

INVESTIGATING TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A CASE STUDY OF A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY'S LECTURERS IN THAILAND

Pannarat Kadish* and Maureen Ricafort**

Abstract: *Amidst the current trends faced by the higher education sector in Thailand, universities strive to achieve excellence by offering quality degree programmes which adopt innovative approaches. In order to create, develop and implement these demand-driven programmes, academic leadership is required to cultivate responsive scholars, professors, lecturers and academic staff. In as much as keeping committed and satisfied employees to the organization is becoming a challenge, retaining effective leaders with the necessary skills that fosters growth and unleashes potentials, now becomes a much harder find. Identifying what keeps employees satisfied supports strategies that would help retain them as well as on how to utilize employees' skills in order for them to provide greater contribution to the organization.*

This research paper aims to address the relationship of transformational leadership with the organizational commitment of lecturers of a private university in Thailand. Empirical evidence were gathered for the purpose of evaluating lecturer's level of agreement towards transformational leadership behavioral factors demonstrated by their respective deans/ department chairs and its relationship with organizational commitment factors. A questionnaire scale which includes the 20 transformational leadership behavioral factors by Bass (1985) and the three-component model (TCM) of organizational commitment by Meyer & Allen (2004) were used to collect primary quantitative information. Conclusions derived from this research study will contribute to the university's knowledge on the relationship of transformational leadership behavioral factors that could influence organizational commitment of their lecturers, which in turn will assist in identifying areas of improvement that focuses on the development of its future leaders.

Keywords: *Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Academic Administrator*

1. INTRODUCTION

The success of an organization depends on continuous improvement of organizational performance built upon effective leadership. Identifying what keeps employees satisfied supports strategies that would help retain them as well as on

* Rangsit University, Thailand

** Webster University, Thailand

how to utilize employees' skills in order for them to provide greater contribution to the organization.

The concept of transformational leadership behavior with regards to its relationship with organizational commitment has been the subject of various research studies. Transformational leadership studies alone were conducted not only in the higher education industry such as the study of Tahir *et al.* (2014) in Malaysia, Mohammed *et al.* (2013) in Nigeria, Bogler *et al.* (2013) in Israel, Webb (2009) in the US, and Pounder (2008) in UAE to name a few, but also in different industries and in relation to other factors, such as the study of leadership styles in university hospital by Negussie & Demissie (2013); transformational leadership in relation to self-efficacy and work engagement of nurses in Portugal (Salanova *et al.*, 2011), transformational leadership and work engagement by Kovjanic *et al.* (2013). Studies on organizational commitment with other variables are also widespread such as the study on organizational commitment, work engagement, person-supervisor fit and turnover intention by Zhang *et al.* (2015), on employee commitment and organizational development by Gul (2015) and on leadership, work engagement and organizational commitment by Sukbong *et al.* (2015). Additionally, studies were also conducted on transformational leadership behavior in relation to organizational commitment such as the study of Dunn *et al.* (2012), Kent and Chelladuari (2001), and Dumay and Galand (2012). These studies revealed that organizational commitment has a strong positive association with transformational leadership behavior.

Following previous studies conducted on transformational leadership behavior and organizational commitment, this study focuses on identifying the influence of transformational leadership behavior of academic administrators (deans/department chair) perceived by lecturers in relation to lecturers' organizational commitment. This paper sought to reveal a strong positive relationship between transformational leadership behavior and organizational commitment factors.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

As higher education in Thailand is gearing towards the concept of autonomy in terms of greater flexibility in academic matters, financial management, and human resources and administration, one factor that hinders its growth is limited leadership vision (Lao, 2015). Lao even further explained that academic administrators are now being driven by the need to meet quantitative standards such as quality assurance ratings and international rankings. This limits the ability of the university to spearhead academic excellence that would give them more edge in the worldwide market. As academic administrators are expected to juggle between producing results that generate revenue (Garrett & Pooch, 2011) and responding to increased regulations and navigating through bureaucracy (Morris & Laipple, 2015), time spent in focusing on academic growth as well as vision setting

and personnel development is now being set aside. According to Suwanwela (2008), an autonomous university will only work successfully through good leadership. Leadership that could generate constructive change (Leithwood & Levin, 2005) and that influences the processes which relates to commitment (Strauss *et al.*, 2009) is called transformational leadership. Transformational leaders according to Burns (1978) motivates followers to achieve more than what they are asked for and expected of. Transformational leaders encourage growth, innovation, productivity and organizational commitment among employees (Mohammed *et al.*, 2012; Putri, 2015).

The study focuses on the factors of transformational leadership behavior according to Bass (1985) which includes the following:

- (a) Idealized influence - encouraging subordinates to think highly of their leaders (attributed) and actions of leaders that demonstrates organizational mission, values and beliefs (behavioral); this component is referred to as a leader's charisma (Bayram & Dinc, 2015) and that leaders enjoys admiration, respect and trust (Boerner *et al.*, 2007).
- (b) Inspirational motivation - leaders who have optimistic organizational vision and leaders who can clearly articulate what needs to be done (Omar & Hussin, 2013).
- (c) Intellectual stimulation - leaders' innovative ideas that inspires subordinates to think out of the box and figure out new perspectives to find solutions (Boerner *et al.*, 2007; Marn, 2012).
- (d) Individual consideration - identifying and responding to the needs of each staff member; "degree of personal attention and encouragement of self-development a leader devotes to the employees" (Marn, 2012).

Retaining academic administrators who demonstrate transformational leadership skills is crucial in instigating organizational commitment of employees. Organizational commitment is important, not only to increase productivity of employees but to also lower the rate of turnover in academics as well as absenteeism (Tahir *et al.*, 2014). Employees who have strong attachment to the organization tends to stay for a longer period of time (Adegue, 2012; Tolentino, 2013). For the purpose of this paper, academic administrators are defined as the deans or department chairs of each faculty/ college of the university.

Components or factors of organizational commitment by Meyer & Allen (2004) that were used in this study includes the following:

- (a) Affective commitment - "employees stay because they want to"; according to Liou (2008), through organizational policies and activities promoting connection with the workforce, employees feel positive connection with the organization which causes their desire to stay; indicates employee's

involvement in a particular organization wherein they feel an emotional attachment and one they can identify with (Dunn *et al.*, 2012).

- (b) Normative commitment – “employees stay because they feel they ought to”; the employee’s desire to stay with the organization is obligation-based (Manion, 2004; Dunn *et al.*, 2012) and that the organization’s beliefs and values only reflects what the employee believes in.
- (c) Continuance commitment – “employees stay because they have to do so”; the employee’s desire to stay is cost-based and to retain something of value such as income and benefits (Tolentino, 2013); refers to the awareness of costs involved if employee leaves the organization (Dunn *et al.*, 2012).

Several studies have been conducted in different countries to find out the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment. Some examples are the study of Chughtai & Sohail (2006) in Pakistan, Sameh (2011) in Yemen, Kamal (2013) in Iran, Teshome (2011) in Ethiopia, Tabbodi (2009) in India and Tahir *et al.* (2014) in Malaysia. All studies concluded that there is a positive significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A primary research was conducted to determine the relationship of perceived transformational leadership behavioral factors demonstrated by academic administrators that could affect organizational commitment of lecturers of a private university in Thailand. The main objective is to establish a correlation between transformational leadership behavioral factors and organizational commitment. A private university in Bangkok, with a population of around 3,000 university lecturers, were asked to participate in this study. A total of 500 lecturers were asked to join as respondents and an estimate sample size of 346 respondents are needed (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). A total of 254 completed questionnaires were gathered. Respondents of the study were limited to lecturers, their perception of transformational leadership behavior demonstrated by their respective academic administrators (deans/department chairs), and their perceived organizational commitment to the current university. All information gathered will only be used for academic writing purposes.

A questionnaire scale which includes the four dimensions of transformational leadership (Idealized Influence – divided into Attributed Charisma and Behavior, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration) by Bass (1985) and the three-component model (TCM) of organizational commitment (affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment) by Meyer & Allen (2004) are used to collect primary quantitative information. The survey questionnaire, composed of three sections,

includes the demographics of the respondents in the first section, lecturers' level of agreement with regards to transformational leadership behavior demonstrated by academic administrators in the second section and lecturer's organizational commitment. The second section of the questionnaire focusing on transformational leadership behavioral factors is adopted from the study of Avolio and Bass (1995), while the third section of the questionnaire focusing on organizational commitment is adopted from the organizational commitment model developed by Meyer & Allen (2004). The questionnaire used forward and back translation, translated from English to Thai and back to English, for ease of data collection.

The analysis of the study will focus on descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations and frequencies generated through the use of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Correlational tests were applied to determine any relationship between the variables of the study, transformational leadership behavioral factors and organizational commitment factors.

Research Design: Descriptive Research
Sampling Unit: Faculty Members
Sampling Method: Convenience Sampling
Sampling Size: 254 Respondents
Data Collection Method: Primary Data
Research Instrument: Questionnaire

4. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to address the following objectives:

- To identify the relationship between transformational leadership behavioral factors demonstrated by academic administrators (deans/ department chairs) and lecturers' organizational commitment.
- To assist the university in identifying desired leadership behavior of lecturers as with regards to academic administrator that affects organizational commitment as well as areas for leadership skills development.

5. HYPOTHESES

This study seeks to identify the relationship between faculty's perception of academic administrators' transformational leadership behavior, as defined by the four dimensions of transformational leadership by Bass (1985) and their organizational commitment as described in the three-component model (TCM) by Meyer & Allen (2004).

In order to achieve the main objective of the study, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturers' affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturers' continuance organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturers' normative organizational commitment.

6. DATA ANALYSIS

6.1. Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Factors

Descriptive statistics of the demographic information of respondents were generated and presented in Table 1 of the Appendix. Of the N=254 respondents, 40.2% were male while 59.8% were female. Respondents age were spread out across age ranges with the highest percentage from 40-49 year range (32.3%), followed by 50-59 year range (29.9%), 30-39 year range (18.9%), 20-29 year range (14.2%) and lastly from the over 60 year range (4.7%). Respondents' length of service in the current university showed that 44.1% of the total respondents were employed by the same university for more than 10 years, while 33.1% stated that they were with the same university for more than a year but less than five years, 16.5% were employed at the same university for more than six years but less than ten, and only 6.3% claimed that they had been with the same university for less than a year. The data collected for the length of service as an academic proved to have almost the same sequence as the length of service with the current university as 40.9% of the respondents stated that they possess more than ten years of teaching experience, 33.9% claimed that they have more than a year but less than five years of teaching experience; however, 14.2% confirmed that they only have less than a year's teaching experience and 11.0% with more than six years but less than 10 years of teaching experience. 71.7% of the respondents were instructors and lecturers, while only 16.5% holds the rank of assistant professor, 6.3% were associate professors and 4.7% stated others.

6.2. Descriptive Analysis of Transformational Leadership Behavioral Factors

Descriptive statistics for the study variables on transformational leadership behavior are described in Table 2 of the Appendix. The level of agreement of lecturers regarding the transformational leadership behavior demonstrated by their respective deans/department chair were gathered and the mean and standard deviations are presented in this study. There were five categories in this section with four factors in each category. All 20 behavioral factors received mean scores of more than 4.0 which indicates that the respondents agree that these behavioral factors were demonstrated by their deans/department chair. Factors that received the five highest mean scores are as follows: considers moral and ethical

consequences of decisions (B3; $M=4.41$, $SD=.670$), emphasizes importance of collective sense of mission (B4; $M=4.39$ $SD=.590$), talks optimistically about future (IM1; $M=4.38$ $SD=.640$), instill pride in others (AC1; $M=4.37$ $SD=.613$), acts in ways that builds respect (AC3; $M=4.34$ $SD=.691$), and articulates a compelling vision of the future (IM3; $M=4.34$ $SD=.656$).

6.3. Descriptive Analysis of Organizational Commitment Factors

The level of agreement for the study variables on organizational commitment factors are described in Table 3 of the Appendix. All 18 factors which is divided into three categories included in the study received mean scores from 3.62 to 4.13. This indicates that the respondents agreed that these factors influence their commitment to the current university. The sixth factor 'organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me' received the highest mean score ($M=4.13$, $SD=.726$) in the Affective Commitment category while the second factor 'I feel that this organization's problems are my own' received the lowest mean score ($M=3.98$, $SD=.815$). In the Continuance Commitment category, the second factor 'it would be very hard to leave organization now even if I wanted to' received the highest mean score ($M=3.92$, $SD=.781$), while the sixth factor 'one of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be scarcity of available alternatives' received the lowest mean score ($M=4.62$, $SD=.949$). In the last category, Normative Commitment, the first factor 'I feel an obligation to remain with my current employer' received the highest mean score ($M=4.00$, $SD=.785$) while the sixth factor 'I owe a great deal to my organization' received the lowest mean score ($M=3.77$, $SD=.951$). Factors from Continuance Commitment category received the lowest mean scores when compared to the other two categories.

6.4. Correlations

A Pearson's correlation was run to determine the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and organizational commitment factors. At a significant level of 0.01 (2-tailed), the data were analyzed to test the hypotheses of the study. Findings are reported in Tables 4 to 6 of the Appendix.

Hypothesis one proposed that there would be a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturer's affective commitment to the organization. In order to test this hypothesis, correlations were generated between six affective commitment factors and 20 transformational leadership behavioral factors ($n=254$). The results indicate significant positive correlations between ACO1 (affective commitment) and six transformational leadership behavior factors, ACO2 and three transformational leadership behavior factors, ACO3 and 16 transformational leadership behavior factors, ACO4 and 10 transformational leadership behavior factors, ACO5 and 12 transformational leadership behavior factors, and ACO6 and 16 transformational leadership behavior factors. The only

factor which received a strong positive correlation ($r=.913, p<.01$) is IS1 (Intellectual Stimulation factor one) 're-examines critical assumptions for appropriateness' vs ACO1 (affective commitment factor one) 'I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization'. All other factors proved to be positively related but with weak associations (correlation near zero than one). Therefore, hypothesis one is accepted for 63 correlation tests of transformational leadership behavioral factors with regards to affective commitment of respondents. Table 4 presents the Pearson correlation (r value) and significance (2-tailed) for these tests.

Hypothesis two proposed that there would be a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturer's continuance commitment to the organization. In order to test this hypothesis, correlations were generated between six continuance commitment factors and 20 transformational leadership behavioral factors ($n=254$). The results indicate significant positive correlations between CCO1 (continuance commitment) and 16 transformational leadership behavior factors, CCO2 and nine transformational leadership behavior factors, CCO3 and two transformational leadership behavior factors, CCO4 and five transformational leadership behavior factors, CCO5 and seven transformational leadership behavior factors, and CCO6 and four transformational leadership behavior factors. All factors proved to be positively related but with weak associations (correlation near zero than one), except for B3 (Behavior factor three) 'considers moral and ethical consequences of decisions' vs CCO6 (continuance commitment factor six) 'one of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives', which received a weak negative correlation ($r=-.179, p<.01$). Therefore, hypothesis two is accepted for 43 correlation tests of transformational leadership behavioral factors with regards to continuance commitment of respondents. Table 5 presents the Pearson correlation (r value) and significance (2-tailed) for these tests.

Hypothesis three proposed that there would be a significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and lecturer's normative commitment to the organization. In order to test this hypothesis, correlations were generated between six normative commitment factors and 20 transformational leadership behavioral factors ($n=254$). The results indicate significant positive correlations between NCO1 (normative commitment) and eight transformational leadership behavior factors, NCO2 and five transformational leadership behavior factors, NCO3 and four transformational leadership behavior factors, NCO4 and 11 transformational leadership behavior factors, NCO5 and four transformational leadership behavior factors, and none for CCO6 and transformational leadership behavior factors. All factors proved to be positively related but with weak associations (correlation near zero than one). Therefore, hypothesis three is accepted for 32 correlation tests of transformational leadership behavioral factors with

regards to normative commitment of respondents. Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation (r value) and significance (2-tailed) for these tests.

7. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

As sustainability is the goal of all Thai universities, motivating its faculty body into delivering quality academic development, along with an increase in number of meritorious research publications has been a challenge to its academic administrators. Retaining transformational leaders that inspire and influence change and initiative among their subordinates foster strong organizational commitment which in turn support the move towards organizational efficiency. In order to respond to the objectives of the study, lecturers' perception on transformational leadership behavior demonstrated by academic administrators and their organizational commitment were explored and tested.

The results of the study, in general, indicated a positive relationship between transformational leadership behavioral factors and organizational commitment of lecturers. Out of the 63 correlation tests that proved to be significant between transformational leadership behavior and affective commitment factors, only one transformational leadership behavior (IS1 - 're-examines critical assumptions for appropriateness') revealed a strong positive correlation, with the first factor of affective commitment (ACO1 - 'I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization'). The highest number of significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and affective commitment factors came from the second category which is Idealized Influence - Behavior (20 out of 24 correlation tests proved to be significant); out of the 20 significant findings, only the fourth factor 'emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission' revealed a positive correlation with all six affective commitment factors. 43 correlation tests proved to be significant between transformational leadership behavior and continuance commitment factors. One test from the 43 revealed a negative correlation between the variables tested. B3 - 'considers moral and ethical consequences of decisions' is negatively related to CCO6 - 'one of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives'. This indicates that if lecturers agree that their leader demonstrate a moral and ethical consideration on consequences of decisions, they disagree with the reason that they only stay with the organization because of a scarcity in alternatives. Instead, they agree that they will stay with the organization because of four affective commitment factors, lecturers feel that they belong (ACO3) and is a part of the family (ACO5), they feel emotionally attached (ACO4) and that organization has personal meaning to them (ACO6). The correlation tests done for normative commitment factors revealed 32 significant relationships between factors. Out of the three categories of organizational commitment, normative factors received the lowest number of positive significant relationship with

transformational leadership behavior. None of the transformational leadership behavior proved to be significant for the last normative commitment factor which is 'I owe a great deal to my organization'. The first objective was addressed by these results.

Findings of the study indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between transformational leadership behavior and organizational commitment of lecturers. This finding is consistent with other research studies, although different models were used as variables of the study and were conducted previously by researchers in different countries (Chughtai & Sohail, 2006; Sameh, 2011; Kamal, 2013; Teshome, 2011; Tabbodi, 2009; Tahir *et al.*, 2014; Iqbal *et al.*, 2012; Dumay & Galand, 2012) and in different industries (Porter, 2015; Dunn *et al.*, 2012; Bernard & O'Driscoll, 2011; McCann, 2011). While there are a number of studies on the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and organizational commitment, the same study conducted in Thailand in the higher education sector is limited if none. This study will aid universities in Thailand in providing initial data that would encourage the university administration to explore this idea more fully in order to identify a good fit of leadership style that would encourage organizational commitment of lecturers and to eventually design leadership development strategies based on desired leader behavior. The second objective was addressed by these results.

Conclusions derived from this research study aims to contribute to the university's knowledge on the relationship of transformational leadership factors that could influence organizational commitment of their lecturers. Further studies can be conducted to include different leadership styles to assess which leadership style fits the higher education sector in Thailand and also in a cross-cultural context.

References

- Adegue, C. (2012). *A structural modeling on learning organization in the context of organizational commitment, organizational culture, and conflict management style*. UIC Research Journal, 18(1): 187-218.
- Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (1995). *Individualized consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: a multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership*. The leadership quarterly, 2: 199-218.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bayram, H., & Dinc, S. (2015). *Role of transformational leadership on employee's job satisfaction: the case of private universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Russian Federation European Researcher, 93(4): 270-281.
- Biju, A. V. (2016). *Social connectivity of local governments: A social network analysis based on Kerala local governments*. Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(1): 44-54.

- Boerner, S., Eisenbeiss, S.A., & Griesser, D. (2007). *Follower behaviour and organizational performance: the impact of transformational leaders*. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(3): 15-26.
- Bogler, R., Caspi, A., & Roccas, S. (2013). *Transformational and Passive Leadership: An Initial Investigation of University Instructors as Leaders in a Virtual Learning Environment*. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 41(3), 372-392. doi: 10.1177/1741143212474805.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Chughtai, A.A., & Sohail, Z. (2006). *Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers*. *Applied Human Resource Management Research*, 11(1): 39-64.
- Garrett, M.D., & Poock, M.C. (2011). *Resource allocation and management strategies in times of fiscal constrain and their impact on students*. *College Student Journal*, 45: 882-890.
- Gul, Z. (2015). *Impact of Employee Commitment on Organizational Development*. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 117-124.
- Jack, J., & Rudnick, J. (2007). *Transformational leadership: model encourages leaders to transcend personal ambition*. *Health Progress*, 88(3): 36-40.
- Jun-Cheng, Z., Wen-Quan, L., Zhao-Yi, Z., & Jun, X. (2015). *Organizational commitment, work engagement, person-supervisor fit, and turnover intention: A total effect moderation model*. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 43(10), 1657-1666. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2015.43.10.1657.
- Kamal, G. (2013). *Investigating the relationship between new leadership style (transformational and transactional) with organizational commitment dimensions (affective, continuous and normative) in Iranian higher education institutions*. *Life Science Journal*, 10(4s): 17-25.
- Kovjanic, S., Schuh, S. C., & Jonas, K. (2013). *Transformational leadership and performance: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of basic needs satisfaction and work engagement*. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 86(4), 543-555. Doi: 10.1111/joop.12022.
- Krejcie, R.V. & Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities*. *Education and Psychology Measurement*.
- Lao, R. (2015). *The limitations of autonomous university status in Thailand: leadership, resources and ranking*. *Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 30(2): 550-59.
- Leithwood, K. & Levin, B. (2005). *Assessing school leader and leadership programme effects on pupil learning: conceptual and methodological challenges*. (Research Report RR662), Nottingham, UK: Department for Education and Skills (DfES).
- Liou, S. (2008). *An Analysis of the Concept of Organizational Commitment*. *Nursing Forum*, 43: 116-125. Doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6198.2008.00103.
- Manion, J. (2004). *Nurture a culture of retention*. *Nursing Management*, 35(4): 28-39.
- Marn, J.T. (2012). *The impact of transformational leadership practices on job satisfaction of PHEI lecturers*. *Journal for the Advancement of Science and Arts*, 3(2): 26-39.
- McMahon, B. (2007). *Organizational commitment, relationship commitment and their association with attachment style and locus of control*. Partial fulfilment of Master of Science Degree in Psychology, Georgia Institute of Technology.

- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (2004). *TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004*.
- Mohammed, K.A., Othman, J., & D'Silva, J.L. (2012). *The influence of leadership styles on organizational commitment: a study of public university lecturers in Nigeria*. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(4): 56-61.
- Morris, T.L., & Laipple, J.S. (2015). *How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within US research universities*. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 37 (2), 241-251.
- Negussie, N., & Demissie, A. (2013). *Relationship between leadership styles of Nurese managers and nurses' job satisfaction in Jimma University Specialized Hospital*. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Sciences*, 23(1): 49-58.
- Newstrom, J. W. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour-Human Behaviour at work*. (12th ed). New York: McGraw Hill International Edition.
- Northouse, P. (2010). *Leadership: theory and practice*. (5thed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Omar, W.A.W., & Hussin, F. (2013). *Transformational leadership style and job satisfaction relationship: a study of structural equation modeling (SEM)*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(2): 346-365.
- Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior* (9thed.). NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sameh, A.A.S. (2011). *The effect of leadership style on organizational commitment among academic staffs in Yemeni universities*. Unpublished Master of Business Administration thesis, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Schultz, D.L. (2002). *Study internal marketing for better impact*. *Marketing News*. 36(21): 8-10.
- Suk Bong C., ThiBichHanh T., ByungIl P. *Inclusive leadership and work engagement: Mediating roles of affective organizational commitment and creativity*. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal* [serial online]. July 2015: 43(6):931-943. Available from: Academic Search Complete, Ipswich, MA. Accessed February 29, 2016.
- Steers, R.M. (1977). *Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22: 46-56.
- Strauss, K. Griffin, M.A. & Rafferty, A.E. (2009). *Proactivity directed toward the team and organization: the role of leadership, commitment and sole-breadth self-efficacy*. *British Journal of Management*, 20(3): 279-291.
- Suwanwela, C. (2008). *The autonomy of Thai universities (khwampenitsarakhongmahawitthayalai thai)*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.
- Tabbodi, M.L. (2009). *Effects of leadership behaviour on the faculty commitment of Humanities departments in the University of Mysore, India: regarding factors of age group, educational qualifications and gender*. *Educational Studies*, 35(1): 21-26.
- Tahir, L., Abdullah, T., Ali, F., & Daud, K. (2014). *Academics transformational leadership: an investigation of heads of department leadership behaviors in Malaysian public universities*. *Educational Studies*, 40(5): 473-495.
- Teshome, T. (2011). *The relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment in private higher education institutions at Addis Ababa City*. Masters in Business Administration thesis, Addis Ababa University.

- Tolentino, R.C. (2013). *Organizational commitment and job performance of the academic and administrative personnel*. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 15(1): 51-59.
- Webb, K.S. (2009). *Creating satisfied employees in Christian Higher Education: Research on Leadership Competencies*. *Christian Higher Education*, 8(1), 18-31. doi: 10.1080/15363750802171073.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6thed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Putri, Y. R. (2015). Transformational leadership and its impact to lecturers intellectual Capital Factors in Telkom economics and business school Telkom University. *International Journal of Business and Administrative Studies*, 1(1), 35-41.

APPENDIX

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Lecturers

Characteristics (N=254)	N	%
Gender:		
Male	102	40.2
Female	152	59.8
Age:		
<20 years	0	0.0
20-29 years	36	14.2
30-39 years	48	18.9
40-49 years	82	32.3
50-59 years	76	29.9
>60 years	12	4.7
Length of Service in Current University		
<1 year	16	6.3
1-5 years	84	33.1
6-10 years	42	16.5
>10 years	112	44.1
Length of Service as an Academic		
<1 year	36	14.2
1-5 years	86	33.9
6-10 years	28	11.0
>10 years	104	40.9
Academic Title		
Instructor/Lecturer	182	71.7
Assistant Professor	42	16.5
Associate Professor	16	6.3
Professor	2	0.8
Professor Emeritus	0	0.0
Others	12	4.7

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics: Transformational Leadership Behavioral factors

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Idealized Influence (Attributed Charisma)		
AC1 Instills pride in others.	4.37	.613
AC2 Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.	4.31	.660
AC3 Acts in ways that builds respect.	4.34	.691
AC4 Displays a sense of power and confidence.	4.13	.693
Idealized Influence (Behavior)		
B1 Talks about most important values and beliefs.	4.05	.732
B2 Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.	4.17	.697
B3 Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.	4.41	.670
B4 Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.	4.39	.590
Inspirational Motivation		
IM1 Talks optimistically about the future.	4.38	.640
IM2 Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.	4.32	.732
IM3 Articulates a compelling vision of the future.	4.34	.656
IM4 Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.	4.33	.678
Intellectual Stimulation		
IS1 Re-examines critical assumptions for appropriateness.	4.30	.645
IS2 Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.	4.24	.659
IS3 Gets others look at problems from many different angles.	4.24	.662
IS4 Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.	4.28	.673
Individualized Consideration		
IC1 Spends time teaching and coaching.	4.13	.603
IC2 Treats others as an individual rather than just as a member of a group.	4.19	.719
IC3 Considers an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.	4.31	.662
IC4 Helps others to develop their strengths.	4.28	.685

N=254

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics: Organizational Commitment Factors

		Mean	Standard Deviation
Affective Commitment			
ACO1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	4.00	.700
ACO2	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	3.98	.815
ACO3	I feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization.	4.01	.694
ACO4	I feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.	4.10	.698
ACO5	I feel like "part of the family" at my organization.	4.08	.761
ACO6	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	4.13	.726
Continuance Commitment			
CCO1	Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	3.97	.754
CCO2	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	3.92	.781
CCO3	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization.	3.79	.963
CCO4	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	3.69	.945
CCO5	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	3.76	.780
CCO6	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	3.62	.949
Normative Commitment			
NCO1	I feel an obligation to remain with my current employer.	4.00	.785
NCO2	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	3.78	.732
NCO3	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	3.85	.835
NCO4	This organization deserves my loyalty.	3.99	.706
NCO5	I would not leave my organization now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	3.91	.727
NCO6	I owe a great deal to my organization.	3.77	.951

N=254

Table 4
Correlation among Transformational Leadership Behavioral factors and Affective Commitment Factors

		ACO1	ACO2	ACO3	ACO4	ACO5	ACO6
AC1	Pearson Correlation	.110	-.036	.142*	.133*	.073	.190**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.571	.024	.035	.248	.002
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC2	Pearson Correlation	.051	-.065	-.005	.034	.030	.062
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.415	.306	.933	.585	.630	.322
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC3	Pearson Correlation	.082	-.075	.110	.075	.145*	.130*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.194	.235	.081	.232	.021	.039
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC4	Pearson Correlation	.049	.046	.162**	-.061	-.020	.168**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.438	.468	.010	.332	.750	.007
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B1	Pearson Correlation	.247**	.213**	.295**	.114	.135*	.226**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.069	.031	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B2	Pearson Correlation	.243**	.088	.242**	.176**	.184**	.299**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.162	.000	.005	.003	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B3	Pearson Correlation	.067	-.119	.163**	.164**	.169**	.196**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.284	.059	.009	.009	.007	.002
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B4	Pearson Correlation	.249**	.243**	.282**	.211**	.249**	.322**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM1	Pearson Correlation	.141**	.102	.242**	.214**	.247**	.214**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025	.104	.000	.001	.000	.001
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM2	Pearson Correlation	.170**	.035	.213**	.183**	.153*	.216**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.578	.001	.003	.015	.001
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM3	Pearson Correlation	.120	.128*	.272**	.321**	.263**	.352**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.041	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM4	Pearson Correlation	.000	-.048	.146*	.112	.179**	.215**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000	.448	.020	.075	.004	.001
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS1	Pearson Correlation	.913**	.205**	.330**	.037	.097	.201**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.000	.557	.124	.001
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS2	Pearson Correlation	.051	.036	.169**	.153*	.120	.132*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.415	.364	.007	.014	.055	.036
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS3	Pearson Correlation	.154*	.080	.288**	.117	.166**	.195**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.201	.000	.063	.008	.002
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS4	Pearson Correlation	.017	.051	.198**	.192**	.266**	.231**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.790	.417	.001	.002	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC1	Pearson Correlation	.206**	.117	.375**	.195**	.185**	.160*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.063	.000	.002	.003	.011
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC2	Pearson Correlation	.078	.086	.298**	.292**	.276**	.209**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.213	.172	.000	.000	.000	.001
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC3	Pearson Correlation	.119	.127*	.287**	.255**	.265**	.340**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.057	.044	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC4	Pearson Correlation	.000	.093	.195**	.156*	.110	.275**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000	.140	.002	.013	.080	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254

AC – Attributed Charisma Factors; B – Behaviour Factors; Inspirational Motivation Factors; IS – Intellectual Stimulus Factors; IC – Individual Consideration Factors; ACO – Affective Commitment Factors

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

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

Table 5
Correlation among Transformational Leadership Behavioral factors and Continuance Commitment Factors

		CCO1	CCO2	CCO3	CCO4	CCO5	CCO6
AC1	Pearson Correlation	.248**	.111	-.027	.101	.134*	-.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.079	.670	.107	.033	.486
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC2	Pearson Correlation	.163**	.108	.016	-.076	.111	-.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.084	.799	.225	.078	.801
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC3	Pearson Correlation	.157*	.093	-.022	-.034	.076	-.093
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.137	.726	.592	.230	.138
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC4	Pearson Correlation	.265**	.312**	.161*	.184*	.264**	.270**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.010	.003	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B1	Pearson Correlation	.375**	.172**	.160*	.170**	.144*	.128*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.006	.011	.007	.021	.041
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B2	Pearson Correlation	.236**	.169**	.147*	.221**	.203**	.155*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.007	.019	.000	.001	.014
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B3	Pearson Correlation	.151*	.017	.001	-.025	.004	-.179**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.793	.991	.687	.946	.004
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B4	Pearson Correlation	.294**	.152*	.117	.015	.096	.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.015	.062	.814	.128	.907
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM1	Pearson Correlation	.303**	.170**	.092	-.016	.085	-.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.006	.142	.794	.179	.555
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM2	Pearson Correlation	.162**	.141*	-.014	-.028	.106	-.108
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.024	.819	.662	.090	.085
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM3	Pearson Correlation	.182**	.222**	.102	.079	.157*	.029
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.105	.209	.012	.650
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM4	Pearson Correlation	.191**	.094	.096	.048	.133*	.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.135	.127	.445	.034	.450
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS1	Pearson Correlation	.280**	.157*	.166**	.242**	.235**	.289**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.012	.008	.000	.000	.000
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS2	Pearson Correlation	.158*	.036	-.020	-.150*	.124*	-.122
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.565	.749	.017	.048	.052
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS3	Pearson Correlation	.174**	.251**	.094	.007	.158*	.059
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.000	.135	.917	.012	.346
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS4	Pearson Correlation	.188**	.177**	.103	.034	.350**	.089
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.005	.102	.588	.000	.155
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC1	Pearson Correlation	.322**	.189**	.183**	.221**	.181**	.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.004	.000	.004	.122
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC2	Pearson Correlation	.186**	.125*	.104	.214**	.094	.163**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.047	.099	.001	.135	.009
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC3	Pearson Correlation	.226**	.216**	.130*	.117	.206**	.140*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.038	.062	.001	.026
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC4	Pearson Correlation	.063	.159*	.113	.119	.300**	.149*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.319	.011	.072	.058	.000	.018
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254

IC – Attributed Charisma Factors; B – Behaviour Factors; Inspirational Motivation Factors; IS – Intellectual Stimulus Factors; IC – Individual Consideration Factors; CCO – Continuance Commitment Factors

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

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

Table 6
Correlation among Transformational Leadership Behavioral factors and Normative Commitment Factors

		NCO1	NCO2	NCO3	NCO4	NCO5	NCO6
AC1	Pearson Correlation	.115	.094	.000	.116	.150*	.051
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.134	.994	.064	.017	.422
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC2	Pearson Correlation	.031	.075	-.002	.039	.110	-.089
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.628	.232	.970	.534	.080	.155
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC3	Pearson Correlation	-.044	-.008	-.104	-.027	.032	-.086
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.488	.898	.099	.669	.607	.170
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
AC4	Pearson Correlation	.203**	.152*	.144*	.115	.198**	.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.015	.022	.066	.002	.583
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B1	Pearson Correlation	.220**	.211**	.193**	.169**	.261**	.095
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.002	.007	.000	.131
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B2	Pearson Correlation	.274**	.134*	.124*	.211**	.265**	.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.033	.048	.001	.000	.198
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B3	Pearson Correlation	-.015	.024	-.031	.057	.031	-.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.812	.708	.618	.365	.622	.109
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
B4	Pearson Correlation	.051	.106	.134*	.254**	.085	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.417	.091	.033	.000	.176	.856
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM1	Pearson Correlation	.126*	.162**	.091	.077	.094	-.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.010	.146	.224	.135	.674
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM2	Pearson Correlation	.110	.148*	.002	.112	.028	-.064
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.080	.018	.978	.075	.659	.309
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM3	Pearson Correlation	.107	.140*	.064	.194**	.150*	.124*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.088	.026	.310	.002	.017	.048
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IM4	Pearson Correlation	.104	.116	.032	.055	.144*	-.030
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.066	.613	.382	.022	.639
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS1	Pearson Correlation	.328**	.207**	.260**	.162**	.280**	.138*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.010	.000	.028
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS2	Pearson Correlation	.031	.026	.050	.038	-.003	-.141*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.628	.675	.426	.546	.965	.025
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS3	Pearson Correlation	.137*	.128*	.152*	.207**	.015	-.012
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.029	.042	.015	.001	.809	.854
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IS4	Pearson Correlation	.150*	-.021	.130*	.188**	.102	-.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.744	.039	.003	.105	.556
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC1	Pearson Correlation	.167**	.224**	.100	.188**	.099	.092
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.000	.110	.003	.114	.145
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC2	Pearson Correlation	.154*	.034	.074	.208**	.065	.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.585	.243	.000	.306	.119
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC3	Pearson Correlation	.228**	.111	.171**	.192**	.079	-.011
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.077	.006	.002	.212	.863
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254
IC4	Pearson Correlation	.323**	.185**	.238**	.201**	.132*	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.000	.001	.036	.999
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254

AC – Attributed Charisma Factors; B – Behaviour Factors; Inspirational Motivation Factors; IS – Intellectual Stimulati
 Factors; IC – Individual Consideration Factors; NCO – Normative Commitment Factors

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

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