The Impact of Perceived Leadership Behavior and Organizational Commitment of Employees in the Education Sector of Pakistan

Chaudhry Abdul Khaliq[1], Ibne Abbas Ashraf [2], Muhammad Nasir Chattha[3], Arshad Haroon[3,4], Nauman Aslam[3,4]*

[1]Hailey College of Commerce, Lahore, Pakistan; [2]Group Head Internal Audit, The Superior Group; [3]Superior College of Accountancy, Superior University, Lahore, Pakistan; [4]Institute of Administrative Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
*E-mail: naumanaslam91@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper aims to study the effect of perceived leadership behavior on organizational commitment of employees and the industry that this paper conducts the study in is the education sector of Pakistan. After a thorough review of the literature, research gap was identified and data was collected with the help of questionnaires. Out of 200 questionnaires that were handed out, 170 complete responses were received with a response rate of 85% as part of this self-administered questionnaire filling activity. These responses were obtained from the faculty members of different colleges and universities in Lahore, Pakistan. Random sampling was carried out for selection of the sample for this study. For analyzing the data Pearson's product moment correlation and regression were used. This study found that there was a positive effect of participative and supportive leadership behavior and the organizational commitment of employees whereas there was a negative relationship between directive leadership and organizational commitment of employees. These findings are useful for managers to understand how they can increase organizational commitment amongst employees for greater organizational productivity. Limitations and future research possibilities have also been indicated.

Keywords: Directive leadership, Organizational Commitment, participative Leadership, Supportive Leadership, normative commitment, continuous commitment

Introduction

Leadership is a social process of influencing the activities of subordinates to achieve organizational goals (Akanwa, 1997). In English language addition of term leadership is quite recent as just 2 hundred years ago this term was used (Stogdill, 1974). Different people are used to define this term differently (Stogdil, 1974). "Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of members" (Bass, 1990, p. 19) and linked with leaders, followers and their interactions (Dansereau, Yammarino & Markham, 1995).

The success or failures of leadership is contributed by number of dimensions including autocratic or democratic, task or people oriented and contingency approach (Daft, 2005). In early 20th century Kurt Lewin and his fellows conducted fist studies on leadership and its behaviors and identifying autocratic leader as who has centralized authority and having control over rewards while democratic leader as who has been encouraging participation and delegating the authority to subordinates (Daft, 2005).

In 1950's consistently studies conducted on leadership behavior by i.e. by Ohio State University, University of Michigan and University of Texas. As a result reliable questionnaires like Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire, LBDQ and models like Leadership Grid by Blake and Mouton were developed and be dominated to leadership related research for some years. Overall in leadership behavior research resulted in two main types i.e. task or people oriented. "People-oriented leadership, which is equivalent to consideration (Ohio State University), employee-centered (University of Michigan) and concern for people (University of Texas)" , i.e. respecting the feeling, ideas and needs of subordinates as having importance of establishment of mutual trust. Task-oriented leadership, "which is equivalent to initiating structure (Ohio State University), job-centered (University of Michigan) and concern for production (University of Texas)", i.e. giving emphasis over efficiency, cost effectiveness and achievement of goals.

This significance of this study is that it gives the unique contribution in the education sector of Pakistan where leadership behavior and its influence on the productivity of the employee are ignored. So this study not only contributed in the body of knowledge that how different leadership behavior trigger the commitment level of employees and help them to devise the policies in order to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of all the institutes in Pakistan.

Literature Review

There are three classes of leadership behavior as described by Path-goal theory i.e. directive, participative and supportive (Hasbullah, 2008). Directive leadership is similar to initiating structure and task oriented as exactly directing subordinates to what they are expected to do. Renwick et al. (2002) point out characteristics of directive leadership behavior like stringent control over employees and non-participation in decision making.

Supportive leadership is like consideration and people-oriented i.e. concerns for human needs of subordinates. Mehta et al. (2003) mentioned that supportive leaders provide facilitative task environment with mutual trust and helpfulness. A participative leader takes opinion of subordinates about decisions (Rad & Yarmohammadian, 2006). Likert (1961) mentions that in participative leadership higher productivity and better employee involvement as manger concerns for the needs and expectations of subordinates. So Hamner and Tosi (1974) mention that participative leadership result in relatively higher organizational commitment. Participative leaders are more tolerant of differences by seeking inputs from subordinates as these differences can improve decision making process. (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

Organizational commitment is defined as "employee's belief in the organization's goals and values, desire to remain a member of the organization and loyalty to the organization" (Mowday et al., 1982). Such identification with goals and values results in an attachment to organization and this identification will be paramount by giving rewards and involvement in goals (Martin et al., 2005). This issue is much significant for managers and with increasing level of change mangers finding ways for commitment of employees and competitive advantage.

According to studies conducted by Kim (2002); Yiing & Ahmad (2009); Dolatabadi H., Safa M. (2010) show that the participative leadership has a positive effect on organization commitment. The outcomes achieved in international hotels in Taiwan, point out that the participative style has a positive and significant relationship with organizational commitment (Tain-Fung Wu et al. 2006, p. 445). Rhodes and Steers (1981) showed in a study that organization commitment was higher when leaders encouraged participation of employees in decision making. According to Godard (2001) directive leaders are expected to exercise a strong positive influence on follower's commitment.

In a study of 1,385 employees from a variety of professions found that employees who perceived a supportive relationship with their supervisors had a strong, positive commitment to their

respective organizations (Mottaz, 1988). According to Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) support from supervisor may be interpreted by employees as a manifestation of commitment towards them which in turn have a tendency to increase their organization commitment.

Hypotheses

H1: There is a relationship exist between directive leadership and organizational commitment.

H2: There is a relationship exist between supportive leadership and organizational commitment.

H3: There is a relationship exist between participative leadership and organizational commitment.

Methodology

The philosophical foundation of this study is positivism and the approach that this study has adopted is that of deductive reasoning. Survey research design has been used for the undertaking of this study. The research strategy that has been used here was quantitative in nature. The data collection strategy used here was based on self-administered questionnaire. Random sampling technique was used in the sampling of the respondents. The unit of analyses for this study were the faculty members of different colleges and universities in Lahore, Pakistan. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed of which 170 questionnaires were received and qualified for validity. 85% response rate was achieved as part of the data collection activity. SPSS 21 software tool was used for the data analyses and the questionnaire was divided into two sections them being demographics and subjective section which is based on 5-pont Likert scale. The data was collected from various educational institutes of Lahore, Pakistan.

Results and Analysis

Table 1 shows that data is gathered through survey from respondents are male (67.1%) and female (32.9%) in which majority of them are under age 21-30 (48.8%) and are married (54.5%) in which the most of them have 5-10 years' experience (33.5%).

Table 1: Categorical Demographics

Category	Classification	Frequency	Percentage
Age	21-30	83	48.8
	30-40	68	40.0
	40-50	17	10.0
	over 50	1	.6
Marital status	Married	92	54.1
	Single	73	42.9
	widowed	3	1.8
Gender	Male	114	67.1
	Female	56	32.9
Experience	Less than 1 year	8	4.7
	1-5	47	27.6
	5-10	57	33.5
	10-15	41	24.1
	15-20	13	7.6
	20-25	2	1.2
	More than 25	2	1.2

Table 2 shows that the directive leadership is positively correlated (.087) with the organizational commitment but they are not significant with each other. The supportive leadership (.322**) and participative leadership (.415**) is moderately correlated with organizational commitment and they are both highly significant with the organizational commitment.

Table 2: Correlation

		Dir.L	Par.L	Par.L	OC
Dir.L	Pearson Correlation	1	**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
Par.L	Pearson Correlation	.415**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
Sup.L	Pearson Correlation	.322**	.482**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		
OC	Pearson Correlation	.087	.286**	.411**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.289	.000	.000	

Table 3 shows that the value of R (.431) which means that there is 43% variation exists between the directive, supportive, participative leadership and organizational commitment. The value of R-square (.186) which is determination coefficient shows the total variation (18.6%) exist between the directive, supportive, participative leadership and organizational commitment.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.431a	.186	.169	.46006

a. Predictors: (Constant), Sup.L, Dir.L, Par.L

Table 4 shows that the value of F (11.121) which shows the overall fitness of the model that model is fit and the value of significance level is less than (0.05) which means that the overall impact of predictors (directive, supportive, participative leadership) are significant on the organizational commitment.

Table 4: ANOVAª

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.062	3	2.354	11.121	.000b
	Residual	30.901	146	.212		
	Total	37.963	149			

a. Dependent Variable: OC

b. Predictors: (Constant), Sup.L, Dir.L, Par.L

Organizational Commitment = 2.279 - .069 (Directive Leadership)

This equation shows that 1% change in the directive leadership will create a variation of 6.9% and the value (2.279) is the organization commitment level in which directive leadership is zero.

Organizational Commitment = 2.279 + .307 (Participative Leadership)

This equation shows that 1% change in the participative leadership will create a variation of 30.7% and the value (2.279) is the organization commitment level in which directive leadership is zero.

Organizational Commitment = 2.279 + .291 (Supportive Leadership)

This equation shows that 1% change in the supportive leadership will create a variation of 29.1% and the value (2.279) is the organization commitment level in which directive leadership is zero.

Table 5: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.279	.286		7.976	.000
	Dir.L	-.069	.062	-.093	-1.116	.266
	Par.L	.307	.066	.146	1.622	.000
	Sup.L	.291	.068	.371	4.301	.000

a. Dependent Variable: OC

Conclusion

The study aimed to test the relationship between directive, supportive and participative leadership and the organizational commitment of employees in the education sector of Lahore, Pakistan. The study found that there exists a positive relation between supportive leadership and organizational commitment. This means that in the presence of a supportive leadership style, the employee commitment improved as per the findings of this study. The study also found that there exists a positive relation between participative leadership and organizational commitment which indicates that in the presence of participative leadership style, the organizational commitment of the faculty members increased. On the contrary, there exists a negative relationship between directive leadership and organizational commitment. Hence, in the presence of directive leadership style, organizational commitment diminishes. In the previous research, there was found positive relation between all the three styles of leadership i.e. supportive, participative and directive leadership. This study approved and confirmed the findings of the previous research, with respect to relation between participative and supportive leadership with the organizational commitment, however the study's findings regarding relationship between directive leadership style and organizational commitment shows the significance of research that in the this sector, instead of having a positive relation there exists a negative impact of directive leadership style on organizational commitment.

References

Akanwa, P. U. (1997). Fundamental of human resources management in Nigeria.

Bass, S. A., Belkacem, M., Bleicher, M., Brandstetter, M., Bravina, L., Ernst, C.,... & Amelin, N. (1998). Microscopic models for ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions. Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, 41, 255-369.

Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American journal of Sociology, 32-40.

Camilleri, E. (2006). Towards developing an organisational commitment-public service motivation model for the Maltese public service employees. Public policy and administration, 21(1), 63-83.

Dansereau, F., Yammarino, F. J., & Markham, S. E. (1995). Leadership: The multiple-level approaches. The Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 97-109.

Daft, C., Wagner, P., Bymaster, B., Panda, S., Patel, K., & Ladabaum, I. (2005, September). cMUTs and electronics for 2D and 3D imaging: monolithic integration, in-handle chip sets and system implications. In Ultrasonics Symposium, 2005 IEEE (Vol. 1, pp. 463-474). IEEE.

Gaines Jr, S. O., Marelich, W. D., Bledsoe, K. L., Steers, W. N., Henderson, M. C., Granrose, C. S., ... & Page, M. S. (1997). Links between race/ethnicity and cultural values as mediated by

racial/ethnic identity and moderated by gender. Journal of personality and social psychology, 72(6), 1460.

Hamner, W. C., & Tosi, H. L. (1974). Relationship of role conflict and role ambiguity to job involvement measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(4), 497.

Hasbullah, N. (2008). The relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment: A.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Sage publications.

Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative science quarterly, 555-573.

Ko, J. W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea.Journal of applied psychology, 82(6), 961.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. Journal of managerial psychology, 16(8), 594-613.

Martin, R., Thomas, G., Charles, K., Epitropaki, O., & McNamara, R. (2005). The role of leader-member exchanges in mediating the relationship between locus of control and work reactions. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78(1), 141-147.

Mehta, R., Dubinsky, A. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2003). Leadership style, motivation and performance in international marketing channels: An empirical investigation of the USA, Finland and Poland. European journal of marketing,37(1/2), 50-85.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human resource management review, 1(1), 61-89.

Mohammad Mosadegh Rad, A., & Hossein Yarmohammadian, M. (2006). A study of relationship between managers' leadership style and employees' job satisfaction. Leadership in Health Services, 19(2), 11-28.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. (1982). Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.

Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. Human relations, 41(6), 467-482.

Renwick, D., & MacNeil, C. M. (2002). Line manager involvement in careers.Career Development International, 7(7), 407-414.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. Academy of management review, 7(3), 418-428.