for survey (Sekaran, 2003). Of the various non-probability sampling technique, convenience sampling and snowball sampling were considered most appropriate and as such adopted for this research. Convenience sampling was used due to the ease of data collection based on proximity and accessibility of the respondents whilst snowball sampling was used due to the ease of identified recruited respondents can refer other respondents to get involved in participating in the study (Saunders et al., 2016).

It is essential to determine an appropriate sample size that represents SACCO employees in Kenya. Strictly speaking, larger sample sizes are a more accurate reflection of the whole population whilst having too large a sample can weaken the relationships between variables as it would still give significant levels of relationship regardless of whether that is the actual case or not (Saunders et al., 2016).

Roscoe (1975) suggested an approach to help deal with the issue of sample size using various rules of thumb. First, samples of 30 or more are recommended for experimental research. In multivariate research, the sample size should be at least ten times larger than the number of variables being considered. For our study, we have a total of 8 variables and at least 80
respondents should be sought for the research which is larger than the minimum of 30 which is recommended to ensure the researcher accrues the benefits of central limit theorem (as cited in Hill, 1988).

Applying the formula recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) where

\[ N = 50 + 8m \]

Where \( N = \) sample size, \( m = \) number of independent variables

i.e.

\[ N = 50 + 8m \]

\[ = 50 + 8(4) \text{ i.e. Job Aspects, Self-esteem, Organizational Based Esteem and Leadership Styles} \]

\[ = 82 \]

Along with the rule of thumb proposed by Roscoe (1975), the sample size for this study was decided to be about 200.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The study used primary data collected using questionnaires. According to (Sekaran, 2003) questionnaires are preformulated written set of questions to which respondents record their answers within closely defined alternatives and can either be personally administered questionnaires or online questionnaires. For this study, only close ended questions were used in line with the objectives of the study. A five-point Likert scale was also used ranging from 1 to 5 with 1 being ‘strongly disagree’, 2 was ‘disagree’, 3 was ‘neither agree or disagree’, 4 was ‘agree’ and 5 was ‘strongly agree’. This Likert scale allowed the respondents to give their opinions and feelings to the questions paused.

Sekaran (2003) in his book listed the advantages of questionnaires being affordable, easy to administer, can reach a wider scope, anonymity is high but noted that it is difficult to obtain responses from unwilling respondents which can lead to data collection taking a longer than expected period.

The independent variables of this study are self-esteem, Organizational Based Self-esteem, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles while the dependent variables are Intention to Quit and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. In addition, this research has 2 mediating
variables i.e. Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment. The study aimed to assess how organizational perceptions (independent variables) affect organizational behaviours (dependent variables). All these sections are contained in the questionnaire which started with obtaining the respondents’ demographic data.

3.5 Research Procedure

To begin, an introductory letter from the university was requested and obtained detailing the validity of the research and gives the reader the assurance that the data collected from this study will be treated with utmost confidentiality. This in addition with the questionnaires was used to gain the confidence of the various respondents and thus obtaining the responses. In some instances, the approval to use a specific institution to collect data was obtained through the leadership of the organization i.e. either the CEO or Head of Human Resources thus making it easier to obtain larger number of responses. Once all the data has been received, a data sanitising exercise was carried out prior to data analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis

After data collection, data was sanitized and summarised. The researcher went through each questionnaire and ensured that they are adequate to the type of data and information being collected. In some instances, some responses were not deemed adequate and as such were discarded prior to analysis. The next step was coding in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program where all questions were coded to ensure that all details were captured. Data entry was carried out before the final analysis was done. The study used quantitative data analysis. Quantitative data analysis refers to numerical data and can range from simple counts such as frequency of occurrences to complex data such as test scores, (Saunders et al., 2003). Descriptive statistics was employed to compare variables numerically and make interpretation easier. Pearson correlation analysis was also used to determine the significance of the various factors, a p value of <0.05 was used as a base for a significant relationship.

The next step was Multiple Regression Review in the M+ Plus software where explorative factor analysis (EFA), comparative factor analysis (CFA) and regressions were reviewed to determine the best data fit for the model.
3.7 Construct Measurement

All survey items were based on 5-point Likert-type scales, ranging from strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree to disagree, agree to strongly agree. The constructs and their measurement are described in the section below and the detailed scale items are listed in the appendix.

3.7.1 Origin of Constructs

Self-esteem

The self-esteem variable was reviewed based on the Rosenberg Self-esteem scale which comprises of 10 questions like, ‘on the whole, I am satisfied with myself’ and ‘I feel that I have a number of good qualities’ (Rosenberg, 1965). These help an individual critically review their own perceptions of themselves that help the research determine individual perceptions that may have an impact on organizational behaviours. The scale also comprises of negative questions like, ‘at times I think I am no good at all’ that help in ensuring respondents are paying attention to their responses in the research.

OBSE

To establish an individual's level of self-esteem specific to their employer, the Organizational Based Self-esteem construct that contains 10 questions like, ‘I am taken seriously’ and ‘I am trusted’ (Pierce et al., 1989) was used.

Individual Job Aspects

To review job aspects, a variation of various job aspects and combined them to create a questionnaire that is suitable to help identify what an individual considers vital for their work and directly affects intention to quit which is one of the key organizational behaviour variables in review (Ghosh et al., 2013). some of the key aspects are job autonomy, goal clarity, organizational culture, compensation and benefits and employee engagement.

Leadership Styles

For the measurement of leadership styles, the study used Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ – 5X) which is the most popular measurement scale for transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles. The current MLQ questionnaire contains 45 questions but only 13 were used in this study. They represented transformational leadership (idealized influenced, inspirational motivational, intelligent
stimulation and individualized consideration), transactional leadership (Contingency Reward, Management by exception and Passive Management by exception) and laissez-faire leadership.

**Team Cohesion**

The team cohesion variable was reviewed using the team work engagement scale. This scale was adopted from the HERO questionnaire and comprises of 3 main sections i.e. vigour, dedication and absorption (Salanova et al., 2012). Vigour comprises of 7 questions like, ‘During the task, my team feels full of energy’ and ‘My team feels strong and vigorous during the task’. Dedication comprises of questions like, ‘My team is enthusiastic about the job’ while absorption comprises questions like, ‘when my team is working, we forget everything else around us’ and ‘my team gets “carried away” by the task’.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment was measured using scales developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and taken from (Labatmedienë, Endriulaitienë, & Gu, 2007). It is composed of the three components of commitment i.e. affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. It contains items like, ‘I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization’, ‘Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now’ and ‘Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me’ which respectively represent the 3 components of commitment. In summary, the organizational commitment variable has 24 questions, with 8 questions representing the 3 components.

**OCB**

Lee and Allen (2002) scale that measures Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Organization and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour - Individual was used to measure the OCB. The items have been presented beginning with the Individual item questions like, ‘I show genuine concern and courtesy toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations’ and followed up with the Organizational item questions, ‘I defend the organization when other employees criticize it’.
ITQ

Turnover intention was measured by Mobley scale that consists 5 items. It consists items like, ‘It is highly likely that I will leave my current job in the next 1 year’. With this variable the higher the score, the higher the intention to leave your employer.

3.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter offers insight on how the study was conducted. It highlighted the data collection and analysis methods applied and provides relevant justification as to the various techniques employed in the analysis stage. The following chapters four and five respectively present the findings of the results carried out and the conclusion of the research in its entirety.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This chapter will present the findings of the study regarding the influence certain organizational perceptions (Self-esteem, Organizational Based Self-esteem, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles) have on organizational perceptions (Intention to Quit and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour) and the mediating effect that Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment has on the research.

4.1 Response Rate

The initial aim of the study was to collect responses from 250 respondents, but we only received 202 full and complete responses which was 81.2% success rate. The response rate is above the success rate of 60% thus rendering the study successful (Cooper & Schindler, 2011).

4.2 Demographic Data

4.2.1 Gender

The questionnaires were distributed indiscriminately but we established that there were more female respondents in comparison to the male respondents. Of the 202 responses, 114 were female while 89 were male which constituted 56.2% and 43.8% respectively.

![Fig 4.1 Respondents' Gender](image)

Fig 4.1 Respondents' Gender
4.2.2 Age

We reviewed the number of employees working in the Sacco sector and established that the majority at 77.34% were either between 25-30 years of age or between 31-35 years of age at 53.2% to 24.14% respectively. This shows that majority of the current workforce is currently filled with generation Y and Echo Boomers which shows that the management and especially HR team members ought to understand how best to manage these generations to help increase their levels of commitment thus influencing the organizational behaviours. The total number of employees over 50 and approaching the Kenyan retirement age of 60 keeps reducing and is currently at 2% which also represents that the older staff members who may have more experience may not be as highly represented.

![Fig 4.2 Respondents' Age](image)

4.2.3 Employees’ Position in the Organization

The employees’ rank in the organization was also sought to help establish their position where more than half are supervisors at 52.7% whilst entry level employees were at 35.47% with senior managers at 11.33%.
Fig 4.3 Respondents' Organizational Rank

4.2.4 Years of Experience

From the respondents, most of the Sacco employees involved in this research had worked in their respective organizations’ for between 1-6 years which shows relatively moderate tenures at 67%. In general terms, individuals do not work for more than a decade for the same employer but in this study only 6.4% of the total respondents worked in the same company.
Fig 4.4 Respondents' Years of Experience

4.3 Reliability Tests

A reliability test is carried out to verify and validate if the responses received are consistent and stable which is done using Cronbach Alpha (Sekaran, 2003). Sekaran (2003) defines the Cronbach’s alpha as a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are correlated to each other. From the table below, we see that most alpha values range from 0.752 (Self-esteem) to 0.938 (Team Cohesion); the closer a value is to 1 the higher the internal consistency reliability.

Based on the values presented below, all the variables were maintained for this research due to the consistency and stability of the results obtained.
### Table 4.1 Reliability Tests

#### 4.4 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics table below gives the total means and standard deviations of all the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Based Self-esteem (OBSE)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Job Autonomy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Styles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Cohesion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to Quit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics

The questionnaire used to collect data for this research had a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 5 with some variables averaging at means of above 4 like self-esteem, OBSE and OCB at 4.1, 4.14 and 4.08 respectively. Individual Job Autonomy had a mean of 3.66,
Leadership Styles 3.52, Organizational Commitment 3.04 and Intention to Quit had the lowest mean at 2.83.

The standard deviations of the variables are self-esteem at 0.59, OBSE AT 0.63, Individual Job Autonomy 0.8, leadership styles at 0.67, Team Cohesion at 0.69, Organizational Commitment at 0.4, OCB at 0.57 and ITQ at 0.93. The total number of respondents varied from one variable to the next which was mostly due to some respondents not answering all the questions in the category.

4.5 Correlation Analysis

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. Correlation analysis relationship between two variables is denoted by ‘r’ which is always between -1 and +1 with a negative value depicting a negative relationship and a positive value depicting a positive relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Self Esteem</td>
<td>(0.752)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 OBSE</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>(0.909)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Job Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>.643**</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Leadership Styles</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.698**</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Team Cohesion</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>(0.938)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OCB</td>
<td>-0.322**</td>
<td>.279**</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>(0.729)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 OCB</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>.658**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.669**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>(0.787)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ITQ</td>
<td>-0.224**</td>
<td>-0.306**</td>
<td>-0.418**</td>
<td>-0.283**</td>
<td>-0.248**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.344**</td>
<td>(0.909)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 4.3 Pearson Correlation

4.5.1 Self-esteem

OBSE and OCB have a positive correlation with self-esteem. OBSE has a low positive correlation with self-esteem at r=0.19 but with a highly significant relationship at 0.009 while OCB also has a low positive correlation at 0.042 with a very low significance of 0.5.

the other variables have a negative correlation with Organizational Commitment having the highest negative correlation at -.322 that is highly significant.
4.5.2 Organizational Based Self Esteem

All variables have a positive correlation with OBSE with autonomy, OCB and team cohesion having the highest values at $r=0.643$, $r=0.627$ and $r=0.532$ respectively and all are highly significant. The only variable that had a negative correlation with OBSE was intention to quit at $-0.306$ which was also highly significant.

4.5.3 Individual Job Autonomy

The highest correlation of the model was between team cohesion and individual job autonomy at $r=0.7$ proving that individual feelings of freedom to plan their work and their deadlines has a high influence on their participation in team activities. Most organizations currently have their work divided to be performed in reliance with other team members and as such it is vital that individual job autonomy is encouraged to ensure that teams perform cohesively. Leadership Styles, OCB and Organizational Commitment at $r=0.698$, $r=0.658$ and $r=0.574$ respectively. The only negative correlation was with ITQ at -0.418 and all the relationships were highly significant.

4.5.4 Leadership Styles

Leadership styles have a high positive correlation with Team Cohesion, Organizational Commitment and OCB at $r = 0.624$, $r=0.529$ and $r=0.531$ which shows that there is a high impact of how the leader is perceived by their subordinates in the organization. This therefore means that organizations ought to ensure that their leaders inspire positive motivations within the team members due to the high influence on the teams’ cohesion levels and how individuals commit to the organization. Leadership styles have a negative correlation with ITQ at -0.283 thus positive leadership style perception reduces individual intentions to leave prior to their actual act of leaving their employer. All these correlations are highly significant.

4.5.5 Team Cohesion

Team cohesion has a higher positive correlation with OCB at $r=0.669$ and a moderate positive correlation with Organizational Commitment at $r=0.45$ whilst has a negative correlation with ITQ at $r=-0.248$. this shows that team cohesion increases the levels of employee actions towards other employees and the organization at high positive levels prompting the need for the organization fostering good team cohesion habits as it also impacts on the extent to which individuals willingly commit to their organization which
eventually reduces their intention to quit levels as evidenced by the negative correlation. All these correlations are highly significant.

4.5.6 Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment has an impact on organizational behaviours with a moderate positive correlation of $r=0.445$ with OCB ($0.3 < |r| < 0.5$) which shows that the increase between the two variables increase together proving that a positive organizational commitment will lead to employees depicting more positive organizational citizenship behaviours towards the individual and the organization. There is however a low negative correlation of $r=-0.110$ with ITQ showing that if organizational commitment levels increase they impact on employee intentions to leave negatively thus leading to a reduction in employee intentions to leave the organization.

4.5.7 Organization Citizenship Behaviour

All variables have a positive correlation with ITQ which is evidence that positive organizational perceptions (Self-esteem, Organizational Based Self-esteem, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles), the considered mediating variables of team cohesion and organizational commitment all inspire employees to exude positive behaviours to each other and towards the organization.

It is the responsibility of every organization especially through their management and boards to create a good environment which will enable employees to be caring and considerate of each other and also of their organization.

4.5.8 Intention to Quit

All variables in research have a negative correlation with ITQ which is evidence that positive perceptions (Self-esteem, Organizational Based Self-esteem, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles), Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment reduce the levels of intention to quit and they all have a significant level. Organizations should ensure that there is a constant effort through different channels to reduce individual intending to leave through ensuring they create a positive working environment for their employees.
4.6 Structural Equation Modelling

4.6.1 Results of Structural Equation Model

The diagram below gives a summary of the direct effects of the final path model for the review. From this research, it shows that all the relationships between the independent variables (OBSE, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles) and the mediating variables (Team Cohesion and Organization Commitment) are not significant but the relationships between the mediating variables and the dependent variables (OCB and ITQ) are highly significant at p values of less than 0.05.

![Diagram showing direct effects of the Structural Model](image)

**Fig 4.5 Direct Effects of the Structural Model**

4.6.2 Specific Relationships between Variables

4.6.2.1 OBSE

The relationship between Organizational Based Self-esteem and team cohesion is not significant and neither is the relationship between OBSE nor Organizational Commitment. The unstandardized effect was 0.14 and 0.07 respectively.

4.6.2.2 Individual Autonomy

The relationship between individual job autonomy and team cohesion is not significant and neither is the relationship between job autonomy nor organizational commitment. The unstandardized effect is 0.024 and 0.191 respectively.
4.6.2.3 Leadership Styles

The relationship between leadership styles and team cohesion is not significant and neither is the relationship between leadership styles nor organizational commitment. The unstandardized effect is 0.21 and 0.000 respectively.

4.6.2.4 Team Cohesion

Team cohesion has a statistically significant relationship with Organizational Commitment and the same is true for team cohesion and both OCB and ITQ. Of the three variables, it has the highest impact with OCB at 0.45 which shows that how cohesive a team is has a large influence on organizational behaviours in the industry.

4.6.2.5 Organizational Commitment

The relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Behaviours (OCB and ITQ) is significant in the industry thus evidence of an increase in Organizational Commitment levels impacting the behaviours positively with 0.31 with OCB and 0.14 with ITQ.

4.6.2.6 OCB

The relationship between the two organizational behaviours OCB and ITQ is statistically significant at 0.238.

4.6.3 Structural Equation Modelling

Alternative Models were tried to compare and find the best fit for the research model. The final model picked had a CFI of 0.991 and a TLI of 0.973. The RMSEA was at 0.036 and SRMR was at 0.03. the degrees of freedom were at 6 thus giving us a good model fit.

The other models below were tried using various criterion. The first model was without the mediating variables which were considered all non-significant in the direct relationships, but it did not produce a good fit. The second model was tried without OCB and OCB and the other two models were missing one mediating variable i.e. No TC for Model 3 and No OC for Model 4. The table below gives a summary of the trials used to determine the best fit model.
As earlier noted, the mediating variables in this study of Organizational Commitment and Team Cohesion were not returning a significant path analysis to the model in the attempt to ascertain if they have significant mediating effects in Kenya’s SACCO industry. For example, the review between OBSE and both dependent variables i.e. ITQ and OCB through the mediating variables TC and OC led to insignificant paths. OBSE → OC → ITQ had an unstandardized estimate of b=0.023, SE=0.055 and a p-value of 0.68 and OBSE → TC → ITQ of b=0.046, SE=0.047 and a p-value of 0.325.

Table 4.5 Summary of Mediating Effects of the Final Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Seab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY → OC → ITQ</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY → TC → ITQ</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE → OC → ITQ</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE → TC → ITQ</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER → OC → ITQ</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER → TC → ITQ</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY → OC → OCB</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY → TC → OCB</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE → OC → OCB</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSE → TC → OCB</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER → OC → OCB</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADER → TC → OCB</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Chapter Summary

The chapter gives a summary of all the data collected from the questionnaires distributed. It offers explanations on the response rate, reliability and validity tests and their relevance towards the research. This chapter has presented results on the influence of the Organizational Perceptions and their level of influence towards the mediating variables and the dependent variables. It also explores the impact mediating variables have on the dependent variables. The next chapter offers the study’s discussion, conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Chapter five aims to present the relevance and applicability of this research on the effects of organizational perceptions on organizational behaviours in the financial sector of Kenya with a focus on Saccos. This will be achieved through the summary, discussion, conclusion and recommendations as determined from conducting this research.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The main aim of this research was to investigate what factors influence organizational behaviours with a limit on self-esteem, OBSE, Individual Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles and the mediating effect that Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment. The study was guided by the following research objectives: the effect of organizational perceptions on team cohesion and organizational commitment, the effects of team cohesion and organizational commitment on organizational behaviour and mediating role of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Perceptions and Behaviours.

The study was limited to employees of Kenya’s Sacco Industry whose specifics and opinions on the data collected is using questionnaires. The questions listed in the questionnaire were obtained from other pre-tested scholars who defined questions specific to the variables. These questionnaires were shared out and responses requested from them SACCO employees. The aim was 250 respondents, but the study only managed 202 responses. The data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and M Plus.

The study showed that employees had significant individual organizational perceptions that influenced organizational behaviours directly. For the large part, organizational perceptions positively affected organizational citizenship behaviour thus high perceptions led to high organizational citizenship behaviours both to the individual and the organization. However, high organizational perceptions significantly influenced intention to quit negatively which led to reduced turnover levels in the organization. The variables of team cohesion and organizational commitment were both not found to have significant mediating effects to the review between organizational perceptions and behaviours.

The Cronbach Alpha’s for all the variables in review were above 0.7 as presented in table 4.1 which shows that the responses obtained for this research were consistent and stable. The results of the correlations showed that there is a positive and significant correlation between
OBSE, Job Autonomy and Leadership Styles and team cohesion at $p<0.01$. The same trend was also noted between OBSE, job Autonomy and Leadership styles against organizational commitment. Self-esteem however has a negative correlation with organizational commitment and team cohesion. The relationship between the mediating variables was such that team cohesion was positively and significantly correlated with organizational commitment at $r=0.45$ at $p<0.01$.

The relationship between all the organizational perceptions and OCB was positively correlated but negatively correlated with ITQ at $p<0.01$.

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 The Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

5.2.1.1 The Effect of SE on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

According to Pierce et al (1989) employees with higher self-esteem foster positive work attitudes and the alternative is true. However, this contradicts this research as the effect of self-esteem on both mediating variables was not significant showing that employees may continue to have Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment despite their self-esteem levels. Self esteem levels in this research was found to be very high amongst the respondents. Employees tend to have high vigour, dedication and absorption in their work and pick up either normative, affective and continuance organization commitment levels due to other factors but not just self-esteem.

The results of this study are also conflicting with the results of another study that found high self-esteem levels to predict high team cohesion and organizational commitment (Kaymak, 2011). However, this research is also in support of the results of our study that found high team cohesion to have a predicting and highly significant relationship with organizational commitment. This can be explained by the fact that Kenyans consider good human relations to be very important in their attitudes towards an organization as employees can rely on each other to navigate working environments as individuals encourage each other thus promoting high affective commitment levels. This variable was not particularly significant in the final model and was as such dropped.
5.2.1.2 The Effect of OBSE on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

The results of our study showed that there is a non-significant relationship between OBSE and Team Cohesion and Organizational commitment with values of 0.14 and 0.07 respectively which are greater than the ideal p-value of 0.05. This is despite individuals perceiving their OBSE levels to be high.

In contrasting works, there was a positive relationship between individual OBSE and team cohesion factors like effectiveness and team involvement (Gardner & Pierce, 2016). High levels of OBSE inspire greater team cohesion and Organizational Commitment but in the Kenyan context, high levels of OBSE do not necessarily affect the two variables. This could be due to the cultural thinking of the Kenyans, they are more inclined to be ‘helpful’ and ‘considerate’ of their team members during performance of work and this is not necessarily affected by whether their OBSE levels are significant or not.

Our results are incongruent with two other studies that found that low OBSE levels significantly affected the overall commitment of their employees and the converse is true where high OBSE levels would lead to higher commitment levels since the relationship between the two variables is significant (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1993; Hui & Lee, 2000). The Kenyan financial industry is currently facing a lot of staff turnover, especially in the banks, where individuals are losing their jobs due to the reduction in total profits due to the interest capping law. These external factors may have caused workers in the larger financial industry to have higher commitment levels due to the high turnover in their counterparts as business, especially loan taking, has customers moving from banks to saccos.

5.2.1.3 The Effect of Individual Job Autonomy on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

Job tasks and autonomy are an important influence on how well an individual will be committed to an organization and especially how well they work within a team to produce the expected results as expected of the team. In our findings, job autonomy does not have a significant influence on team cohesion with a p-value of -0.024 which is in line with various researches that found high individual autonomy to be harmful to group effectiveness and this is especially true in self managing teams (Langfred, 2000; Langfred, 2004). This could be as a result of individuals with high autonomy finding it difficult to take a backseat in assignments and let the overall team work together who might affect the delivery of their
output, team autonomy is better suited to affect team cohesion positively (Langfred, 2000). Too many freedoms can at times lead to a clash in different personalities that may be working in the same team.

In addition, high levels of job autonomy did not have a significant influence on organizational commitment with a p-value of 0.19 which is in line with another research that found that high autonomy is not necessarily a sign of high commitment levels amongst employees (Lin & Ping, 2016). Autonomy needs to be properly managed and balanced based on the type of task at hand as it can cause more harm than good if freedoms are left without adequate monitoring. In addition, high levels of job autonomy can also be detrimental to a person who might translate this to a lack of support, challenge or guidance therefore leading to low organizational commitment. High levels of job autonomy can also be a sign of laissez faire leadership which does not support individual growth in technical know-how and can lead to poor output in assigned job roles which further builds employee frustration.

5.2.1.4 The Effect of Leadership Styles on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

As with the other independent variables mentioned above, leadership styles did not have a significant influence on team cohesion and organizational commitment despite employees having relatively moderate perceptions of their leaders. The recorded non-significant p-values in our research was 0.21 with team cohesion and 0 with organizational commitment. This is in line with other research that found that leaders who are benevolent in nature influence cohesiveness in a team in comparison to more autocratic leaders (Vahdani et al., 2012).

A lack of positive yet inspiring leadership traits in a team or organization at large can lead to employees turning to each other for support and can further have a more cohesive relationship regardless of their leaders. This is supported with another research in the sporting world where bad coaches did not affect team commitment levels especially continuance commitment due to the affiliation the players had with the sporting team (Aoyagi, 2008). The same is true for commitment levels where individuals may find that other factors like their position in the organization, their potential for growth and exciting assignments can cause individuals to still have high commitment despite not getting the necessary motivation from their direct leaders.
Whilst leadership traits are often a key factor to determine team relationships and commitment levels in an organization, in some instances other factors like brand perception in the case of prestigious institutions or career progression take precedence and individuals obtain inner strength to be resilient because of the overall benefits they stand to accrue despite the working environment. In this instance, normative commitment takes precedence over both affective and continuance commitment which is likely to be the case in this research.

5.2.2 The Effects of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviour

5.2.2.1 The Effects of Team Cohesion on Organizational Behaviour

Our findings demonstrate that team cohesion in the Sacco industry has a highly significant influence on ITQ and OCB with p-values of 0.45 and 0.33 respectively. This is because how well a team interacts and performs work creates a very positive working environment for all employees.

Our results contradict the results of a study that found that team cohesion does not necessarily influence ITQ in as far as strong bonds, especially friendship bonds in the workplace are concerned. This was justified in that friendships are not limited to the working environment, but individuals can carry on their friendship after they leave an employer especially if there are other negative perception factors in the office (Honda & Takamizawa, 2017). It however is supported by a different study which found that negative group cohesion increases group conflict which in turn causes higher levels of relational conflict (Pyne, 2007). Kenyans are a people who thrive on relationships and the type of relationships individuals have in a team can affect if team members want to remain working with and in the same team. Good and working relationships inspires team members to want to play their role and maintain the good neighbourliness which if disrupted by conflict leads to team members actively looking to leave the toxicity in the environment in which they spend most of their time in.

Team cohesion in this industry also affects OCB as individuals will only want to treat their fellow colleagues well if they have a good working relationship amongst themselves. Work in SACCOs is often interdependent with relating work objectives where one departments’ input is another departments’ output. This school of though was maintained by other researches that found that team cohesion is positively and significantly related to OCB,
especially OCB-I (Martinez, 2013; Ngxukumeshe, Smith, & Mazibuko, 2016). Good teamwork leads to more effective and efficient performance of job tasks.

5.2.2.2 The Effects of Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviour

The results show that there is a moderate level of organizational commitment amongst the respondents with a mean of 3.04 but there is a high positive significance between organizational commitment and both ITQ and OCB with p-values of 0.31 and 0.14 respectively. The relationship between OC and ITQ is negatively related while that with OCB is positively related.

The results of this research are in-line with research that says positive and higher commitment levels lower negative behaviours like ITQ and increase positive work behaviours like OCB-I and OCB-O (Sarmawa, 2015; Khan & Rashid, 2012). SACCO employees with high commitment levels exude positive organizational behaviour habits which would then lead to a more engaging and positive working environment that helps with achieving goals in the workplace. Organizations should ensure that they have highly committed workforce as the returns are immense even to the bottom-line through reducing turnover costs. Another research whose results are like this research found that high commitment levels can easily be cultivated in organizations through open and transparent communication with employees into corporate strategies which positively increases overall OCB-O (DeConnick & Bachmann, 2011). Because the SACCO industry is growing, it is possible that management is keen in communicating the potential and growth strategies of the organizations to their employees who therefore see their potential value and current place in their respective organization leading to higher commitment levels and positive organizational citizenship traits. This in turn lowers turnover intent levels and overall turnover levels.

5.2.3 The Mediating Effect of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on the relationship between Organizational Perceptions and Organizational Behaviours

The path between individual autonomy and ITQ with organizational commitment as a mediating variable had a p-value of 0.358 while the path between OBSE and ITQ with organizational commitment as a mediating variable had a p-value of 0.681. The last variable path in the best fit model is between leadership styles and ITQ with organizational commitment as a mediating variable had a p-value of 0.998 which were greater than 0.05. This research shows that in the path between the individual organizational perceptions and
ITQ were not significantly mediated by organizational commitment which was supported by another research that established that organizational commitment is influenced more by job characteristics and less by individual factors which our research was largely based on (Balfour & Wechsler, 1996). In a different research it was found that organizational commitment was a positive mediating variable between individual organizational perceptions like leadership styles especially with transformational leadership styles (Ahmad et al., 2012).

The path between the various individual perceptions and ITQ with team cohesion as a mediating variable all had had p-values that were greater than 0.05. The specific values of the individual perceptions in the aforementioned path was individual autonomy with a value of 0.884, OBSE at 0.325 and leadership styles with 0.085. Team cohesion, has a direct effect on ITQ as evidenced in our research with a direct and significant effect of 0.33 which is affected by other individual perceptions like leadership skills have a direct role in influencing team cohesion (Faunce, 1993) but this did not have an effect in the context of this research model. Team cohesion is operationalized along social and task dimensions (Lee et al., 2012) and individual perceptions may still affect behaviours regardless of whether task dimensions in the Kenyan financial sector are established or not. These dimensions that help in the efficiency and effectiveness of task performance are not necessarily considered as vital as social dimensions in the team in influencing whether individuals may want to continue working for the same employer or leave in the near future.

The path between individual autonomy and OCB with organizational commitment as a mediating variable had a p-value of 0.378 while the same path with OBSE as the individual perception had a p-value of 0.684 and that with leadership styles as the independent variable had a p-value of 0.998 which are all greater than 0.05. These findings were found to be contrasting with other research works that found that organizational commitment had a significant mediating influence on OCB as an organizational behaviour (Khan & Rashid, 2012; Paul, Bamel, & Garg, 2016). This is especially true in instances where organizational commitment affects OCB-O as individuals who are not excited to be a part of their current employer either because they do not believe in the goals of the organization or the direction in which decisions made take the organization in the future. In this case of respondents, commitment did not inspire more productive work behaviours.
The path between individual autonomy and OCB with team cohesion as a mediating variable had a p-value of 0.884 while that with OBSE as the independent variable had a p-value of 0.322 and the path with leadership styles was 0.08. This study also contrasts with another research that found team cohesion to have mediated the influence of OCB especially OCB-I in as far as overall team performance is concerned (Lin & Peng, 2010).

In a nutshell, organizational perceptions affect organizational behaviours without having team cohesion and organizational commitment influencing the impact on the behaviours. Kenyans are generally peace-loving people and will forge positive team cohesion behaviours but this will not influence their overall intention to keep working for the same employer and exhibit positive behaviours towards each other or the organization at large.

5.3 Conclusion

5.3.1 The Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

Individuals involved in this review were found to have strong organizational perceptions with self-esteem at a mean of 4.1, OBSE at 4.14, Individual Job Autonomy at 3.66 and Leadership Styles at 3.52 yet this did not have a significant effect on both Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment. This shows that whilst employees may have very significant individual perceptions it does not significantly influence how they behave in teams and how they commit to their employer.

Factors like individual self-esteem, OBSE, high job aspects like having autonomy in how they carry out their tasks and the type of leaders they report did not affect team cohesion and organizational commitment. Organizational perceptions in review did not affect team cohesion especially in Kenya and East Africa at large which could be because the local culture of the inhabitants is such that people are friendly, not only willing but also expected to help each other in their day to day work. Whilst individuals may have high personal and organizational based self-esteem levels, this does not actually affect whether they work reasonably well in teams and try to help each other especially where there is task interdependence to work more effectively and efficiently. Leadership styles did not influence team cohesion and organizational commitment, and this could be due to the financial sector being focussed on profits and transactions. Since the pressure could be from the board to the management, the leadership style is likely to be focussed on returns thus not really focussed on how committed employees are.
In addition, most employees that join the financial sector in Kenya are aware that the industry is not keen on people elements but more on delivery of job tasks, assignments and ‘numbers’ as efficiently and effectively as possible. Since the expectation is already set up, employees may not expect more people focussed opportunities in the workplace like they would if they worked in a different industry. This could also be an element of external factors as in Kenya today. The unemployment levels are so high for graduates and finding new jobs is difficult, so employees accept their current jobs without expectation for better working environments, higher engagement levels or motivation from their employers.

5.3.2 The Effects of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviour

How well teams interact has a significant influence on Organizational Commitment and on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and Intention to Quit. This is evidence by employees in the SACCO industry who have a lot of responsibilities that they rely on each other and teams in their line of work and put a lot of emphasis on how well these teams work together in their attempt to achieve their goals as it affects their intentions to remain at their employer in the foreseeable future. As such elements of team cohesion like how absorbed in the task teams are, the energy they put in to perform their work and dedication to the task at hand even after working hours have ended is an important tell-tale sign of how teams behave.

Organizational Commitment also has a positive and highly significant impact on OCB and ITQ. Companies should therefore have strategies in place to ensure that organizational commitment of the employee is high as it can either lead to high OCB or reducing their overall turnover intent.

5.3.3 The Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Organizational Behaviours

All organizational Perceptions have a positive significant influence on OCB but negative significant influence on ITQ which is significant in ensuring that there are positive behaviours in the organization. OBSE, Leadership Styles especially transformative leadership styles and Individual Job factors should be taken into serious consideration during people management conversations both at the board level and at management level. Boards and management should realize the impact they have on employee and the overall success of the organization. People are the greatest asset in the SACCO environment as with any other environment, especially talented individuals. This is because they influence the
achievement of corporate goals making the company both sustainable and competitive in the industry.

In conclusion, the type of leaders hired should help propagate the corporate goals and especially the corporate image in the quest for building an organization that current employees want to keep working for without aiming to change employers which would be detrimental to the company. High levels of intention to quit leave in any organization in Kenya’s budding SACCO industry would lead to loss of corporate secrets that can lead to the competitor aiming to get business and becoming more professional in how they perform their tasks. Ergo, companies should ensure they have a highly committed workforce with teams that are highly cohesive.

5.3.4 The Mediating Effect of Organizational Perceptions on Organizational Behaviours

This study shows that team cohesion and Organizational Commitment are expected to have a mediating effect between perceptions and behaviours. But the context of this study was in Kenya and specifically the SACCO industry which is in a highly intuitive society as far as mental capabilities are concerned and as such the effect of individual perceptions especially on team cohesion do not necessarily have a significant effect.

5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 The Effects of Organizational Perceptions on Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment

The organizational perceptions in our review had an insignificant influence on the mediating variables in review. Managers in the industry should be keen to observe the influence too much or too little individual job autonomy has on a specific team and compare this to team autonomy and review if this influences how well teams work together and if the individual organizational commitment is influenced more by team autonomy. Individual self-esteem is affected by other factors outside the organization like an individual’s familial background, personality type and their experiences in life just to mention a few factors. A good people manager should ensure that they are able to make the best out of all their team members variable levels of self-esteem to avoid employees with higher self-esteem from overpowering those with lower self-esteem levels which can cause team conflict and poor communication between teams with dictatorial tendencies cropping up.
Another aspect of OBSE should be highly considered for people managers to make sure they inspire higher OBSE levels in their employees. Employee OBSE levels can keep changing based on how various projects are handled in the organization which can be observed by the types of behaviours employees are exuding in the workplace. Managers should ensure they keep adapting to the changes they observe through strategies like giving them different assignments or projects to show they are valued in the organization and that their work directly feeds into corporate strategic goals and financial performance. Through periodic informal meetings with employees, managers should be able to get information on the interests that employees may have to grow their careers or suggestions they may have on how to perform job tasks which can further improve their OBSE as they may feel listened to.

All the variables above should be based on the leadership styles that people/departmental managers may have. Committed and dedicated leaders should be clear on the different personalities they are managing and aware of the various stages employees are in their personal lives that could affect how their teams perform their work. This can be done through getting employees to take personality tests that will help managers make informed decisions in how they treat their employees thus creating a variable and good working environment. Another strategy should be through HR managers who ought to understand the personality style of the departmental leader. An introverted leader would do best with an extroverted team as they will be able to listen to their leaders and not drown their voices, during recruitment HR should ensure that they have a good mix of personalities in teams to avoid employees who are not listened to while they may want or even need to be listened to. It is also prudent for generational factors be considered by organizations to help give employees the best packages and corporate experiences. For example, the best teams in projects should comprise of millennials who prefer working in teams as opposed to working individually thus influencing organizational commitment. Millennials also prefer flexible working times in comparison to Gen X and Y who may be keen on pension and higher salaries. Variable pay packages should be highly considered amongst other factors.

Additionally, recruitment in organizations has also drastically changed to ensure that the ‘social fit’ of employees is considered in the interviewing process through involving potential team members to have a say in the interview process to avoid including individuals who may struggle to fit socially with the team members which therefore would affect the new employee’s organizational commitment leading to a waste of time and energy in the
organization. It is better to take a longer time during the recruitment process as opposed to having to fire an employee who has a hard time fitting in both socially and technically thus increasing team conflict.

5.4.2 The Effects of Team Cohesion and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Behaviour

Managers in SACCOs should be aware of how influential the corporate environment they create in an organization can lead to high team cohesion and organizational commitment which will influence organizational behaviour. Managers should then ensure that teams created to work on projects should have the right mix of individuals and skills to ensure that the task does not overwhelm the team to the extent that there is collision between team members. In addition, organizational commitment is an important concept for board members and managers to consider ensuring that their employees continue working in the organization for the foreseeable future and should determine how to keep employees engaged and motivated to continue doing their jobs in the same organization.

5.4.3 The Effects of Organizational Perceptions on Organizational Behaviours

Positive organizational behaviours should motivate management in different organizations to ensure organizational perceptions are well catered for. Job related elements like job autonomy should be highly considered based on their different job roles, experience and position in the organization. For management level employees, there should be a higher level of job autonomy owing to the fact that these employees have the title to match their responsibility and accountability in the organization and also their level of experience in contrast, lower level of employees should have less job autonomy as they need an opportunity to grow and learn from their superiors in order to exude confidence in their work. Training, learning and development is key to lower level employees and both formal and informal trainings should be considered for all employees.

Esteem elements of both the individual and organizational have an influence on either decreasing intention to quit or increasing high OCB levels. Management should ensure that the corporate brand of the organization is highly regarded by employees so that they are proud to work for their employer and are confident in their position because they feel valued. This could be done through engaging employees in project-based work to give them variable
experience and coming up with awards like ‘employee of the month’ in order to communicate their value in the organization.

Leaders should develop a good working environment for their team members to excel, this should especially be through transformative leadership styles. Leaders should be considerate to the ‘feelings’ and concerns of their employees over and above the quality and quantity of work of their employees.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

The goal of this study was to establish the effects of organizational perceptions on organizational behaviours and its bias is Kenya’s Financial Sector and the results are limited to the SACCO industry. This study has shed light on how various organizational perceptions affect organizational behaviours with the use of team cohesion and organizational commitment as mediating variables.

Researchers and scholars should also consider a more in-depth review on how various generations in the workplace perceive organizational perceptions and organizational behaviours to help establish how companies can tailor make their remunerational strategies and their practices to suit their employees.

The variable self-esteem is also not as widely spread out in the context of organizations in Kenya and other researchers ought to establish what influence it may have on other organizational behaviour and organizational psychological variables in the region. Self-esteem as a variable requires further study to ascertain identified results.

Most of the research in this area of the world is focussed on how turnover is influenced by financial variables and organizational performance. Focus has also been on goals and strategies that companies have set out but not on other perceptions and behaviours that are not tangible and easily accounted for like autonomy, leadership styles etc. As such, it would be prudent to perform this research and compare the results between workers in other industries e.g. Manufacturing Industry, other Financial Institutions like insurance companies and Public sector to see how the results in the various industries compare against each other.

Further to this, research should also be conducted to establish the difference in impact between the job-related factors like skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback as defined by Hackman and Oldham against those of individual organizational perceptions and how they affect organizational behaviours in the Kenyan context.
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19th February 2018

To Whom It May Concern

Research Project by Njoki Mwisesywa, Student ID: 652558

The bearer of this letter is a student at United States International University-Africa pursuing a Master of Science in Management and Organizational Development (MOM) degree.

As part of the program, she is required to undertake a research project on “Factors that influence organizational commitment”. This requires her to collect data and information from various relevant institutions.

Kindly assist by enabling her access data, information and contact with respondents who can complete her questionnaires. I assure you that the information provided will be treated with the utmost confidentiality.

Should you have any queries regarding the student research please feel free to contact me on my email, tlinge@usiuc.ac.ke or Phone +254 730116419

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Dr. Teresa Linge
Associate Dean, Chandaria School of Business
APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent, I am a Masters student at the United States International University – Africa pursuing my Masters in Science in Management and Organizational Development. As part of my program, I am conducting a research in partial fulfilment of my program. This research seeks to delve into the factors that influence an individual’s commitment to their organization. The information obtained will not be shared in other forums and will strictly be used for this study. In addition, the details of your organization shall not be recorded and as such remains anonymous. For further questions and/or clarifications, kindly contact the undersigned:

Name: Njoki Mwisywa

Email: dokinjoki@gmail.com

Background Information:

1. Gender:
   - □ Male
   - □ Female

2. How old are you?
   - □ Under 25
   - □ 25-30
   - □ 31-35
   - □ 36-40
   - □ 41-45
   - □ 46-50
   - □ 51-55
   - □ 56-60
   - □ 0ver 60 years

3. My level of Education:
   - □ Form four certificate
   - □ Diploma
   - □ Bachelor’s Degree
   - □ Master’s Degree
   - □ PhD

4. How many years have you worked in your current organization?
   - □ Less than 1 year
   - □ 1-3 Years
   - □ 4-6 Years
   - □ 7-10 Years
   - □ More than 10 Years
5. What is your level in the organization?

☐ Junior /Entry Level

☐ Middle Management/Supervisor

☐ Senior Management
### SELF-ESTEEM

**Answer the questions below with what extent of the statement you agree with**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>At times I think I am no good at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational Based Self-esteem

**Respond to the statements below starting with the phrase, 'I feel that...'. These questions refer to you as an employee of your organization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am taken seriously at my organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am trusted by my organization and managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I can make a difference in this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am valuable to my organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. I am helpful around my organization   | 1 2 3 4 5
6. I count around the organization   | 1 2 3 4 5
7. There is faith in me in the organization   | 1 2 3 4 5
8. I am efficient in the organization   | 1 2 3 4 5

**Individual Job Autonomy**

**Respond to these statements with the extent to which they refer to how you perform your work:**

1. Organizational goals are clear to me   | 1 2 3 4 5
2. I have a vital role in achieving my organizational goals   | 1 2 3 4 5
3. I have an opportunity for independent thought and action   | 1 2 3 4 5
4. I have control over the pace of my work   | 1 2 3 4 5
5. At work I have the opportunity to do the best   | 1 2 3 4 5
6. There is someone at work who encourages my development   | 1 2 3 4 5
7. The mission/purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important   | 1 2 3 4 5
8. This organization deserves my loyalty   | 1 2 3 4 5
9. I am fairly paid for what I contribute to my organization   | 1 2 3 4 5
10. My salary is equal to market rate   | 1 2 3 4 5
11. Organizational decisions are always transparent   | 1 2 3 4 5
12. Hard work is the only key to promotions in this organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

13. Good performance is the only key raises in salary here | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Team Cohesion**

Rate the statements below with reference to your team/department in the organization:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | During the task, my team feels full of energy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 2. | My team can continue working for very long periods of time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 3. | My team keeps on working, even when things do not go well | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 4. | My team feels very persistent during the task | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 5. | My team feels strong and vigourous during the task | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 6. | When the task is finished, my team has quite some energy left for other activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 7. | My team is involved in the task | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 8. | My team is enthusiastic about the job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 9. | When my team is working, we forget everything else around us | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 10. | My team takes new initiatives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 11. | Time flies when my team is working | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
| 12. | My team feels happy when we are engrossed in the task | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviour**

With regard to your behaviour towards your peers/team members and the organization, please rate the questions with the extent to which you agree with the following statements:
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I help others who have been absent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I share personal property with others to help their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I assist others with their duties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I show genuine concern and courtesy toward co-workers, even under the most trying business or personal situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I adjust my work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I go out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I give up time to help others who have work or non-work problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I show pride when representing the organization in public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I express loyalty toward the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I defend the organization when other employees criticize it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I keep up with developments in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I take action to protect the organization from potential problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I demonstrate concern about the image of the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I attend functions that are not required but that help the organizational image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

**Leadership Styles**

**Answer the following questions about your manager:**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My manager seeks different opinions when making decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My manager goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My manager considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My manager is genuinely concerned about my personal well-being and affirms this by constantly checking in on me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My manager talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My manager re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My manager spends time teaching and coaching juniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My manager makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My manager keeps track of all mistakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My manager waits for things to go wrong before taking action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My manager avoids making decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My manager suggests new angles of looking at assigned tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My manager expresses confidence that a goal will be achieved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Commitment**

Please respond to the questions below with the extent to which you agree with the statements:

<p>| 1. | I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | I think I could become as easily attached to another organization as I am to this one | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Right now, staying with my organization is a necessity as much as a desire | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>One of the major reasons that I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job right now without having another one lined up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>It would not be too costly for me to leave my organization in the near future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I think that people these days move from company to company too often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
21. One of the major reasons that I continue to work here is that loyalty is important and therefore, feel a sense of moral obligation to remain | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
22. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
23. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Intention to Quit**

Please respond to the questions below with the extent to which you agree with the statements:

1. I frequently scan newspapers and websites from recruiters and potential employers looking for job opportunities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
2. My personal values are compromised at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
3. It is highly likely that I will leave my current job in the next 1 year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
4. I do not look forward to another day at work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
5. I am often emotionally agitated when arriving home from work after a day’s work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**THANK YOU! BE BLESSED!**