

## **Demographic Variables in Subordinates Perception of Transformational Leadership and their Organizational Commitment**

**\*Assegid Demissie Shishigu**

\*Assistant Professor, University of Gondar, P.o.Box 196, Gondar, Ethiopia;  
700583

### **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of demographic variables on the perception of employees' about immediate superiors, heads of government agencies' Transformational Leadership behaviors and its influence on employees' organizational commitment.

Data are collected through questionnaires from 255 respondents. The instruments used are adapted from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed By Bass and Avelio (1997); and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) proposed by Meyer and Allen (1995).

The findings of the study show a lower manifestation of Transformational Leadership behaviors (M=2.16) and Organizational Commitment (M=3.11). The variance explained by Transformational Leadership behaviors in Organizational Commitment is 19.2 percent. Demographics variables in total explained only 1.2 percent (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) of the variation in Transformational Leadership, (R<sup>2</sup> = .016), F=4.105, p=.044). The Beta analysis also shows "Age" emerged as the significant predictor demographic variable of Transformational Leadership ( $\beta = 0.126$ , p=.044). Employees who stayed under one superior for more than 3 years have relatively the lowest Organizational Commitment. New comers are found having relatively better Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, and Normative Commitment than senior employees, while employees who serve longer and less in their educational background have relative higher Continuance Commitment.

**KEY WORDS:** *Demographic Variables, Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment.*

### **1. Introduction**

Transformational Leadership behaviors introduced by Burns, (1978) and developed further by Bass, (1985), Bass & Avolio, (1994) and Bass & Riggio, (2006) is often seen as a promising approach to understand the role of leadership in employees' organizational commitment. In well over 100 empirical studies, Transformational Leadership has been found to be consistently related to organizational commitment and leadership effectiveness (Bryman, 1992; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

However, most of these studies were not conducted in public organizations. And the influence of demographic variables on subjective' perception of their superiors' Transformational Leadership behavior and its effect on their commitment were not extensively studied.

Therefore, recognizing a gap in the literature, which provided no clarification of the extent of manifestation of Transformational Leadership behaviors and employees' Organizational Commitment, within the context of government agencies and

respondents' perception based on their demographic variables are the main purposes of this study.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study is to examine effects of subordinates' demographic variables on their perceptions of immediate superiors' manifestation of Transformational Leadership behaviors and on their organizational commitment.

Hence, the specific objectives of this study are:

1. To undertake assessment to what extent Transformational Leadership behaviors is perceived particularly based on their demographic;
2. To assess the level of commitment of employees of government agencies based on their demographic;
3. To identify the effect of demographic of subordinate's on their perception of their superior's transformational leadership behaviors;
4. To assess the effect of demographic variables on employee's organizational commitment level.

## 3. Research Question

The following research questions are addressed by this study:

1. To what extent that heads of government agencies exhibit transformational leadership behaviors as perceived by their direct reports based on their demographic variables?
2. To what extent those immediate subordinates of heads of government agencies commit to their organizations based on their demographic variables?
3. What is the influence of demographic variables on the perception of employees' transformational leadership behaviors of their leaders?
4. What is the relationship between demographic variables of respondents and their organizational commitment?

## 4. Literature Review

### 4.1. Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership refers to a class of theories that describe effective leaders as those able to inspire their followers to perform at higher levels than they would under normal circumstances (Den Hartog et al., 1997). Transformational leaders develop their follower (thought coaching effort and personal involvement) to the point where the followers are able to take on leaders roll and perform beyond standard or goal (Yukl, 1990). According to Bass and Avolio, (1994) the consequence of Transformational leadership behavior is that followers develop the capacity to solve future problems which might be unforeseen by the leader. Transformational leader engages with others in such a way the leader and the followers raise one another to a high level of motivation (Yammario & Bass, 1990). The distinctive dimensions of Transformational Leadership are *Idealized Influence* (trust, respect, and pride stimulated by and emotional identification with the leader), *Intellectual Stimulation* (encouraging followers to question their own way of doing things and become innovative), *Inspirational Motivation* (encouraging followers to improve their contribution by articulating a compelling vision), and *Individualized Consideration* (providing personal attention, empathy, and encouragement for self-development of followers) (Bass & Avolio, 1993).

In this study additional dimension or component, *Empowerment* is used because it is considered as a core component of Transformational leadership by (Behling & McFillen, 1996; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Podsakoff et al., 1990; Yukl, 1999; cited in Edward, Jennifer R, 2008).

## **4.2. Organizational Commitment**

According to Allen & Meyer, (1990), Organizational Commitment has three general components: attachment to the organization (*Affective Commitment*), perceived costs associated with leaving the organization (*Continuance Commitment*), and feelings of obligation to the organization (*Normative Commitment*).

Mathieu and Zajac, (1990) in a meta-analytic study of 14 studies with 7420 subjects involving gender and *Organizational Commitment* obtained a mean correlation of 0.089 for organizational commitment and gender. They suggest that gender may affect employee's perceptions of their workplace and attitudes towards the organization. Hawkins, (1997) Kalderberg and his colleagues, (1995); Colbert and Kwon, (2000) founds no significant difference between the mean level of commitment for female and male high school principals. Ngo and Tsang, (1998) supported the viewpoint that the effects of gender on commitment are very subtle.

The antecedents of *Affective Commitment* to the organization include personal characteristics- age, gender, organization tenure, educational level etc-, (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The relationship between demographic variables and affective commitment are neither strong nor consistent (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Age and tenure are best thought of as substitute variables of accumulated investments and perceived alternatives and not as direct predictors of *Continuance Commitment* (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Wahn, (1998) on the other hand, argued that women can exhibit higher levels of continuance commitment than men can.

*Normative Commitment*- John P. Meyer et al., (2002), argued that organizational tenure correlated less strongly with normative commitment in studies outside North America. Allen and Meyer, (1990) reported that factors such as (education, age, etc.) may influence the level of normative commitment).

In general, although the relationship between gender, age and tenure as well as educational level and organizational commitment has been extensively studied, the literature has yet to provide strong and consistent evidence to enable an unequivocal interpretation of the relationship (Meyer & Allen, (1997). Specially their relationship with that of Transformational leadership is not well addressed.

## **5. Research Methodology**

### **5.1. Research Technique**

The research technique that this study followed is descriptive research .Data is collected from both primary and secondary sources.

### **5.2. Population**

This study is conducted in three Zones (sub-divisions of a regional state) and 16 woredas (sub-division of a Zone) of the Amhara National Regional State, Ethiopia which are selected by their convenience. At each Zone and Woreda level there are at least 13 government agencies or offices (such as: Education, Health care, Agricultural development, etc,) who directly involve in serving the rural population.

The population for the study is therefore, 798, the total actual number of immediate subordinates of each of heads of agencies or “job process owners”.

### 5.3. Sample

The sampling technique used in this study is stratified sampling .The total population is divided into two strata (i.e. Zone and Woreda administrative levels). A sample of 330 (At Zone level, 90; and at Woreda level, 240) was randomly selected from 13 government agencies. Questionnaires were distributed to the 330 and 264 responses were received, incomplete responses were removed, and 255 useable questionnaires were collected.

### 5.4. Research Instruments

Transformational Leadership behaviors is measured by questionnaire adapted from The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaires (MLQ-form 5x) developed by (Bass & Avolio, 1995). This instrument contains 30 items that are rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled as 0=*not at all*, 1=*once in a while*, 2= *sometimes*, 3=*fairly often*, 4=*frequently, if not always*.

The most ideal level of effective leadership suggested by (Bass and Avolio, 1997) is a mean of 3.0 or above is taken as a standard for measuring the transformational leadership behaviors and dimensions.

The adapted instrument reliability and validity is tested by *cronbach’s Alpha (.897)*, *factor analysis*, the five factors components explained about, of variance, (56 percent ), and *inter- component correlations*( $r=.546$  - $.726$  ).

The second instrument adapted from Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), developed by (Meyer &Allen, 1997) has 15 items rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labeled: 1=*strongly disagree*, 2= *disagree*, 3= *neither agree nor disagree*, 4=*agree*, 5= *strongly agree*. It is self-scoring questionnaire.

The reliability and validity tests of the instrument were a) the cronbach’s alpha of Organizational Commitment instrument is .761, and the three subscales, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, and Normative Commitment have cronbach’s alpha .649; .641; .669 respectively b) the factor analysis, five components explained about 60 percent of the variance; and c) the inter - component correlations are between ( $r=.230$ - $.439$ ;  $p<0.01$ ).

**5.6. Data Analysis:** descriptive statistical analysis, Pearson’s product movement correlation and Stepwise multiple regressions are used.

## 1. Results of Data Analysis

### 2.

#### 6.1. Respondents Demographics Data

Respondents provided their gender with male accounting for 89.8 percent; more than two-third of the respondents 67.8 percent (N=173) were undergraduate, and 28.6 percent (N=73) were diploma holders. 38.8 percent (N= 99), are below 26 years of age, 28.2 percent (N=72) of them were between the age of 26 and 35 years, and another 18.8 percent (N=48) are between 36-45 years old. In general about 67 percent of respondents are below the age of 36 and 85.9 percent of the respondents are below 46 years old (Table 1).

In addition to this, 37.3 percent (N=95) of the study subjects have experience of one year or below, and 27.4 percent (N=70) of them have up to 3 years work experience. Overall 64.7 percent of the respondents served in the organization up to 3 years.

53.3 percent (N=136) have an experience of one year or below under their current immediate superior, while the other 25.9 percent (N=66) serve from one – two years.

In general, 79.2 percent of them have worked under their current superior up to two years. Hence, the majorities of respondents are male, youngsters, first degree holders, and have an experience of one year or below in the organization and under their current superior.

**Table 1: Demographics of the Sample (N= 255)**

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	229	89.8
	Female	26	10.2
Age	less than 26 yrs	99	38.8
	26 up to 35 yrs	72	28.2
	36 up to 45 yrs	48	18.8
	46 up to 55 yrs	35	13.7
	56 yrs and above	1	.4
Education	grade 12 complete	7	2.7
	Diploma	73	28.6
	Under graduate	173	67.8
	Masters	1	.4
	.Others	1	.4
experience with organization	one yr and below	95	37.3
	above 1yr up to 2yrs	34	13.3
	2yrs up to 3yrs	36	14.1
	3yrs up to 4 yrs	17	6.7
	above 4yrs	73	28.6
experience with superior	1yr and below	136	53.3
	1 up to 2yrs	66	25.9
	.Greater than 2yrs and up to 3yrs	24	9.4
	more than 3yrs	29	11.4

**6.2. Research question one:**

Research Question 1 state that “To what extent that heads of government agencies exhibit transformational leadership behaviors as perceived by their subordinates based on their demographic variables?”

As illustrated in Table 2, male participants’ perception means score is better than females (M=2.17 vs. M= 2.03). Respondents whose educational level is only 12<sup>th</sup> grade completed and those 56 years and more old have relatively the highest and equal perception (M=2.67) of transformational Leadership behaviors. Those who serve in the organization from 3-4 years have relatively the least perception (M=1.83).In two demographic variables “years of experience in the organization”, and “years of experience under current superior”, participants who stayed for 1-2 years rated, 2.35.and 2.19 respectively.

### 6.3. Research Question Two

Research Question 2 states that *“To what extent those immediate subordinates of heads of government agencies commit to their organizations based on their demographic variables?”*

The results reported in Table. 2 Illustrate descriptive statistics of organizational commitment, Affective commitment, Continuance commitment, and normative commitment based on demographic variables.

*Gender:* male participants have relatively better Organizational Commitment (M=3.12), Affective Commitment (M=3.54), Continuance Commitment (M=2.83), and Normative Commitment (M=2.98), than female.

*Age:* respondents who are 46-55 years old have relatively the highest Organizational Commitment (M=3.32), Affective Commitment (M=3.75), and Continuance Commitment (M=3.03),. Participants with 56 years and more have relatively the highest Normative Commitment (M=3.20), and lowest Organizational Commitment (M=3.00), Affective Commitment t (M=3.20), and Continuance Commitment (M=2.6), (Table2). The table also displays that respondents whose *educational* level is grade 12<sup>th</sup> completed have relatively the highest (M=3.26) of Continuance Commitment.

*Year of experience in the organization:* Subordinates who serve in the organization one year or below have the lowest Continuance Commitment (M=2.73). But those who serve for more than 4 years in the organization have relatively the highest Continuance Commitment (M=3.01), while those who served more than 4 years have the highest Organizational Commitment (M=3.17), those who serve 1-2 years have relatively the highest Affective Commitment (M=3.63), and Normative Commitment (M=3.00). Participants with 3-4 years service rated the lowest for organizational commitment (M=2.95), Affective Commitment (M=3.15) and normative commitment (M=2.91) (Table2).

*Years of experience under current superior:* respondents who served under their current superior for one year or below have the highest Organizational Commitment (M=3.13), Affective Commitment (M=3.55) and Normative Commitment (M=3.02) level, while those served for 3 and more years have the lowest for organizational commitment (M=2.92), affective commitment (M=3.38), Continuance Commitment (M=2.61), and Normative Commitment (M=2.78) (Table 2).

In general, employees who worked for *three years and more* under the current superior have the lowest Organizational, Affective, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment. Subordinates who are female, who are 56 and more years old, those who serve in the organization for one year or below, and those who serve for more than 3 years under their current superior have relatively the lowest Continuance Commitment.

Overall according to the perception of the study subjects' heads of government agencies are not Transformational Leaders. Employees are not commitment to their organization.

**Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment and subscales based on demographic (N = 255)**

		TL		OC		AC		CC		NC	
		M	Std	M	Std	M	Std	M	Std	M	Std
Gender	Male	2.17	.714	3.12	.521	3.54	.728	2.83	.716	2.98	.644
	Female	2.03	.686	2.97	.430	3.37	.565	2.76	.722	2.78	.618
Age	< 26 yrs	2.08	.689	3.05	.431	3.48	.681	2.70	.677	2.96	.572
	26 - 35yrs	2.20	.690	3.12	.566	3.52	.719	2.91	.784	2.92	.726
	36 up to 45 yrs	2.04	.834	3.05	.561	3.49	.764	2.81	.715	2.86	.651
	46 up to 55 yrs	2.46	.568	3.32	.513	3.75	.725	3.03	.622	3.18	.619
	56yrs and above	2.67	.	3.00	.	3.20	.	2.60	.	3.20	.
Education	grade 12th complete	2.67	.590	3.03	.430	3.49	.823	3.26	.321	2.34	.550
	Diploma	2.14	.717	3.16	.539	3.50	.706	3.00	.748	2.99	.674
	Under graduate	2.15	.710	3.08	.502	3.55	.719	2.74	.688	2.96	.615
	Masters	1.80	.	2.60	.	3.00	.	1.40	.	3.40	.
Years of experience in organization	1yr or below=95	2.12	.675	3.10	.538	3.58	.704	2.73	.795	2.99	.674
	above 1yr up to 2yrs, N=34	2.35	.732	3.13	.403	3.63	.581	2.77	.585	3.00	.627
	2yrs up to 3yrs, N=36	2.10	.745	3.03	.474	3.34	.845	2.78	.545	2.97	.567
	3yrs up to 4 yrs ,N=17	1.83	.850	2.95	.614	3.15	.841	2.79	.461	2.91	.810
	above 4yrs N=73	2.23	.685	3.17	.520	3.59	.658	3.01	.759	2.92	.613
Years of experience under	1yr or below N=136	2.16	.711	3.13	.525	3.55	.711	2.81	.757	3.02	.683

superior	1 up to 2yrs N=66	2.1 9	.73 7	3.0 9	.52 5	3.4 8	.74 7	2.8 5	.69 8	2.9 4	.61 4
	more than 3yrs,N=2 9	2.1 1	.66 8	2.9 2	.51 0	3.3 8	.80 2	2.6 1	.61 7	2.7 8	.60 8

**TL=transformational leadership, OC=organizational commitment, AC=affective commitment, CC=continuance commitment, NC=normative commitment**

#### 6.4. Inter- Correlations

As Table 3 illustrates gender is negatively significantly correlated with Age ( $r = -.195, p < .01$ ) and with Experience in the Organization ( $r = -.138, p < .05$ ); Work Area is negatively significantly correlated with Age ( $r = -.192, p < .01$ ) and with Education ( $r = -.179, p < .01$ ); Age is positively correlated with Experience in Organization ( $r = .494, p < .01$ ), with Experience under Superior ( $r = .286, p < .01$ ) and negatively significantly related with Education ( $r = -.285, p < .01$ ); Education is also negatively and significantly correlated with Experience in Organization ( $r = -.254, p < .01$ ), and with Experience under Superior ( $r = -.333, p < .01$ ). Experience under Superior is also positively significantly related with Experience in Organization ( $r = .481, p < .01$ ). Experience in organization has highest positive correlation with age and with experience under superior.

**Table 3: Inter-correlations among the Demographic Variables (N = 255)**

	1	2	3	4	5
Gender	1				
work area	-.014	1			
Age	-.195**	-.192**	1		
Education	-.011	-.179**	-.285**	1	
experience in organization	-.138*	.025	.494**	-.254**	1
experience under superior	-.057	.067	.286**	-.333**	.481**

**\*\*.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), **\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

#### 6.5. Research Question Three

Research Question 3 stated that, “What is the relationship between demographic variables of respondents and their perception of transformational leadership behaviors and its dimensions?”

As table 4 indicates only “Age” is positively significantly associated with Transformational Leadership behaviors ( $r = .126, p < .05$ ), Individual Consideration ( $r = .135, p < .05$ ), and Empowerment ( $r = .134, p < .05$ ). The other demographic variables (gender, work area, education, years of experience in the organization, and years of experience under superior) have no significant correlation with any of components of Transformational Leadership. Gender and education are negatives for all dimensions and Transformational Leadership.



**Table 4: Correlation between Demographic variables and Transformational Leadership**

	Idealized Influence	Inspirational Motivation	Intellectual Stimulation	Individualized consideration	Empowerment	Transformational Leadership
Gender	-.018	-.010	-.073	-.091	-.061	-.061
work area	-.042	.043	.046	-.045	-.065	-.018
Age	.100	.084	.070	<b>.135*</b>	<b>.134*</b>	<b>.126*</b>
Education	-.003	-.022	-.018	-.037	-.026	-.026
experience in organization	-.006	.011	-.015	.021	.047	.015
experience under superior	-.019	-.063	.001	.001	.020	-.013

**\*\*.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). **\***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed),

#### **6.6. Variance of Transformational Leadership Explained by Demographic Variables**

To see if demographic variables significantly predicted the perception of Transformational Leadership, *stepwise regression analysis* is used. As Table 6 reveals demographics variables explained only *1.2 percent* (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) of the variation in transformational leadership, (R<sup>2</sup> = .016), F=4.105, p=.044). The *Beta analysis* also shows “Age” emerged as the significant predictor demographic variable of transformational leadership ( $\beta = 0.126$ , p=.044) .the rest dimensions: gender, work area, education, years of experience in the organization and years of experience under their current superior are not significant

Therefore, the findings of this study shows that older and less educated subordinates have relatively better perception of Transformational Leadership behaviors of their superiors. As the descriptive statistics in Table1 contained *67 percent* of respondents are below the age of 36 and more than two-third or *67.8 percent* are undergraduates. Therefore, the probable reason might be older respondents are less in their educational level.

**Table 6: Variance of Transformational Leadership predicted by Demographic variables**

<b>Regression analysis</b>						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	.126	.016	.012	.708	4.105	.044

**Coefficients**

Model	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		Beta		
1 (Constant)	.097		20.513	.000
Age	.041	.126	2.026	.044

**6.7. Research Question Four**

Research Question 4 stated, “*Are there relationships between demographic variables of respondents and their organizational, affective, continuance, and normative commitment?*”

To answer research questions 4 as Table 5 indicates only “*Age*” is positively and significantly correlated with Organizational Commitment, ( $r=.129$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). This is consistent with previous researchers, such as (Mathieu and Zajac ,1990; Brief & Aldag, 1980; Dornstein & Matalon, 1989; Kushman, 1992; Morrow & Wirth, 1989). But the study of Colbert and Kwon (2000) had not been able to show a significant link between Age and Organizational Commitment.

On the other hand, in this study, there is no significant correlation between Demographic variables (gender, education, years of experience in the organization, and years of experience under the superior) and Organizational Commitment (Table 5).

Other researchers such as, (Loscocco, K. A., 1990; Kalderberg et al., 1995; and Hawkins, 1997) did not find significant difference between the mean level of commitment for female and male.

But there was general support as there is a positive correlation between organizational commitment and organizational tenure (Kushman, 1992; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

The current study reveals that subordinates who are older (46-55 years old), and those who serve for few years (1-2 years of experience in the organization) have relatively better organizational commitment; while the study of Chu, Chien-Hong’s , (2007) showed older, and long-term employees have a higher level of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen, (1993) also reported that middle tenure employees exhibited less measured commitment than new or senior employees did.

However, this findings shows that respondents who worked in the organization, and under the same superior for more than 3 years, have the lowest Organizational Commitment.

In the current study, male participants have relatively better mean score of continuance commitment than their female counter-parts. While previous researchers such as, Wahn, (1998) argued that women can exhibit higher levels of continuance commitment that men can.

On the other hand, ‘Age’ is positively and significantly correlated with Continuance commitment ( $r=.132$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) while *Education* has negative statistically significant ( $r= -.177$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) correlation with Continuance Commitment. But *Education* has no significant correlation with Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment and total Organizational Commitment.

*Experience in organization*: Experience in organization has positive statistically significant ( $r= .153$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) with Continuance Commitment. Overall, Continuance Commitment is significantly correlated with Age, Education (negatively), and Experience in Organization.

Normative Commitment and Affective Commitment have no significant correlation with all six demographic variables indicated (Table 5).while John P. Meyer et al., (2002), argued that organizational tenure correlated less strongly with Normative Commitment in their studies outside North America. Allen and Meyer, (1990) reported also that factors such as (education, age, etc.) may influence the level of Normative Commitment).

In this study, respondents who worked in the organization, and under the same superior for more than 3 years, have the lowest Organizational Commitment.

**Table 5: Pearson Correlations Demographics as independent variable and subscales of Organizational Commitment as dependent (N=255)**

o	Organizational Commitment	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative commitment
Gender	-.089	-.075	-.029	-.097
work area	-.066	-.059	-.087	.005
Age	.129*	.093	.132*	.061
Education	-.012	.044	-.177**	.120
experience in organization	.035	-.034	.153*	-.048
experience under superior	-.019	.011	.027	-.089

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

### 6.8. Variance of Organizational Commitment Predicted by Demographic Variables

Demographic Variables (Table 6) as a group explained 1.3 percent (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variation in Organizational Commitment ( $R^2 = .016$ ) and the significant F-value ( $F = 4.210$ ,  $p=.041$ ). The Beta analysis also reveals “Age” is the only significant predictor of Organizational Commitment ( $\beta =0.128$ ,  $p=.041$ ). All other Demographic Variables in the study are not significant predictors of Organizational Commitment.

**Table 6: Variance of Organizational Commitment explained by significant Demographic variables**

Regression analysis						
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
	.128	.016	.013	.511	4.210	.041

**Coefficients**

Model		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
			Beta		
1	(Constant)	.070		42.594	.000
	Age	.030	.128	2.052	.041

**6.9. Variance of Continuance Commitment Explained**

Continuance commitment is positively significantly correlated with “Age”, and “Experience in the organization” but with “Education” negatively (Table 5). The stepwise regression analysis in (Table 7) displays that demographic variables as independent variables explained 2.7 percent (Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>) of the variation in continuance commitment (R<sup>2</sup> = .031). The significant F-value (F = 8.151, p=.005). The beta analysis in Table 7 also shows that *education* as demographic variable is negatively the significant predictor of continuance commitment ( $\beta = -.177$ , p=.005).

The descriptive statistics in Table 1 also illustrates participants who are 46-55 years old, and those serve in the organization for more than 4 years have relatively the highest continuance commitment. This result is similar with the study of Meyer and Allen, (1997) who recommended that age and tenure are best thought of as substitute variables of accumulated investments and perceived alternatives and not as direct predictors of continuance commitment. Romzek, (1990) also suggested age and tenure are associated with the accumulation of investments.

As shown in Table 5, *education* has negative, statistically significant correlation with continuance commitment, and participants who are 12th grade completed in their educational level have relatively the highest continuance commitment (Table1).

This study also shows that those who have experience under current immediate superior for more than 3 years have the lowest continuance commitment, whereas, those who stayed below two years have higher continuance commitment (Table 1). This finding implies that to work for more than two years under the supervision of one superior is boring and damaging subordinates’ need to stay with the organization.

On the other hand, 68.6 percent of respondents are undergraduates and above in their educational level, 67.1 percent of them are below the age of 35 years, and 71.4 percent have maximum 4 years of experience in the organization (Table 1). Therefore, these groups might not have a cost to leave the organization; but they may face lack of job alternative that force them to stay in the organization.

Overall, the study shows demographic variables of respondents' influence their continuance commitment only by explaining 2.7 percent of variance, which is very low.

**Table 7: Variance of Continuance Commitment explained by significant Demographic variables**

Regression Analysis						
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
	.177	.031	.027	.705	8.151	.005

#### Coefficients

Model		Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
			Beta		
1	(Constant)	.211		16.202	.000
	Education	.077	-.177	-2.855	.005

Excluded: age, experience in the organization

#### 6.10. Variance of Affecting Commitment and Normative Commitment Explained

Table 5 displays that all demographic variables are not significantly associated with affective commitment and Normative Commitment. None of them are found predictor of affective commitment and Normative Commitment of subordinates.

As it is shown in (Table 1) subordinates who are above 56 years old, those who have experience of one-two years in the organization, and those who stayed for one year or below under their current immediate superior have relatively the higher Normative Commitment. On the other hand, those who are 36-45 years old, and who have experience more than three years under their current immediate superior have the lower Normative Commitment. According to Meyer & Allen, (1997) normative commitment develops on the basis of a particular kind of investment that employees find difficult to reciprocate such as education. Given the norms of reciprocity, employees might develop feelings of obligation to the organization as they try to rectify the imbalance. They also added that cultural and individual differences exist in the extent to which people will internalize reciprocity norms and therefore in the extent to which organizational investments will lead to feelings of indebtedness.

## 7. Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that heads of government agencies are not manifesting Transformational leadership behaviors. Employees are not committed to their organizations. However, relatively male respondents' perception of the manifestation of their superiors' Transformational leadership behaviors means score is better than females ( $M=2.17$  vs.  $M= 2.03$ ). Subjects of the whose educational level is only 12<sup>th</sup> grade completed and those 56 years and more old have relatively the highest and equal perception ( $M=2.67$ ) of Transformational Leadership behaviors. The study participants who stayed 1-2 years in the organization and under their current superior rated their perception 2.35 and 2.19 respectively.

*Age* is positively significantly associated with *Transformational Leadership Behaviors* ( $r=.126$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), *individual consideration* ( $r=.135$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), and *empowerment* ( $r=.134$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). In general, demographics variables in total explained only 1.2 percent (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variation in Transformational Leadership, ( $R^2 = .016$ ),  $F=4.105$ ,  $p=.044$ ). The *Beta analysis* also shows "Age" emerged as the significant predictor demographic variable of Transformational Leadership ( $\beta =0 .126$ ,  $p=.044$ )

Older respondents have relatively the highest Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, and Continuance Commitment. Respondents whose *educational* level is grade 12<sup>th</sup> completed have relatively the highest of Continuance Commitment. Subordinates who serve in the organization one year or below have relatively the lowest Continuance Commitment. Those who serve 1-2 years have relatively the highest Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment. Participants with 3-4 years service rated the lowest for Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment. Respondents who served under their current superior for one year or below have the highest Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment and Normative Commitment level, while those served for 3 and more years have the lowest for Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, and Normative Commitment.

*Age* is positively and significantly correlated with Organizational Commitment, ( $r=.129$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), and Continuance Commitment ( $r=.132$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). Education has negative statistically significant ( $r= -.177$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) correlation with Continuance Commitment. But it has no significant correlation with Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment and Organizational Commitment. Experience in organization has positive statistically significant ( $r= .153$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) Continuance Commitment.

The value of  $R^2$  shows that demographic variables as a group explained 1.3 percent (adjusted  $R^2$ ) of the variation in Organizational Commitment ( $R^2 = .016$ ) and the significant F-value ( $F = 4.210$ ,  $p=.041$ ). The Beta analysis reveals that *Age* is the only significant predictor of Organizational Commitment ( $\beta =0.128$ ,  $p=.041$ ).

## References

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P.(1990).The measurement and antecedent of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63: 1-18.
- Bass, B. M., (1985).*Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J.(1993a).Transformational Leadership and Organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17, 1-7.
- Bass,B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994).Improving organizational effectiveness through Transformational Leadership. California: Sage.
- Bass, B.M.,& Avolio, B.J. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual leader form, rater, and scoring key for MLQ (Form 5x-Short).Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B.(1997). Full range leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden
- Bass B. M., & Riggio, R. E.(2006).Transformational Leadership. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bryman, A. (1992) Charisma and Leadership in Organizations, London: Sag
- Edward,Jennefer,R.(2008).Transformational leadership, [http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/persons/jennefer Edward](http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/persons/jennefer%20Edward), accessed on 12/03/09
- Brief, A. P., & Aldag, R. J.(1980).Antecedents of organizational commitment among hospital nurses.*Sociology of work and occupations*, 7, 210-221.
- Burns, J. M.(1978).Leadership. NY: Harper & Row. Consulting, Psychologists Press.
- Chu, Chien-Hong,(2007).Evaluating the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' organizational commitment in the Taiwanese Banking Industry. *Journal of Dissertation abstract international*, Vol.67 (7):2642-A
- Colbert,A.E. and Kwon,I.G. (2000). Factors related to the organizational commitment of college and University Auditors. *Journal Of managerial issues* 11(4):484-502
- Denhardt, J. V. &Campbell, K. B. (2006).The role of democratic values in transformational leadership. *Administration and society*.38,5: 556-572
- Den Hartog,M.,van Muijen, J.& Koopman,and P. (1997) .Transactional versus transformational leadership. *Analysis of MLW*, 70:19-43
- Dornstein, M., & Matalon, Y.(1989). A comprehensive analysis of the predictors of organizational commitment: A study of voluntary Army personnel in Israel. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34:192-203.
- Edward,Jennefer,R.(2008).Transformational leadership, [http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/persons/jennefer Edward](http://www.ibr.tcu.edu/persons/jennefer%20Edward), accessed on 12/03/09
- Hawkins, P. (1997). Organizational culture: sailing between evangelism and complexity. *Human Relations*, 50, 417-440
- Javidan, M. and Waldman, D.A.(2003).Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: measurement and consequences. *Public administration review*, 63 (2): 229-242
- John P. Meyer, David J. Stanley, Lynne Herscovitch, and Laryssa Topolnytsky(2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 61, 20–52 (2002)
- Kalderberg, D.O.,Becker,B.W. & Zonkovic,A. (1995). Work and Commitment among young professionals: A study of male and female dentists. *Human relations*, 48(11):1355-1377
- Kerr, S., and Jermier, J. M.(1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22: 375-403.
- Kouzes & Posner, 1987
- Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 5-42. ;
- Loscocco, K. A. (1990). Reactions to blue-collar work: A comparison of women and men. *Work and Occupations*, 17, 152-177
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N.(1996). Effectiveness correlates

of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.

Massie Joseph L.(2003).*The essential of management*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Prentice-Hall of India P.L.C

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M.(1990).A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2):171-194.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J.(1991).A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1:61-89.

Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C.(1993). Commitment to Organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J.(1997).*Commitment in the workplace*. Thousands Oaks,CA: Sage Publications

Morrow, P. C.,& Wirth, R. (1989).Work commitment among salaried professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34:40-56.

Ngo, H.Y. and Tsang, A.W.1998, Employment practices and organizational commitment: differential effect for men and women? *International Journal of organizational analysis*,6(3):251-267

Podsakoff et al., 1990;

Quinn,John F.&Joseph A.Patrick(1997).*Management Ethics Integrity at work*. India: Sage Publications,

Romzek,B.S., (1990). Employee investment and commitment: The ties that bind. *Public Administration review*, 50:374-382

Shamir, B.& Howel, J. M. (1999).Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *Leadership quarterly*, 10, 2:257-283

Van Wart, M.(2003). Public sector leadership theory: an assessment. *Public administration Review*, 63, 2: 214-228

Wahn,J.C. (1998).Sex difference in the continuance component of organizational commitment. *Group and organizational management*, 23(3): 256-266

Yammarino, F.J. & Bass, B.M.(1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects on naval officers: Some preliminary findings', in K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (eds) *Measures of Leadership*, Leadership Library of America, West Orange, NJ.

Yukl,G. (1990).*Skills for managers and leaders*. Englewood Cliffs,NJ: Prentice Hall

Yukl G.(2002).*Leadership in organizations*.5<sup>th</sup>ed., Sourabh Printers pvt.Ltd.