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Abstract

This research was carried out with the intention of examining the impact employees’ perceptions of their immediate supervisors’ supportive and directive leadership behavior and different types of organizational commitment in plantation companies in Malaysia. The study used a survey strategy “self-administered questionnaire”, to collect the primary data. The sample of the targeted consists of 300 supervisors and employees from various plantation companies in Malaysia by using the non-random sampling technique to participate in this study. The statistic results found that there are significant strong relationship between the leadership behavior and the organizational commitment. More importantly, there are significant impacts of the leadership behavior on organizational commitment. In addition, supportive and directive leadership behaviors do play important roles in determining the levels of employee’s commitment. Leaders should consider in matching both leadership behaviors based on the situation of their subordinate. Thus, the paper contributes to the existing pool of knowledge on the empirical impact of leadership behaviors on organizational commitment. Different aspects of these variables were tested, so as to provide a wider and more comprehensive understanding of the factors that affect organizations and employees in plantation company’s societies in Malaysia.

1. Introduction

The behavior of employees in organizational life and their relationship with their jobs are affected by a lot of variables. One of the most important of these variables is leadership behavior of supervisors for leadership is seen as the behavior of impressing people in many studies. It has also become clear that organizational commitment has important implications for employees and organizations through various studies by researchers. Bennett and Durkin (2000) stated that the negative effects associated with a lack of employee commitment include absenteeism and turnover. As suggested by Hesselbein and Cohen (1999), organizations are now evolving toward structures in which rank means responsibility but not authority, and where the supervisor’s job is not to command, but to persuade. Hence, in order to be effective, it is critical for managers to influence their subordinates, peers, and superiors to assist and support their proposals, plans, and to motivate them to carry out with their decisions (Blickle, 2003).

* Corresponding Author: Mahmoud Khalid Almsafir. Tel.: +6-019-260-9395
E-mail address: mahmoud@uniten.edu.my
Organization commitment can also increase the creativity in the organizations (Sousa & Coelho, 2011). However, organizational commitment is one of strong determinant of success towards employees for the better performance of the organization, which is highlighted various times in the past literature (Chew & Chan, 2008; Das, 2002). It is important for the company to know what are the aspects that plays important role or have big impact in boosting the commitment of the employees. Blau (1985), Demir, Sahin, Teke, Ucar, and Kursun (2009), and Dick, Carey and Carey (2009) stated that the effects of leadership behavior on employees could be considered in a large scale which includes organizational commitment of employees. Furthermore, leadership behavior that encourage employee commitment is essential in order for an organization to successfully developed a business strategies, achieving their goals, gain competitive advantage and optimizing human capital (Erasmus, Swanepoel, & Wyk, 2003). The research on the leadership style and organizational commitment were conducted by Lo, Ramayah, Min and Songan (2010) referred that a mediating role of leader member exchange and provide direction for further study; conflict can be reduced between the leader and subordinate when culture reflect the employee values. As such, committed employees are more motivated and dedicated towards meeting and achieving organizational goals. In Malaysia, employees are found to be no more loyal to their organizations as they used to be in the past. Due to low commitment, employees tend to leave for slightly better pay from their organizations. According to Nijhof, Jong and Beukhof (1998), the success of an organization does not only rely on how human capital and competencies are being utilized but also on how it incites commitment to the organization. Therefore, the biggest challenge for organizations in Malaysia is to provoke and instill a sense of commitment and loyalty to their employees. Employees with sense of organizational commitment are less likely to engage in withdrawal behavior and more willing to accept change (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999). The basic orientation of this study is to discover the impact of supportive and directive leadership behavior on affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment of plantation companies in Malaysia.

2. Literature Review

The following section provides a summary of the academic literature that is relevant to this study. It includes a section on leadership and leadership behavior, organizational commitment, and leadership and organizational commitment.

2.1. Leadership Behavior

Leadership has been a very controversial concept and it has more than 350 definitions (Burke, 1985). Other than that, Kuchler (2008) was highlight that leadership persistent to be one of the most extensively discussed topic by the researchers from all over the world. The term leadership means different things to different people. Although no ultimate definition of leadership exists (Yukl, 2001), the majority of definitions of leadership reflect some basic elements, including “group” “influence” and “goal” (Bryman, 1992). Today, new definitions are added to the list as well. Despite the fact that there have been very different definitions of leadership, concept of ‘influence’ has been used in almost all of them (Çokluk & Yılmaz, 2010). One of the most important reasons for this difference in leadership definitions is the difference and leadership theories in positioning leadership. Moreover, leadership also is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where Northouse (2010) was highlighted the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal which according in a popular textbook on leadership, Yukl (2010) defined leadership as the process of influencing others to recognize and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives. Yet, Yukl’s states that leadership includes efforts to influence and facilitate the current work of the group, and it also ensures that the group is ready to meet future challenges. By referring Daft (2008), considerate leaders are sociable, provide open communication, develop teamwork, and are oriented toward their subordinates. Tjosvold (1981) theorized that if power were to be defined in field theory rather than in behavioral terms, it is more like the control of valued resources where A has power in relation to B when A has resources that can affect the extent that B accomplishes goals. Later, contingency or situational approach came into the picture which largely displaced the dominant trait and behavior approach. This approach views leadership effectiveness as dependent upon a match between leadership style and the situation. It also focuses on the degree to which the situation gives control and influence to the leaders. The primary thrust was that the qualities of leaders differentiate in various situations and so were those qualities
were perhaps appropriate to a particular task and interpersonal context. One of the most important theories evaluated among situational leadership theories is Path-Goal Theory developed by (Evans, 1970; House, 1971). Currently, Path-Goal theory is the most influential contingency approach to leadership (Robbins, 2005). In this theory, the way the leader impresses the followers, the way goals about the work are perceived, and the ways to achieve the goals are taken into consideration. Thus, according (Njoroge, 1997), leaders cannot be successful and responsible leaders without the right skills, tools and resources. According to Path-Goal Theory, motivations, satisfactions, and work performances of followers depend on the leadership styles chosen by their administrators (Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; House, 1971; Sayles, 1981). Multiple dimensions of leadership behavior were carefully examined and revised in Path-Goal Theory studies. In this investigation, some dimensions such as leader initiating structure, consideration, authoritarianism, hierarchical influence, and degree of closeness of the supervision were determined. All dimensions were analyzed with Path-Goal Theory’s variables such as balance and effectively taken into consideration (House, 1971). As a result of these analyses, four basic leadership behaviors were determined in Path-Goal Theory. These are supportive, directive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership behavior. Supportive leadership and directive leadership were resided on in this study. These leadership behavior forms two contrary poles. It was considered appropriate to take the two leadership behavior in accordance with the objective of this study.

2.1.1 Supportive Leadership

According to Rollinson & Broadfield (2002) refer that supportive leadership includes leadership behavior it seems like as talking to people, supporting their efforts, giving them hope, solving their problems, and participate them in decision-making process. Thus, supportive leadership involved in emotions and personal expectations are taken into consideration. Leaders tend to stray from the path they follow for the sake of happiness and satisfaction of their followers. In this context, House (1996) was highlighted that supportive leadership is the most effective leadership behavior on subordinates. In additional, supportive leaders could be described as having characteristics such as being a model, appreciating and congratulating what has been done, helping their subordinates, explaining reasons for criticisms, and set constructive criticisms. Furthermore, leader's response was legitimate, having an increased commitment, building support for the leader, defending the leader's response, having increased respect for the leader, empathizing with the leader, and offering to find a joint solution (Eubanks, Antes, Friedrich, & Caughron, 2010). In further elaborated that a supportive leadership style is one in which the leader creates a facilitating task environment of psychological support, mutual trust and respect, helpfulness, and friendliness (Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011).

2.1.2 Directive Leadership

The definition of directive leadership tells subordinates exactly what they are supposed to do. According to House (1971) examined the directive leadership and described as the situation where leader gives complete and essential directives on a particular subject. In directive leadership behavior, the questions like “what to do, how to do, where to do, when to do, and who should do?” was clearly specified. Thus, Hanson (2003), Lunenburg and Ornstein (2000), and Rollinson and Broadfield (2002) examined the performances of the organization members are secretly inspected and observed. In the other hand the behavior of directive leadership is telling the expectations to those under the command (followers), planning, programming, autocratic controlling goal performance, and bringing out standards in behavior. The leader explains followers’ roles, and followers clearly understand what they are expected to do.

2.2 Organizational Commitment

According to Demir et al. (2009), commitment is a personal relationship to some course of action. Personal or self-commitment involves a guarantee to do the best one can in every situation and to be the best that employees can be. While there are different definitions of organizational commitment in scholarly literature, these definitions share a common theme in that organizational commitment is recognized to be a bound of the individual to the organization (Samad, 2005). Committed employees feel the need to go beyond normal job requirements in order to make a significant personal contribution to the organization (Perryer & Jordan, 2005). Moreover, organizational commitment is multi-dimensional construct refers to view in the direction of employee's attachment to organization and it is a constant process which indicates the contribution of individuals in organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo,
Davis-LaMastro, 1990). So that, the organizational commitment determines individual characteristics with a certain organization and its contribution in that organization, consistently organizational commitment considered as a kind of emotional and psychical attachment to the organization. Thus, according to this advance by Aghdasi, Kiamanesh and Ebrahim (2011) individual with strong attachment to this organization will feels cohesive with it and get pleasure from being a member of organization. Furthermore, it is employee’s feelings of obligation to stay with their organizations. These feelings result from the normative pressures employees’ experience (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Viljoen & Rothmann, 2009). According to this definition, organizational commitment has three basic components are identification as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, involvement as willingness to exert a considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and loyalty as a strong intent or desire to remain with the organization. Therefore, organizational commitment has been suggested three different types by Allen and Meyer (1990) which has been commonly used in other studies in last 20 years for example Dawley, Stephens and Stephens (2005) as listed below.

2.2.1 Affective Commitment

Based on Meyer and Allen (1991), definition of affective commitment refers to employee’s emotional attachment, identification and involvement in the organization. Due to this loyalty, one is fully willing to accept the company’s goals and values as his/her own. Moreover, affective attachment refers to affective orientation to the group; it is the strength of individual identification with the group or organization, or an emotional bond between individual and organization (Ashman & Winstanley, 2006). According to Hartmann and Bambacas (2000) affective commitment is a feeling of attachment and belonging to an organization, that includes the structure of the organization, the type of work experiences, and personal characteristics.

2.2.2 Continuance Commitment

In continuance commitment refers to employee’s point of view of whether the costs of leaving an organization are greater than of the costs of staying. Employees who perceive that the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the costs of staying remain because they need to. In addition, anything that increases the cost associated with leaving the organization can lead to the development of continuance commitment where self-investment is the amount of valuable resources such as effort, time, and energy that an employee has spent in the organization for its well-being (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Lost benefits include accrued pensions, promotions based on tenure, loss of values, future opportunities, or lost efforts if skills or systems are not transferable (Hartmann & Bambacas, 2000).

2.2.3 Normative Commitment

However, all of the two types of commitment above, Dawley et al. (2005) refer normative commitment is obligation can be reflected as the result of familial or cultural pressures. In other words, normative commitment it’s more focused towards employees’ feelings of obligation to the organization. Where the employees with high levels of normative commitment stay with the organization because they feel they ought to (Parish, Cadwallader, & Busch, 2008). On the basis of the works of Meyer and Allen (1991), Scholl (1981), and Wiener, (1982) suggested that two mechanisms, socialization and exchange, play a key and operative role in the development of normative commitment. According to Wiener (1982), normative commitment develops as a result of normative beliefs that are internalized through pre-entry (familial and cultural) and post entry (organizational) socialization processes. The second mechanism is the principle of exchange, or what is called a norm of reciprocity by Scholl (1981). Based on this principle, normative commitment develops through the receipt of rewards from the organization that instill a sense of moral obligation to reciprocate with commitment.

Referring to Carrière and Bourque (2009), the most universal forms of organizational commitment studied and reported in the academic literature are affective (emotional attachment to the organization), continuance (perceived costs related with leaving the organization) and normative (feelings of obligation towards the organization). Organizational commitment are depends on the perception of employees. Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986) and Steers (1977) show that if the employee finds the organization to be more supportive, a higher level of organizational commitment will result and the direct effort to induce commitment can produce long-term benefits for the organization.
2.3. Leadership and Organizational Commitment

Several studies found a positive relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Çokluk & Yılmaz, 2010; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976; Savery, 1994; Wilson, 1995; Yousef, 2000; Zeffane, 1994). Therefore, leaders should understand that the issue of employees’ commitment is a crucial element to be addressed to. The most importance of leaders’ role in persuade employees’ behavior have been shown by preceding studies (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad, & Abu Sama, 2008; Bhal, Gulati, & Ansari, 2009). Organizational commitment is influenced by the job environment created by the employee’s supervisor. This organizational environment, together with the employee’s ability, will largely determine eventual performance. According to Stum (2001), employee commitment reflects the quality of the leadership in the organization.

However, Eisenberger et al. (1986) showed that employees’ organizational commitment is strongly influenced by perceived (generalized) organizational support. However, employees are more likely to feel an obligation to return the supportive behavior in terms of affective commitment. According to Mottaz (1988) examined of 1,385 employees from various occupations found that employees who perceived a friendly and supportive relationship with their co-workers and supervisors had a strong and positive commitment to their respective organizations. Employees who believe their superiors are considerate leaders will be more committed to their organizations than those who do not perceive their managers. Supervisory consideration refers to leader behaviors concerned with promoting the comfort and well-being of subordinates. Yet, employees may interpret the support provided by their leader as a demonstration of commitment towards them which in turn tend to enhance their commitment to the organization. In 1993, the research showed that support from one’s direct supervisor led to less absence among subordinates (Tharenou, 1993). Based on (Pelz, 1952) also presented data suggesting that at least in large groups, employees were more satisfied with superiors who identified closely with higher management and assisted the main goal attainment. Therefore, during year 1995, Liou examined the relationship between the broad construct of organizational commitment and the outcome measures of supervisory trust, job involvement, and job satisfaction. In all three areas, reported positive relationships with organizational commitment. More specifically, perceived trust in the supervisor, an ability to be involved with the job, and feelings of job satisfaction were major determinants of organizational commitment. In another study, Becker (1992) examined whether employees’ commitment to different constituencies or to the overall organization were better predictors of job satisfaction and pro social behavior. He discovered that employees’ commitment to top management, supervisors and workgroups contributed significantly beyond commitment to the organization. When initial research suggests that leaders who acquired a variety of encouraging states or traits, goals, values, and character strengths are competent to positively persuade followers’ states, behavior, and performance (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Peterson, 2009; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). Kent and Chelladurai (2001) found that individualized consideration has positive relationship with both affective commitment and normative commitment. According to Yousef (2000), those who perceive their superior as adopting consultative or participative leadership behavior are more committed to their organization. However, a supervisor who provides more accurate and timely types of communication enhances the work environment and thereby is likely to increase employees’ commitment to the organization. In line with the view suggested in the literature, the study formulated the research hypotheses as below.

\[ H_1: \text{There are significant relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment.} \]
\[ H_2: \text{There is significant impact of leadership behaviors on organizational commitment.} \]

3. Methodology

An organization that is able to improve its leadership behavior would be able to sustain employees in the organization. Previous research have shown that organizations with a more persuasive and guidance behavior of leadership would be able to improve the organization’s goals, to increase the work effectiveness of employees and to increase the employees satisfaction that would lead them to be commitment with the organization. The study was conducted under the framework as shown in figure.1. It demonstrates the variables of leadership behavior and organizational commitment that were used in the study.
3.1. Questionnaire Design

The data for this study were collected via a questionnaire survey. Most of the measurement items in the questionnaire were based on previous studies. Content validity was ensured through an extensive literature review of published material in academic and practitioner journals, and by discussion with several experts and scholars in this field. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: Demographic Profile (Section A); Supportive and Directive Leadership Behavior (Section B); and Affective, Continuance, and Normative Organizational Commitment (Section C). The present study adopted an existing five-point Likert scale, where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.” All items in the questionnaire adopted the same five-point Likert scale.

3.2. Data Collection

The sample for this study was chosen based on random sample of (300) supervisors and employees in four different Plantation Companies in Malaysia which are Sime Darby Sdn Bhd, Genting Plantation Berhad, IOI Group and Prosper Group Sdn Bhd. The survey was distributed directly to the 300 supervisors and employees, and a total of 220 questionnaires were returned or (73 percent). 20 of the 220 returned questionnaires were discarded because of incomplete information. There were 200 usable responses in total, for an overall response rate of 67%. Research analytical methods included exploratory factor analysis, reliability and validity. The analyses made use of SPSS (version 18) program for Windows to carry out the dissipative statistical analysis.

4. Findings

4.1. Descriptive Analysis

Respondents for the present study are 200 individuals working in different types of Plantation Companies in the state of Malaysia. From these individuals 100 respondents were female, while the rest consisted of male respondents. Of the subjects, only 21 percent were represented by the age of 20 and less years old, while 40 percent came from 20-30 years of age. On the other hand, 27.5 percent were from 41 to 50 years of age. Majority of the respondents were Malay amounted about 54 percent. About 49.5 percent of the respondents completed their education up to diploma and completed their Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia as compared to a smaller number of respondents who pursued higher educations. 135 of the employees being surveyed were employed as middle management, followed by 40 respondents working as supporting staff, and only 25 respondents working as top management. Over 66% were non-supervisors. Besides, about 32.5 percent had 2-4 years of experience in their
present occupation, while 6 percent have been working with the present organization for more than 10 years. The mean time for working for their immediate supervisor was a little over than 2-4 years.

4.2. Reliability Analysis

Reliability was tested for each variable of leadership behavior and organizational commitment. To measure the consistency of the scale, Cronbach’s alpha was used as a measure of reliability. After factor loading was carried out, most of the variables showed an acceptable range of reliability where the results score for supportive and directive leadership behavior are .75 and .71 each whereas for affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment are .84, .75 and .86 each with a ranged from .71 to .86. Basically, reliability coefficients of 0.7 or more are considered adequate for social studies (Hair et al., 2006).

4.3. Correlation Analysis

In this section, Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the relationship among the study variables. In addition, it identifies significant that opposes the potential value of the error from first type, and it is the amount probability uncertainty value is at significance (0.05) and (0.01) to determine the moral differences between the study variables. The statistical results are shown in table 1, which verifies the hypothesis, that is, there are significant correlations between the supportive and directive leadership behavior and affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. The details are as in the following.

4.3.1 Testing Hypothesis

H1: There are significant relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment

Statistical results the correlation between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment are shown in table 1. Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between supportive leadership behavior and affective organizational commitment was 0.806** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means supportive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with affective organizational commitment.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between directive leadership behavior and affective organizational commitment was 0.830** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means directive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with affective organizational commitment.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between supportive leadership behaviour and continuance organizational commitment was 0.757** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means supportive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with continuance organizational commitment.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between directive leadership behaviour and continuance organizational commitment was 0.680** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means supportive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with continuance organizational commitment.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between supportive leadership behaviour and normative organizational commitment was 0.753** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means supportive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with normative organizational commitment. This in turn supports the sub-hypothesis mentioned above.

Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between directive leadership behaviour and normative organizational commitment was 0.666** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means directive leadership behaviour has strong significant relationship with normative organizational commitment. This in turn supports the sub-hypothesis mentioned above.
As the statistical results shown in table 1, Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient value on the relationship between total leadership behavior and the total organizational commitment is 0.834** at a significance smaller than 0.01. It is a significant positive correlation. This means leadership behavior has strong significant relationship with organizational commitment. This in turn supports the first hypothesis mentioned above.

4.4. Regression Analysis

A series of linear regression analyses were conducted to measure the impacts between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The regression results are shown in table 2. R square is the square of the multiple correlation coefficients; it indicates the proportion of the variance of the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. The closer R square near to 1, the better the linear regression model is. The F-value is computed as the ratio of the mean sums of squares of the regression equation and the residual. The coefficient indicates the number of units of increase in the dependent variable caused by an increase of one unit in the independent variable. The detailed verifications of the second hypothesis are provided in the following.

Table 2: Regression Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Leadership</td>
<td>Affective Organizational</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>366.066**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.806**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive Leadership</td>
<td>Affective Organizational</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>437.918**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.830**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total Organizational</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>453.125**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.834**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant < 0.01, * significant< 0.05

Predictors: (Constant), Supportive & Directive Leadership Behavior

4.4.1. Testing Hypothesis

H2: There is significant impact of leadership behaviors on organizational commitment

Statistical results in table 2 illustrate the impact of leadership behaviors on organizational commitment. Statistical results illustrate the relations between supportive leadership behavior and affective organizational commitments.
were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 366.066 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.647. This means the supportive leadership behavior explain and interpret 64.7% from the gained changes affective organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the supportive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of affective organizational commitment is 0.806 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the supportive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.806 in the affective organizational commitment.

Statistical results illustrate the relations between directive leadership behavior and affective organizational commitments were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 437.918 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.687. This means the directive leadership behavior explain and interpret 68.7% from the gained changes affective organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the directive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of affective organizational commitment is 0.830 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the directive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.830 in the affective organizational commitment.

Statistical results illustrate the relations between supportive leadership behavior and continuance organizational commitments were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 265.009 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.570. This means the supportive leadership behavior explain and interpret 57.0% from the gained changes continuance organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the supportive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of continuance organizational commitment is 0.757 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the supportive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.757 in the continuance organizational commitment.

Statistical results illustrate the relations between directive leadership behavior and continuance organizational commitments were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 170.108 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.459. This means the directive leadership behavior explain and interpret 45.9% from the gained changes of continuance organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the directive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of continuance organizational commitment is 0.680 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the directive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.680 in the continuance organizational commitment.

Statistical results illustrate the relations between supportive leadership behavior and normative organizational commitments were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 259.523 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.565. This means the supportive leadership behavior explain and interpret 56.5% from the gained changes of normative organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the supportive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of normative organizational commitment is 0.753 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the supportive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.753 in the normative organizational commitment.

Statistical results illustrate the relations between directive leadership behavior and normative organizational commitments were acceptable. As indicated in the test (F) the calculated (F) value is 157.886 which are the largest of the indexed value (F) at significance less than 0.01. As a result, value of the adjusted coefficient (interpretation) $R^2$ is 0.441. This means the directive leadership behavior explain and interpret 44.1% from the gained changes of normative organizational commitment. In addition, the value of the coefficient Beta (B) for the directive leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the respondent (dependent) variable of normative organizational commitment is 0.666 at a significant less than 0.01. In other word, the change of one unit in the directive leadership behavior is followed by an increase of 0.666 in the normative organizational commitment.
As shown in table 2, for the total leadership behavior and organizational commitment, the results of F-value is 453.125 at significant less than 0.01. It indicates that the regression result of leadership behavior and organizational commitment is acceptable. The adjusted $R^2$ is 0.694, which indicates that leadership behavior explain 69.4% of the gained changes of the respondent (dependent) variable of organizational commitment. Moreover, the value of the coefficient Beta for the leadership behavior as an explanatory (independent) variable for the organizational commitment is 0.834 at a significant smaller than 0.01. This verifies the validity of the second hypothesis.

5. Discussion

Noticeably, this is a study of empirically tested the relationship and impact of supportive and directive leadership behavior with affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. The results of this investigation suggest that supportive and directive leadership behavior have significance relationship and impact with affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment in plantation companies in Malaysia. The statistical results have indicated a positive direct relationship and impact of two dimensions of path goal leadership modal, namely the supportive and directive leadership behavior with affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment which is in line with similar research as stated by Meyer and Allen (1991), employees who stay with an organization because they feel obligated or having no choice do not exhibit the same eagerness and involvement as employees who stay with an organization. As such, supportive and directive leadership behaviors are as strongly related to affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. This implies that the leaders who give advices, supports, and pay attention to the individual needs of followers will enhance the level of organizational commitment of the employees (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). Generally the results of this study support previous research (Çokluk & Yılmaz, 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Perryer & Jordan, 2005) that suggests leadership behavior have significant impacts on employees’ commitment to the organizations. In this study supportive and directive leadership behavior was shown to be a significant contributor to employees’ affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment. While the current results did not support any of the assumptions in the literatures about directive leadership behavior being able to impact the organizational commitment of employees. On the other hand, Brower, Schoorman and Tan (2000) stated that effective managers do not work in isolation from their subordinates, instead they would prefer to work with their subordinates, and the nature of the relationship between the manager and subordinate has been acknowledged as complex, interactive, and exist reciprocity in the dyad.

6. Conclusion

The above statistical results prove that there are significant strong relationship between the leadership behavior (i.e. supportive and directive) and the organizational commitment (i.e. affective, continuance and normative). More importantly, there are significant impacts of the leadership behavior on organizational commitment. In others words, improvement in the two dimensions of the Leadership Behavior may result in the improvement of the Organizational Commitments. Eventually, there should be some regulations in organizational life that will increase organizational commitments of employees. Leaders are the primary people in charge to realize these regulations, because they are responsible for effective functioning of organizations. In this sense, one of the things leaders should do is to perform supportive and/or directive leadership behavior. Supportive and directive leadership behavior is not the only determinative of organizational commitment. However, it is certain that it has a positive effect.
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