LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND COMMITMENT AMONG EMPLOYEES OF SMALL AND MEDIUM SCALE BUSINESSES IN KADUNA, NIGERIA

By

AGBO, EMMANUEL HELEN ENE

NSU/MSC/BUS/0024/16/17

BEING A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY KEFFI, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF DEGREE OF MASTERS OF SCIENCE (M.Sc.) IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF ADMINISTRATION

NASARAWA STATE UNIVERISTY, KEFFI

MAY, 2019

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this Dissertation has been written by me and is a report of my research work. It has not been presented in any pervious application for a Masters of Science (M.Sc.) Degree in Business Administration. All quotations are indicated and sources of information specifically acknowledged by means of references.

AGBO, Emmanuel Helen Ene
NSU/MSC/BUS/0024/16/17

CERTIFICATION

The Dissertation "Relationship between Effective Leadership and Commitment among Employees of Small and Medium Scale Businesses in Kaduna, Nigeria" meets the regulations governing the award of Master of Science (M.Sc.) Degree in Business Administration, of the School of Postgraduate Studies, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, and is approved for its contribution to Knowledge.

Dr. J. E. I. Abbah Chairman, Supervisory Committee	Date
Dr. J. E. I. Abbah Head of Department	Date
Prof. F. Ayatse Internal Examiner	Date
Prof. H. Ibrahim Dean of Faculty	Date
Prof. A. A, Aminu External Examiner	Date
Prof. J. M. Ayuba Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies	Date

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to God Almighty my creator, my strong pillar, my everything. He alone be praised for ever. I also dedicate this work to my husband, Engr. Agbo O.O who had been my support and courage throughout the period of this work. Also my children Victor, Oche, Isreal and Treasure. Thank you. God bless you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people without whom this thesis might not have been written and to whom I am greatly indebted.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Abbah for his patience and support. His guidance has been of immense help to me in this work.

To my sisters Dr. (Mrs.) Okwori and Catherine Akogwu, thank you for your support and encouragement. May the Lord bless you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page

Declaration ii

Certification iii

Dedication iv

Acknowledgements v

List of Tables ix

List of Figures xii

Abstract xiii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study 1

1.2 Statement of the Problem 2

1.3 Research Questions 3

1.4 Objectives of the Study 3

1.5 Statement of Hypotheses 4

1.6 Significance of the Study 4

1.7 Scope of the Study 5

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Review 6

2.1.1 Concept of Leadership and Leadership Style 6

2.1.2 Concept of Leadership Effectiveness 10

2.1.2.1 Path- Goal Leadership 11

2.1.3 Employee Commitment 16

2.1.3.1 Components of Commitment 18

2.1.3.2 Stages of Employee Commitment 22

2.1.4 Concept of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) 23
2.2 Literature Review 24
2.2.1 Directive Leadership and Employee Commitment 25
2.2.2 Supportive Leadership and Employee Commitment 26
2.2.3 Participative Leadership and Employee Commitment 27
2.2.4 Achievement-Oriented Leadership and Employee Commitment 28
2.3 Theoretical Framework 30

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design 38
3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Technique 38
3.3 Method of Data Collection 40
3.3.1 Reliability of Research Instrument 40
3.3.2 Validity of Research Instrument 42
3.4 Technique for Data Analysis 42
3.5 Justification of Method 44

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Presentation 46
4.2 Data Analysis and Results 74
4.2.1 Test of Research Hypothesis I 74
4.2.2 Test of Hypothesis II 75
4.2.3 Test of Hypothesis III 76
4.3.4 Test of Hypothesis IV 77
4.3 Discussion of Findings 77

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary 80

5.2 Conclusion 80
5.3 Recommendations 82
5.4 Limitations of the Study 83
5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies 83
References 85
Appendicies

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Stratified Sample of SMEs in Kaduna Metropolis 39
Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Leadership and Commitment Components ... 41
Table 4: Biographical Data of Respondents 46
Table 5: My Immediate Supervisor Lets me Know What is Expected of me. 47
Table 6: My Immediate Supervisor Gives Vague Explanations of what is Expected of Subordinates on the Job. 48
Table 7: My Immediate Supervisor is Available when Needed. 48
Table 8: My Immediate Supervisor Spends Time for Teaching and Coaching. 49
Table 9: My Immediate Supervisor Concentrates His/Her Full Attention on Dealing with Mistakes, Complaints and Failure 49
Table 10: My Immediate Supervisor Helps others in Developing their Strengths. 50
Table 11: My Immediate Supervisor Suggests New Ways of Approaching Assignments. .. 50
Table 12: My Immediate Supervisor Expresses Satisfaction When His/Her Expectations Are Met. 51
Table 13: My Immediate Supervisor is Effective in Meeting the Job Related Needs of Others. 52
Table 14: My Immediate Supervisor Maintains a Friendly Working Relationship with Subordinates. 52
Table 15: My Immediate Supervisor Listens Receptively to Subordinates' Ideas and Suggestions. 53
Table 16: My Immediate Supervisor Does Little Things To Make It Pleasant To Be A Member Of The Group. 53
Table 17: My Immediate Supervisor Encourages Continual Improvement In Subordinates' Performance. 54
Table 18: My Immediate Supervisor do not Say Things that are Hurtful to Subordinates' Personal Feelings. 54
Table 19: My Immediate Supervisor Behaves in a Manner that is Thoughtful of Subordinates' Personal Needs. 55
Table 20: My Immediate Supervisor Treats others as Individuals Rather than Just a Member of a Group 56
Table 21: My Immediate Supervisor Consults with Subordinates when Facing a Problem. 56
Table 22: My Immediate Supervisor Asks for Suggestions from Subordinates

Concerning how to Carry out Assignments. 57
Table 23: My Immediate Supervisor Does Not Show Doubts about Subordinate's Ability to Meet Most Objectives. 57
Table 24: My Immediate Supervisor Helps Subordinates Overcome Problems that Stop them from Carrying out their Tasks. 58
Table 25: My Immediate Supervisor Does not act without consulting Subordinates. 58
Table 26: My Immediate Supervisor Asks Subordinates for Suggestions on what Assignments Should be Made. 59
Table 27: My Immediate Supervisor Keeps a Focused Attention on Irregularities, Mistakes, Exceptions, and Deviations from Standards. 59
Table 28: My Immediate Supervisor Informs Subordinates about what Needs to be Done and how it Needs to be Done. 60
Table 29: My Immediate Supervisor Asks Subordinates to Follow Standard Rules and Regulations. 60
Table 30: My Immediate Supervisor Explains the Level of Performance that is Expected of Subordinates. 61
Table 31: My Immediate Supervisor Lets Subordinates Know of the Expectation for them to Perform at their Highest Level. 61
Table 32: My Immediate Supervisor Sets Goals for Subordinates' Performance that are Quite Challenging. 62
Table 33: The Immediate Supervisor Directs Attention towards Failures to Meet Standards 62
Table 34: I am Happy to be Part of this Organization. 63
Table 35: I Enjoy Discussing about my Organization with People Outside it. 64
Table 36: I really feel as if this Organization's Problems are my Own. 64
Table 37: I Think that I Could not Easily Become as Attached to Another Organization as I Am to this One. 65
Table 38: I Feel Like Part of the Family at my Organization. 65
Table 39: I feel Emotionally Attached to this Organization 65
Table 40: This Organization has Great Deal of Personal Meaning for Me. 66
Table 41: I do not feel a Strong Sense of Belonging to My Organization. 66
Table 42: I am Loyal to this Organization because I have So Much Emotional, Social and Economic Investment in it. 67
Table 43: I am dedicated to this organization because I fear what I have to lose in it. 67

Table 44: Sometimes I Worry About what Might Happen if Something was to Happen to the Organization and I was No Longer a Member. 68
Table 45: If I Wasn't a Member of this Organization, I would be Sad Because my Life Will be Disrupted. 68
Table 46: I Worry about the Investments I Have Made in this Organization. 69
Table 47: I often feel Anxious about What I Have to Lose with this Organization. 69
Table 48: One of the Major Reasons I Continue to Work for this Organization is that Leaving Would Require Considerable Personal Sacrifice – Another Organization May Not Match the Overall Benefits I Have Here. 70
Table 49: One of the Few Serious Consequences of Leaving this Organization would be the Scarcity of Available Alternatives. 70
Table 50: I Feel That I owe this Organization Quite a Bit Because of what it Has Done for Me. 71
Table 51: My Organization Deserves My Loyalty because of its Treatment Towards Me. . 71
Table 52: I feel I would be Letting my Co-Workers Down if I wasn't a Member of this Organization. 72
Table 53: If I Got Another Offer for a Better Job Elsewhere, I would Not Feel it Was Right to Leave my Organization. 72
Table 54: Things were Better in the Days when People Stayed in One Organization for Most of their Careers. 72
Table 55: One of the Major Reasons I Continue to Work in this Organization is that I Believe Loyalty is Important and therefore feel a Sense of Moral Obligation to Remain. 73
Table 56: I Believe that a Person Must Always be Loyal to His Or Her Organization. 73
Table 57: Association between Directive Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment 74
Table 58: Association between Supportive Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment 75
Table 59: Association between Participative Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment 76
Table 60: Association between Achievement-Oriented Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment 77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Path-Goal Theory..... 35

ABSTRACT

The research study was concerned with determining the relationship between leadership practices and commitment among employees of Small and Medium Scale businesses in Kaduna through a correlational analysis between components of path-goal leadership and components of commitment using primary data collected from a sample of 336 employees across 188 SMEs in various industries in the capital. The Goodman and Kruskal Gamma statistic was applied in the analysis of the collected data. The findings showed that both directive and supportive leadership had strong positive statistically significant association with affective commitment and statistically significant negative relationship with continuance commitment. Participative leadership style was found to be the only leadership style that had positive relationship with continuance commitment. However, it at the same time, had weak negative association with the affective component of commitment. Furthermore, achievement-oriented leadership was found to be the only component of path-goal leadership that was positively correlated with normative commitment. Supportive leadership was therefore best for affective commitment and participative leadership was the best for continuance commitment. Achievement-oriented leadership, on the other hand, was found to be best suited for normative commitment. Directive leadership was found to be the most ineffective component of path-goal. The study thus recommended that, based on the form of commitment, practices such as management receptiveness, the promotion of a friendly work environment, encouragement of employee participation and contribution, and the promotion of personal importance should be encouraged.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Leadership is an important element that guides businesses towards the achievement of important goals and objectives. Therefore, the behaviours and competencies of leaders are crucial in ensuring that businesses function smoothly. In the midst of challenges faced by businesses such as fierce competition, a lot of attention is usually paid to ways of effectively navigating their harsh environment, and one of these ways is through good leadership. As Northouse (2007) points out, effective leadership in organizations helps facilitate the achievement of the overall effectiveness of those businesses and their preparedness in accomplishing mission and goals. Researchers have argued that effective leadership is a key determinant of the success or failure of any organization (Madanchain, Hussein, Noordin, & Taherdoost, 2017). Leaders can facilitate changes in their organization through their influence on the behaviours of employees under them. Collective employee performance drives organizations forward, and these in turn are sensitive to the behaviours of leaders (Tandon, 2011).

An effective leader is one who is able to influence subordinates under them to perform functions that bring about positive organizational outcomes (Madanchain, Hussein, Noordin, & Taherdoost, 2017). Although there are different ways of measuring how effective leaders are in business organizations, a practical approach is the measurement of specific outcomes as a result of their performance as leaders, and here, as adopted by the study, is the direct impact on employees. The study specifically looks at employee commitment as an outcome in the evaluation of effective leadership. The significance of

employee commitment owes to the fact that the extent to which employees identify with their organization and are committed to its goals is an important predictor of other outcomes such as work satisfaction and general performance, and an anchor for positive organizational outcome (Kaiman, 2013). Leadership effectiveness should be given adequate attention it the organization intends to achieve its objectives. The study thus approaches the investigation of the importance of effective leadership by looking at the outcome of employee commitment.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In a competitive business environment, organizations rely upon their leaders to facilitate the changes and innovations required to maintain competitive advantage. These individuals are seen as persons who can navigate organizations through environmental instability. However, leadership has evolved over time in response to changes in employee requirements resulting in a demand for change in the relationship between a leader and his subordinates. Leaders have been found to influence followers in many ways that have an effect on the way they behave. These followers or subordinates are the employees that have been observed to be the most effective asset in achievement of organizational objectives and goals. They have the tendency to enhance the organization's productivity and profitability by utilizing the organizational capital efficiently and effectively (Javaid, 2012).

Despite this, the issue of employee turnover still remains a major problem plaguing businesses in Nigeria, especially in Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) (Siyanbola & Gilman, 2017). High rates of turnover should be worrisome as it exerts a negative impact on affected organizations including high cost implications. For instance, replacing employees who leave involves a series of recruitment, selection and

training processes, that may likely cost up to 25% of the employee's annual compensation (Kenny, 2007). It may also affect the firm's productivity, and thus performance, especially when it involves critical positions in the organization. High turnover also fosters a sense of discontinuity in the workplace hence, unsettling managers and employees. Companies that are unable to reduce their employee turnover rate will typically lose their competitiveness in the long run (Ismail & Lim, 2007). The study thus seeks to look into the nature of relationship that exist between leadership and the commitment of employees in order to determine the extent to which the attachment of employees to their jobs can be improved upon through sound leadership.

1.3 Research Questions

The research study seeks answers to the following questions:

i. What is the relationship between directive leadership and employee commitment?
ii. What is the relationship between supportive leadership and employee commitment?
iii. What is the relationship between participative leadership and employee commitment?
iv. What is the relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and employee commitment?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The research study has the following objectives:

i. To examine the relationship between directive leadership and employee commitment.

ii. To assess the relationship between supportive leadership and employee commitment.

iii. To examine the relationship between participative leadership and employee commitment.

iv. To examine the relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and employee commitment?

1.5 Statement of Hypotheses

Hypotheses to be tested in the study are as follows:

H_{O1}: There is no significant relationship between directive leadership and employee commitment.

H_{O2}: There is no significant relationship between supportive leadership and employee commitment.

H_{O3}: There is no significant relationship between participative leadership and employee commitment.

H_{O4}: There is no significant relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and employee commitment.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The research study will be important in different ways. Firstly, businesses, especially SMEs will find it useful in understanding the influence leaders have on directing the behaviours of employees, and in so doing allow them adequately commit resources towards the achievement of favourable organizational outcomes in terms of

performance. It would also help in the reduction in costs associated with coping with employee turnover.

Prospective researchers in related areas will also find this study of immense importance as a source of information and aid in setting of research direction by making available information that will act as a starting point for other studies, such as areas not covered in the research. It will also be valuable as giving the tools needed for a more extended study, such as for an industry or geopolitical zone in the country.

The general public will also benefit from the study in its capacity as an important source of information on the performance of leaders and how this is related to the commitment of individuals under them within the organization. Through the study they will possess an understanding of how certain factors affect employee feeling of attachment to an organization and the role of organizational leadership in the exploitation of these factors.

1.7 Scope of the Study

The research study will specifically focus on the determination of the relationship between effective leadership and employee commitment, using sampled Small and Medium Scale enterprises in Kaduna metropolis as case studies.The businesses used in the study were those registered with the Kaduna Investment Promotion Agency (KADIPA).

The study will look at leadership effectiveness in terms of four components of a Path-Goalleadership process – supportive, directive, participative and achievement-oriented and how it affects different components of employee commitment, based on the analysis of primary data respondents across the sampled businesses will provide. The period of the study is 2018.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Review

2.1.1 Concept of Leadership and Leadership Style

Leadership occupies an important part of literature on organizational performance and the behaviour of employees. Through leadership, an executive influences and guides a group towards the accomplishment of specific goals in a given situation. Such influence may include the communication of ideas, gaining acceptance of those ideas and the motivation of followers to support and implement the ideas through change. Leaders are required to develop the future vision, and to motivate the organizational members to want to achieve the visions and to improve the performance of the organization as a whole (Lussier, 2013, cited in Githuka, 2017; Iqbal, Anwar, & Haider, 2015). Burns (1978, cited in Lincoln, 2012) argues that leadership is a mobilization process by individuals with certain motives, values and access to resources in a context of competition and conflict in the pursuit of goals.

Leadership can be a key factor in the initiation of transformative change in organizations as leaders have the ability to facilitate the development of behaviours and attitudes that result in a positive effect on individuals, teams, and organizations (Raja & Palanichamy, 2011). According to Daft (2008), leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes and outcomes that reflect their shared purposes. The concept of leadership highlights the human factor that binds a group together and increases their performance. Sperry (2002) indicated keywords of empowerment rather than controlling the acknowledgement that leadership is concerned

with dealing with change, focusing on the long-term and the big picture, and the concentration on people and values. Leaders induce subordinates to work with confidence and zeal (Iqbal, Anwar, & Haider, 2015).

From ancient times researchers and scholars have tried to come up with explanations of why and how leaders lead. Over the years, different styles of leadership have been recognized that describe the methods leaders utilize in steering individuals under them towards specific directions. Leadership style describes the approach that managers use on people in their teams. Neagu (2015) provides three main approaches to leadership: an approach *centred on features* that can be used to differenciate an effective leader from an ineffecitive one; the *behavioural approach*based on what the leader actually does; and the *situational approach*, which is based on not just the behaviour of the leader, but also on the context which the leader must adjust to, or cope with and react accordingly.

1. **Feature-Centred Approach**

   Neagu (2015) outlined 6 groups of features that are necessary in the determination of an effective leader:

   a. Physical Characteristics: age, presentation of leaders.
   b. Social Environment: education, social position, experience and the professional mobility of leaders.
   c. Intelligence: the possession of a large amount of knowledge, better judgment, outstanding decisional capacity.
   d. Personality: self-confidence, active spirit, integrity of character, determination, independence, introverted/extroverted spirit, friendly/aggressive spirit, need to dominate / tendency toward authoritarianism.

e. Characteristics related to a task / labor: motivation/enhanced toughness, a strong need for achievement and a remarkable sense of responsibility and initiative, a "finisher".

f. Social and interpersonal skills: active involvement in activities, managerial skills, inter-relating with a variety of individuals - skill of cooperation, prestige, popularity, tact, diplomacy, charisma.

2. Approaches Based on Leader Behaviour

Approaches based on behavior emphasize that an effective leader adopts an effective behavioral style that incites, mobilizes individuals and groups to achieve organizational goals, equally favoring higher productivity and employee satisfaction. Effective leader behavior falls into antonymic pairs: autocratic/democratic, direct / permissive, oriented to tasks / oriented to people. Studies have revealed two types of leaders: task-oriented and employees-oriented.

a. Task-oriented leadership style (structural dimension) focuses on the definition and division of tasks to achieve the establishment of a formal communication level in a group / organization to define directions of the activity of the group, the main aim being to achieve the objectives, tasks.

b. Employee-oriented leadership style (relational dimension) focuses on behaviors that create a work environment where trust, mutual respect, friendship and support occupy an important place. This type of leadership is concerned with safety, comfort, job satisfaction of employees, promotes interpersonal relationships and takes the time to listen, prefers working relationships based on mutual trust, communication, respect ideas, personal opinions. Researches have

promoted the idea that the leadership style oriented on employees is the most effective, these leaders being associated with both greater productivity of the group and increased satisfaction with the work.

3. **Approaches Focused on Situation**

   The appearance of leaders is urgently needed depending on the situation and their ability to meet the expectations of people that follow them. Situational approaches emphasize the complexity of situational variables which might influence the effectiveness of a leader, proving that leadership is flexible, depending on the stage of maturation and subordinates. They take into account the possible influence of leader traits and behavior: -Personal characteristics of the leader: personality, needs, motivation, experience; -Characteristics of subordinates: their personality, needs, motivations, expectations, skills / past experience; -Characteristics of the group: stage of development, structure, nature of the task, formal and informal rules; -Characteristics of organizational structure: sources of leader power , rules and procedures established by the organization, professionalism of employees, the time to perform a task or decision.

In recent years, leadership theories have shifted from looking at leaders from the standpoint of attributes and characteristics they possess to the study of the behaviour of leaders and their relationship with their subordinates in various contexts. Changing business environments have necessitated the development of new effective approaches for managing employees and the organization as a whole, owing to the need for leaders to be fluid and dynamic in response to these changes in the process of interaction with subordinates in ways that would improve performance (Iqbal, Anwar, & Haider, 2015)

2.1.2 Concept of Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership effectiveness is generally concerned with how well a leader to influence followers and other stakeholders in the organization to meet the goals of that organization. The specific components of this influence may however vary according to geographical location and organizational type and makeup (Yuki, 2008; Madanchain, et al., 2017). According to Kenneth and Heresy (1988, cited in Suri, 2016), an effective leader is a good diagnostician that adopts different styles to meet the demands of the situation that manifests. Different leadership styles fit employees on the basis of direction, empowerment, and decision making power. In the absence of this, employee performance may be negatively affected due to lack of proper direction and application of strategic style in managing daily duties.

As observed by Smith and Swan (2002), effective leaders focus on 4 main areas – setting direction, mobilizing action, building capacity and acting with courage. Effective leaderhip enable organizations innovate, respond to changes in markets and environments, and meet challenges and sustain high performance in creative ways. Effective leadership has also been seen as the ability to lead and implement change.Some researchers have pointed out that for leadership to be effective, there must be a functional combination of a range of skills and high levels of personal values which manifest in the activities of the leaders bringing about outcomes for followers and the organization (Turner, 2008; Yuki, 2006). LFHE (2007) highlight a range of factors that contribute to leadership effectiveness. These are given below:

i. The provision of strategic direction.
ii. The creation of supportive structure for strategic decision.
iii. Facilitation of the development of supportive and collaborative environment.
iv. Provision of communication pertaining to developments.

v. The possession of credibility to act as role model.

vi. Protection of staff autonomy.

vii. Respect of existing culture while seeking to instill values through a vision for the department/institution.

viii. Possession of personal integrity.

ix. Establishment of trustworthiness as a leader.

x. Representation of the department/organization to advance its cause and network on its behalf.

xi. Facilitation of participation in decision making and consultation.

The study approaches the concept of effective leadership through a consideration of the four components of Path-Goal leadership - directive, supportive, participative and achievement leadership.

2.1.2.1 Path- Goal Leadership

Path-Goal Leadership is based on the Path-Goal theory of leadership developed by Robert House as an improvement on the previous work of M. G. Evans, starting from an article published in 1971 and others over the years. The theory specified a number of situational moderators of relationships between task and person-oriented leadership and their effects. Path-Goal leadership seeks to explain how the behaviour of a leader influences the performance and satisfaction of subordinates. The leadership style is similar to the contingency leadership model, but goes beyond it to provide a leader with an appropriate style to apply, regardless of preferred traits and behaviour, to influence employees towards enhanced performance. The Path-Goal theory emphasizes that an ability and commitment to providing employees with the psychological and technical support, information and other resources necessary for the completion of tasks is crucial

for leadership effectiveness (Lussier & Achua, 2016; Clegg, Kronberger, & Pitsis, 2005).

The Path-Goal model is used to select the leadership style, whether *directive, supportive, participative* or *achievement-oriented* that is most appropriate to the situation for maximizing performance. Here, the leader is responsible for motivating the followers towards the attainment of organizational goals through the clarification of the followers' path and the removal of obstacles that could prevent them from reaching such pre-defined objectives. Clegg, Kronberger, & Pitsis (2005) explain the path-goal model as being used to determine employee objectives and to clarify how to achieve them using one of the four leadership styles. It focuses on how leaders influence employees' perceptions of their goals and the paths they follow toward goal attainment.

2.1.2.1.1 Directive Leadership

With directive leadership, employees are given guidance of what to do and what is expected of them. By so doing, the employees will be able to have a higher degree of understanding of their roles and tasks. This style of leadership is effective in situations when individuals are unsure about how to go about tasks given to them. This might be in cases were goals are ambiguous, the employee is not experienced in carrying out such role, or when employees lack motivation. Leaders give very clear guidelines, while at the same time, indicate clear deadlines for task completion (Nevarez, Wood, & Penrose, 2013).

Githuka (2017) explored directive leadership in three main aspects: Planning and Scheduling, setting performance goals and the enforcement of rules and regulations. The directive leader is in total control of planning and scheduling of tasks, the directive leader, although little delegation of sequencing may be assigned to subordinates. The

leader gives specific instructions on how given tasks should be done and clearly communicates the outcomes expected and is in total control of the different stages of execution that the task involves, and how these phases are to be accomplished as well as the duration that each should take (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987, cited in Githuka, 2017). In the area of performance goals, the directive leader provides direction and influences followers towards the attainment of his predetermined target. Here, the leader is effective in communicating goals in a clear manner. The leader also enforces strict adherence to rules and regulations among subordinates. This has been argued to ensure strict compliance with procedures which increases work performance (Githuka, 2017).

Some researchers have argued that this form of leadership is more suited to new employees as well as those that are inexperienced who require step-by-step guidance due to their observed lack of commitment to task completion. However, despite the fact that this form of leadership ensures clarity in goals and task completion process, it has been criticized on the grounds that it depends on coercion or compulsion rather than choice. This absence of delegation and close monitoring can also lead to a sense of resentment and lack of trust from the leader failing to win affective commitment and loyalty. Therefore, employees may embark on accomplishing tasks because they are being monitored, and not necessarily because they are committed to doing so. It might also bring about low creativity as it works best in situations where there is no need for innovation (Githuka, 2017; Dolatabadi & Safa, 2011; Ekaterini, 2010; Clinebell, Skudiene, Trijonyte, & Reardon, 2013; Lok & Crawford, 2004).

2.1.2.1.2 Supportive Leadership

The supportive style is viewed as a people-oriented leadership behaviour style that involves a two-way communication and focuses mainly on emotional and social support. This type of leadership considers the wellbeing and personal needs of

employees, and facilitates the development of a friendly and supportive working atmosphere. This type of leadership goes beyond just assigning tasks and receiving results, there is heavy reliance here on delegation. The leader here works through the tasks with the employees to improve their skills and talents to a point where he is confident that the employee can handle doing a task correctly. The supportive leader is approachable and this helps in building of trust and confidence on the part of employees (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2015; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004; Lacoma, n.d.).

Supportive leadership is distinguishable in its approach to emotions, training and time. This form of leadership requires some degree of empathy and sensitivity on the part of the leader. The leader trains employees to deal with issues as they arise by themselves as much as possible, although relying on the leader when necessary. This requires significant time investment on the part of the leader. This type of leadership fits well into businesses with flat organizational styles and with employees that need to be creative and manage projects on their own. However, this form of leadership could be a waste of time in organizations where tasks are straightforward and simple. The coaching and training aspects of the style can waste time for such companies and interrupt the accepted decision-making process if employees take irresponsible initiative. The supportive style has been argued to be included in other leadership styles at least in some quantity. A level of consideration and care is required for any form of management and activity and task completion (Lacoma, n.d.).

2.1.2.1.3 Participative Leadership

First proposed in an experiment conducted in the Hawthorne Plant by America's National Research Council near Chicago in 1924, the participatory leadership style gives a balance in the involvement of leaders and their subordinates, such that these two groups make joint decisions, share information and solve problem jointly. The

participated style has an imbedded feature of *shared influence* among individuals that might be of different hierarchy fed by a culture of consultation which the leadership style promotes (Githuka, 2017; Kim, 2002; Somech, 2005; The Economist, 2009).

Although the leader takes the final decision, there is room for consultation in the form of suggestions from subordinates. Here, employees are included on the planning process as well as in the decision and execution phase (Negron, 2008). House (1996, cited in Hilda, 2016) identified four effects of participative leadership:

i. Participative leadership clarifies path-goal relationships pertaining to effort and work-goal realization and extrinsic rewards.
ii. It increases the balance between employee and organizational goals, because under participative leadership employees have influence about their allocated goals and would therefore select goals they highly value.
iii. It improves employee autonomy and ability to carry out their intentions, leading to greater effort and performance.
iv. It facilitates the organizational performance by increasing employee involvement and commitment.

2.1.2.1.4 Achievement-Oriented Leadership

Achievement-oriented leadership emphasizes the accomplishment of both formal and informal goals. An important feature of this form of leadership is a leader who challenges subirdinates to perform at the highest possible level. Such a leader establishes a high standard of excellence for followers and fosters continuous improvement (Northouse, 2010). Berger (2013) explains three perspectives that determine the ability of leaders to achieve goals: the characteristics of the individual leader, the leader's behaviour and the contextual contingencies of the task to be done.

Stogdill (1963, cited in Kasimu, 2016) highlighted three important aspects of the achievement-oriented style of leadership. Firstly, a leader's achievement-oriented behaviour involves emphasis on employees creating productive output. Another important element here is the initiation of structure in which the leader defines roles employees will assume while communicating to followers what is expected. A third element of this behavior is role assumption where the leader actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. Use of persuasion and argument effectively while exhibiting strong convictions also defines task-oriented leadership. An achievement-oriented leader sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in performance and shows a high degree of confidence that the subordinates will assume responsibility, put forth effort and accomplish challenging goals(House & Mitchell, 1974, cited in Kasimu, 2016).

Achievement-oriented leadership will enable employeesstrive for higher standards of performance and to have more confidence in their ability to meet challenging goals. Through this form of leadership therefore, the leader enhances the expectations of the subordinates that difficult goals can be achieved through greater effort. Achievement-oriented leadership has been argued to be effective in cases where followers are open to autocratic leadership and have eternal locus of control, when follower ability is high, when the environmental task is simple, authority is strong, and job satisfaction from coworkers is either high or low (Bryman, 2013; Lussier & Achua, 2012).

2.1.3 Employee Commitment

Employee commitment features in the relationship that exists between employees and their organization. Commitment indicates the attachment employees form to their organizations. A committed employee is seen as one who stays with an organization,

attends work regularly, puts in a full day and more, protects corporate assets, and believes in the organizational goals. Such an employee contributes positively to the organization and exceeds the basic requirements and expectations of the job (Saqer, 2009; Teshome, 2011; Werner, 2007). The conceptualization of the concept of commitment of employees in an organization can be seen from three main approaches:

the attitudinal approach, the beahvioural approach and the multidimensional appraoch (Mathebula, 2004). These are explained as follows:

a. Attitudinal Approach:

This refers to the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization. The attitudinal approach focuses on the process, in terms of a mindset, by which individuals come to think about their relationship with the organization as regards to the degree to which their goals, values conform with those of the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979, cited in Saqer, 2009) highlighted three features of attitudinal commitment –

i. Willingness to exert a consideration effort on behalf of the organization.
ii. A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values.
iii. Strong intent or desire to remain with the organization.

b. Behavioural Approach:

Behavioural approach on the other hand concerns with the process by which individuals become locked into an organization and how they deal with it. This approach looks at the willingness of the employee to participate in extra role behaviour for the benefits of the organization as a whole while performing

assigned roles fully and making sacrifices for the organization Bhagatwar (1989, cited in Mishra, 2005; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Research shows that individuals and organizations are adversely affected when commitment is low, and that both benefit when commitment is high. Organizational commitment is associated with increased satisfaction, performance, and organizational adaptability (Meyer & Becker, 2004), as well as decreased absenteeism and employee turnover (Lo, Ramayah, & Min, 2009).

2.1.3.1 Components of Commitment

Modern researches however, has been based on viewing employee commitment as a multidimensional concept. The consideration of commitment in this way have been widely attributed to John Meyer and Nancy Allen, with their tri-component commitment model. Allen and Meyer (1990, cited in Poddar, 2012) categorized commitment into the following three components:

a. Affective Commitment

This refers to the affective commitment as the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. It involves the desire to be involved in the organization and involves an employee's long-term feelings towards work. Employees guided by affective commitment remain in the organization because they choose to. Affective commitment is essentially made up of three aspects:

i. The formation of emotional attachment to an organization.
ii. Identification with the organization.
iii. Desire to maintain organizational membership.

The potency of affective commitment is reflected in the degree to which the needs and expectations of individuals about the organization match their actual experiences (Storey, 1995, cited in Manetje, 2009). Manetje (2009) observed that affective commitment was shaped by such factors as job challenge, role clarity, goal difficulty, management receptiveness, peer cohesion, equity, personal importance, feedback, participation and dependability. This type of commitment has involves *identification*, which is based on the desire to establish a rewarding relationship with the organization, and *internalization*, revolving around congruent goals and values held by individuals and the organization (Beck & Wilson, 2000).

Affective commitment is attitudinally based. Allen and Meyer (1990, cited in Poddar, 2012) argued that an individual develops attachment when they identify with the goals of the organization and are willing to help the organization in obtaining those goals. This is the most discussed form of commitment associated with desirable organizational outcomes. Here, the employee chooses to stay with the organization because he wants to. It is therefore crucial that organizations facilitate feelings of affective commitment as this will result in employees freely deciding to stay and accept the organization's objectives and values (Teshome, 2011).

b. Continuance Commitment

Unlike with affective comitment, here, the employee remains with the organization due to a consideration of the cost of leaving. Based on the *Side-Bet* theory, continuance commitment is based on the argument that the more an individual remains with an organization, the more he accumulates *investments*

that become more and more costly to lose the longer he remains there (Poddar, 2012). Allen and Meyer (1990, cited in Teshome, 2011), describe these investments as *non-transferable*, and include such things as organization-specific skills, years of employement, work realtionships, and benefits peculiar to the organization.

Continuance commitment is a form of psychological attachment to the organization that is determined by a consideration of the employee of the disadvantages of quitting in terms of the loss he will suffer if he leaves. Here, the employee remains with the organization because he needs to, in order not to lose the investments he has accumulated over the years. In addition to the fear of losing investments, employees might develop continuance commitment due to a lack of alternatives, as the decision to continue to staty, or not to leave could also be based on the individual's perception of employement options outside the organization. This might be the case when an individual lack the types of skills he requires to adequately function in other places, or have industry specific skills that do not allow for flexibility and thus, occupational mobility. The result is that the employee is compelled to commit to the organization. Thus, while effective commitment involves emotional attachment, continuance commitment indicates a comparison on the part of the employee of the cost of leaving vis-a-vis the benefits of staying (Poddar, 2012).

Tetrick (1995, cited in Manetje, 2009) sees the need of an employee to remain in an organizaion and continue to participate in work activities as profit, and the leaving the employment as a cost. In this way, continuance commitment is therefore seen as a framework of exchange in which performance and loyalty are offered in return for material benefits and rewards. Hence, in order to retain

employees who are continuance committed, it is important that the organization puts more consideration on the identification of elements that boost the morale of employees to make them affectively committed.

c. Normative Commitment

Normative commitment is based on the employee's feeling of obligation to remain with the organization. The employee is attached to the organization because he feels that he ought to stay. This form of commitment has been linked to moral obligation employees feel that they have to the organization which is influenced by accepted rules about reciprocal obligation between the organization and its members. Such obligation is based on the social exchange theory which argues on an individual who is receiving a benefit being under strong normative obligation to repay the benefit in some way (McDonald & Makin, 2000; Suliman & Iles, 2000). In other words, a psychological contract exists between the employee and the organization from the moment he is hired. Such a contract includes the perception of the employee about what he feels is reasonable treatment as a member of the organization. Therefore, normative commitment manifests when the employee feels the organization is keeping to its end of the psychological contract (Jex, 2002).

The obligation an employee might perceive he owes the organization can develop from the investment an organization makes in an employee. For example, an employee may feel an organization has spent a lot of time or money developing him though such measures as paying for his education to upgrade his qualification. The employee thus believes he should give back by continuing to work in such an organization. However, normative commitment is generally

most likely when individuals find it difficult to reciprocate the organization's investment in them(Meyer, Becker& Vandenberghe, 2004; Poddar, 2012).

The three commitment components are not mutually exclusive.it It has been observed that an employee can possess similar or different levels of the three components of commitment. They are not mutually exclusive. Thus, regardless of the definition, committed employees are more likely to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

2.1.3.2 Stages of Employee Commitment

The development of commitment among employees to their organization follows a process which has been generally identified to occur in three stages:

Compliance Stage

This stage involves the employee adhering to the influence of others in order to benefit from them in the form of remuneration or promotion. This stage shares similar characteristics with the continuance component of commitment (O'Reilly, cited in Eskandaricharati, 2014). Here, employees adopt certain attitudes and behaviours chiefly to gain specific rewards, rather then adhering to shared beliefs in itself. In this stage, the employee is calculative with the need to stay with the organization while evaluating what he will receive in terms of rewards(Beck & Wilson, 2000).

Identification Stage

Unlike in the compliance stage, here, employees admit the influence to preserve a satisfying self-defining relationship with the organization as it gives them identity. The individual here is guided by a sense of duty and loyalty towards the organization. This stage complies with the normative dimension of organizational commitment. Employees

in this case see the roles and responsibilities they have in the organization as part of their self-identity and feel proud to be part of the organization (O'Reilly, cited in Eskandaricharati, 2014; Manetje, 2009).

Internalization Stage

This stage manifests when the employee comes to the realization that the organization's values are intrinsically rewarding and in line theirs. This stage conforms with the affective dimension of organizational commitment. In addition to a sense of belonging, the employee also develops a passion to be part of the organization(O'Reilly, cited in Eskandaricharati; Manetje, 2009).

2.1.4 Concept of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs)

The concept of SMEs is not a new one and has been a part of numerous discussions, especially those centred around increasing productivity, economic growth and general welfare. There has been continued focus on these enterprises as means of correcting problems in the economy. Furthermore, a lot of individuals have continued to establish such businesses as ways of achieving financial returns and improve their standard of living, especially with the rising unemployment rate, and also in the performance of important functions in the economy. Sanusi (2003) gave a definition of SMEs by the Small and Medium Industries Equity Investment Scheme (SMIEIS) as those enterprises with total capital employed not below ₦1,500,000, but not exceeding ₦200,000,000, including working capital but excluding cost of land, with an employee strength of not below 10 and not above 300.

SMEs in Nigeria take up about 50% of total employment, and also 50% of the country's industrial output. These businesses make up about 90% of Nigeria's industrial sector in terms of number of enterprises or firms, but however contribute just 1% of GDP

(Abdullahi, et al., 2015). Aregbeyen (1999, cited in Tom, Glory, & Alfred, 2016) argued that the sector faced a lot of obstacles that have contrained its contribution to the economy. SMEs have the ability to bring about industrial and economic development through their potential for efficient utilization of local resources, the production of intermediate goods and services and the transformation of rural technology.

To give a clear picture of the identifying features of SMEs, Mohammed and Obeleagu-Nzelibe (2014) give certain characteristics that can be associated with SMEs in the country in terms of ownership structure and span of operations. The ownership structure of these form of enterprises revolves around the chief excutive who generally actively participates in the decision-making process and day-to-day operation of the business with little or not support. The chief executive can be known by all employees of the company or organization and is the owner, founder and manager as well as the controller of the business.

Additionally, SMEs cut across the industrial sector although majority are Agro- Allied and food processing businesses, there are quite some wood products and product furniture, in non-metallic mineral, in plastic wares, in clothing, tailoring, and the rest. They form a large pool of indigenous enterprise, technical know-how and a breeding ground for entrepreneurial management.

2.2 Literature Review

The section explores researches that have been done to provide empirical evidence on the nature of relationship between a variety of leadership and commitment measures. This is shown under the subsections that follow.

2.2.1 Directive Leadership and Employee Commitment

Wiza and Hlanganipai (2014) conducted a study on the impact of leadership styles on employee organizational commitment in higher learning institutions. The study analyzed responses from 160 staff at a South African university selected by the use of stratified sampling through the application of Spearman Product-Moment correlation. The findings of the study indicated that directive leadership style had a positive influence on continuance commitment.

In a similar study, Mahdi, Mohd and Almsafir (2014) examined the impact of employees' perceived leadership behaviour on their commitment in plantation companies in Malaysia. The study used primary data collected from a random sample of 300 supervisors and employees in four different plantations. The data collected was analyzed using the spearman correlation coefficient to determine the relationship among variables included in the study. The findings indicated that a strong significant positive relationship existed between directive leadership and continuance commitment.

In a study on the relationship between leadership style and the commitment of entry level employees to organizations among working adults in Bangkok, Tanchaisak (2009) analyzed primary data from a random sample of respondents with the use of the Pearson correlation statistic. The result of the study showed that directive leadership had a significant positive relationship with affective commitment.

Çokluk and Yılmaz (2010) studied the relationship between leadership behaviour of school administrators and the organizational commitment of teachers in Turkish primary schools using primary data from a random sample of 200 teachers. Collected data was analyzed with the use of the Pearson Correlation statistic. Findings from the study

showed that there was just moderate relationship between directive leadership and affective commitment among primary school teachers.

2.2.2 Supportive Leadership and Employee Commitment

Mclaggan, Bezuidenhout and Botha (2013) carried out a study on the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment in the mining industry in Mpumalanga in South Africa. The number of respondents that took part in the study where 88, made up of leaders (managers, team leaders and supervisors) and followers – ordinary mine employees who were randomly selected for the study. Supportive leadership style was found to have statistically significant moderate positive relationship with employee affective commitment.

In a study on the effect of nurse managers' leadership styles on organizational commitment of nurses working at government hospitals at Taif in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, El Dahshan, Youssef, Aljouaid, Babkeir and Hassan (2017)analyzed primary data from a random sample of 570 nurses at two government hospitals - King Abdul Aziz and King Faisal. Applying cross sectional correlation analysis, their study found significant positive correlation between supportive leadership style and organizational affective commitment, and therefore recommended such things as trust creation, encouragement of creativity and the introduction of common vision.

In their study on the influence of fair and supportive leadership behavior on commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, Meierhans, Rietmann and Jonas (2008) applied structural equation modelling to data collected from a random sample of 260 bank employees. The result of the study was in support of supportive leadership style having a significant positive impact on the affective commitment of employees to the organization.

2.2.3 Participative Leadership and Employee Commitment

Leng, Xuan, Sin, Leng and Yan (2014) undertook a study on the impact of leadership styles on the commitment of employees in the retail industry Malaysia. The study used primary data from the responses of 384 employees across three states of Malaysia – Perak, Johor and Penang, and analyzed this collected data with the Pearson Correlation technique and multiple regression analysis. The result from the study showed that participative leadership style had significant positive but low impact on normative commitment.

Bell and Mjoli's (2014) study was on measuring the effect of participative leadership on organizational commitment among bank clerks, using primary data obtained from a random sample of 100 clerks of four selected banks of the towns of Alice and King Williams in Cape Town. Pearson Correlation was applied to the collected data in order to test the hypotheses formulated for the study. The result showed that participative leadership had a significant positive effect on affective organizational commitment.

In a study on the effect of leadership styles on the commitment of employees to service quality in Bank Melli in Isafahan Porvince in Iran, Asgari (2014) collected responses from a random sample of managers and employees across 137 branches of the bank and analyzed it using the t-test. The result of the study pointed to the fact that participative leadership was the strongest influencer, both directly and indirectly, of employee affective commitment to the bank and service delivery.

In a study by Chipunza, Samuel and Mariri (2011), the relationship between leadership style and employee commitment was explored among managerial and non-managerial employees in a retail bank in South Africa. The respondents totalled 121 and were selected using stratified random sampling, the data from which was analyzed through

the use of measures of central tendency and the Pearson Correlation technique. The findings from the study indicated a very weak relationship between participatory leadership style and continuance commitment of employees.

Ispas and Băbăiță (2012) carried out a study on the effects of leadership style on the job satisfaction and commitment of employees in the hotel industry in Romania. Data was collected from a random sample of 367 employees of Romanian 3 and 4 star hotels. The result of the multiple regression applied in the study to analyze the collected data showed that participative leadership style had a significant positive impact on the affective commitment of employees.

Wu, Tsai, Fey and Wu (2006) examined the relationship between the leadership style of managers and the organizational commitment of employees in international tourist hotels in Taiwan, using responses from 390 respondents, made up of lower-level managers, across 58 state-qualified hotels collected through stratefied random sampling. Analysis of collected data involved the application of descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and the Scheffé test. Findings from the result indicated that participative leadership style had a very high and significant positive impact on the affecttive commitment of employees.

2.2.4 Achievement-Oriented Leadership and Employee Commitment

In a study on the relationship between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behaviour among organizations in Mashhad in Iran, Zabihi and Hashemzehi (2012) applied multiple regression analysis on primary data collected from a stratified sample of 98 employees of organizations in Mashhad in 2011. The study found that achievement-oriented leadership had positive and significant impact on the affective commitment of employees to their organization.

Githuka's (2017) study was on the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in Non-Governmental Organizations, using Christian Aid as a case study. The study used stratefied random sampling in the selection of 100 respondents made of up employees of Christian Aid from three countries – Kenya, Nigeria and Malawi across different levels (managers and non-managers) and departments of the organization. The result from the correlation and regression analysis applied in the study showed that achievement-oriented leadership had sigificant positive impact on employee normative commitment

There is an observable dearth of literature on the relationship between the types of path-goal leadership components (directive, participative, achievement-oriented and supportive) and components of employee commitment, especially in Nigeria. Studies on the relationship between path-goal leadership types and employee commitment in SMEs are especially lacking. Effective leadership involves influencing employees to engage in extraordinary performance in face of challenge and change, and maintenance of constant performance and benefits. Thus in a country focused on making the SME sector as effective as possible, a study of this nature looking into how employees can be made better, which will in turn bring about increased overall business performance is crucial.

Another uniqueness of the study stems from its digression in the choice of method for data analysis. The research will therefore apply the use of the *Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma* that is more suited to a study of this nature which involves ordinal variables with ordered categories, rather than the Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Ordinary Least Squares regression that most of the reviewed studies applied.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

There are a number of theories formulated to explain leadership styles or ways in which a leader can behave. Some of these are explained below:

Full Range Leadership Theory

Based on more than 100 years of research, the Bass and Avolio Full Range Leadership theory explains leadership over a wide range of behaviours categorized in three main styles of transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership.

Transformational Leadership Style:

A transformational leader has idealized attributes and is perceived by followers to be authentic and highly credible. The types of behaviour portrayed by this type of leader can being about a high level of commitment among followers, with high level of trust and shared goals (Kanste, Kaariainen, & Kyngas, 2009). Barbuto and Cummins-Brown, (2007) give the following components of the transformational style:

i. *Intellectual Stimulation:*

   This involves leadership behaviours such as the encouragement of imagination of subordinates, challenging of the old ways of doing things, willingness to take risks for potential gains, and the encouragement of looking into better ways to do things.

ii. *Individualized Consideration:*

   Behaviours here include the encouragement of the continuous development and growth of employees, empathizing with individual needs and the development of personal relationships with subordinates, as well as the display of genuine care and compassion in actions.

iii. *Inspirational Motivation:*

Inspirational motivation involves the inspiration of others to perform, the creation of a strong sense of purpose among employees, the clarification of where the organization will be in the future, the encouragement of subordinates to achieve more than they even thought was possible and the alignment of individual and organizational needs.

iv. *Idealized Influence:*

Under idealized influence, the transformational leader exhibits great commitment and persistence in the pursuance of objectives, develops trust and confidence among employees, demonstrates an inclusive vision, and expresses confidence in the vision of the organization.

A transformational leader empathizes with followers and displays a genuine, caring behaviour, and connects with them, thus making them more enthusiastic about their roles and encourages them to achieve goals (Kanste, Kaariainen, & Kyngas, 2009).

Transactional Leadership Style

Associated with Max Weber and Bernard Bass, this is often referred to as managerial leadership style as it has strong focus on supervision, organization and performance. Components of the transactional style are:

i. *Management-By-Exception*

This can be passive or active. In both cases however, leaders are more acutely aware of the mistakes of their subordinates and tend to react to correct those mistakes. This leader practicing this form of beahviour therefore stresses what people are doing wrong and taking corrective actions. Additionally, the leader

here sets standards but wait for problems to arise before doing anything (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007).

ii. *Contingent Reward*

Here, the leader established achievement goals and attaches rewards or recognition when goals are completed. The leader therefore exchanges rewards and recognition for accomplishments. Subordinates under this type of leader are clear on expectations of outcomes and rewards that can be gotten. Transactional leaders applying contingent rewards apply constructive transactions and actively monitor employee progress and provide feedback (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007).

Laissez-Faire Leadership Style

With the laissez faire there is an absence of leadership. The leader here avoids taking a stand on issues. This is the least effective and less desired style of leadership. The laissez faire leader exhibits non-interventionist and non-caring attitude (Perez, 2014). The leader is unaware of employee performance, does not emphasize results and refrains from intervening when issure arise (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007).

Lewin's Leadership Theory

The Lewin Leadership theory was formulated by Kurt Lewin, being an extension of his his 1939 study centred around training of graduate assistants in leadership behaviour. The theory had three main components. The ***Autocratic leader*** practices tight control over functions, duties and activities. He is authoritative and coercive. This type of leader initiates structure and is socially distant. They can also be power-oriented and manipulative as well as task-concerned and production-oriented. The ***Democratic Leader,*** on the other hand is socially close to his subordinates and has a participatory

orientation. A democratic leader is consultative, relations-oriented, shares power and is considerate of the ideas of others and situations. Such a leader is also egalitarian and is concerned with affiliative practices with followers. The last category of the Lewin model is the ***Laissez faire*** leader who practices a hands-off style, is usually passive and isolated, withdrawn and inactive. The participation of the leader here is generally minimal (Bass, 1990).

Often referred to as the father of social psychology, Lewin has been attributed with the creation of such fields as organization development and diversity awareness. His contribution to leadership theory have been variously discussed in literature. Lewin's theory has been praised as been a refinement of how leadership is viewed. For example, it represents a developmental shift away from the view that leaders are born. The theory is also simple in its applicability which makes it valuable for executive and leadership coaching. Furthermore, it can also be integrated with other theories and can serve as an organizing framework (Kavanagh, 2014).

Hershey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Model

Developed in 1969, the situational leadership model of Hershey and Blanchard is based on the following principles as provided by Kavanagh (2014):

i. Effective leadership involves the variance of the leader with the prevailing situation.

ii. Leadership styles can vary from leader to leader.

iii. Maturity of followers related to the stage in a group's life cycle or to the previous education and training of the followers.

iv. The job and psychology maturity of the followers in most crucial in determining which behaviourial style of leaders will result in the most effectiveness.

v. Some leaders initiate structure in order to accomplish tasks, while other leaders build and maintain good personal relationship. Others still do both, and still others do none of the above.

As Manning and Kurtis (2009) explain, the situational leadership model is concerned with behaviours that best fit the contingency approach and thus, its attributes vary with each situation. The situational model can be described as a highly applied relational approach to leadership, and is also prescriptive and relatively easy to follow. The theory is made up of four main styles depicting choices of behvaviour:

i. Directing

ii. Supporting

iii. Coaching

iv. Delegating

Although the model has been criticized on the fact that it might be too simplistic and prescriptive, its greatest strength revolves around the fact that as leaders apply it, they further develop greater understanding of what works and what doesn't and can change their style to match the level of competency and maturity of followers (Kavanagh, 2014).

Path-Goal Theory

The research study is however, centred around the ***Path-Goal theory***. Developed by organizational researchers Martin Evans and Robert House in the 1970s, the Path-Goal theory demotes flexibility in leadership. As Northouse (2010) explained, path-goal

leadership is designed to explain how leaders can help subordinates along the path to their goals through the selection of specific beahviours best suited to their needs and the situation at a particular period and work situation. The theory explains the framework by which leaders attain work group effectiveness through increase in worker motivation through clarification, direction, structure and rewards (Hsu, Huang, Leong, & Li, 2003; Silverthorne, 2001). (Bess & Dee, 2012)

Northouse (2010) summarizes the basic idea of the path-goal in the diagram below:

Figure 1: Path-Goal Theory



Source: Northouse (2010)

Leaders with Path-Goal leadership styles clarify and provide direction for followers, help remove obstacles, and provide encouragement and rewards for goal achievement. Obstacles can be anything that prevents subordinates from reaching their goals. These create excessive uncertainties, frustrations, or threats for subordinates, and thus, it is the leader's responsibility to remove the obstacles or help them work around them. Through this, the leader increases the expectations of the subordinates that they can accomplish the task at hand. Here, leaders achieve results because of their influential posture, ability to work effectively with others, and success in generating worker satisfaction (Youngjin, 2006; House and Mitchell, 1974; Northouse, 2010).

House's formulation of the theory categorized path-goal leadership style into four main components – Directive, Supportive, Participative and achievement-oriented. Based on the theory, the leader starts by assessing relevant variables in the environment, then applies one of these four styles that best fits the situation at hand.

The ***Directive Style*** is a task-motivated style that emphasizes formal activities including planning, organizing and controlling. The directive style improves morale when there is absence of clarity with the task. The ***Supportive Style*** is relationship-motivated and indicates the leader's concern for the wellbeing of group members and creates an emotionally supportive work environment. The supportive leader provides motivation and builds morale in instances where employees experience stress, frustration and dissatisfaction in carryout tasks. With the ***Participative Leadership Style*** on the other hand, the leader consults with subordinates to know their suggestions and then takes the final decision while considering these inputs from followers. This type of leadership is more suited to improving morale of well-motivated employees who perform nonrepeating tasks. Furthermore, a leader who is ***Achievement-Oriented*** sets challenging goals, pushes for work improvement and sets high expectations for team members, who are also expected to assume responsibility. This is especially suitable in instances when tasks are ambiguous (DuBrin, 2013).

The importance and uniqueness of the path-goal theory of leadership has been identified by Northouse (2010). Firstly, the theory is one of the first theories to leadership to specify four conceptually distinct varieties of leadership – directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented, which expanded the focus of prior researches (Jermier, 1996, cited in Northouse, 2010). Additionally, is was also one of the first situational contingency theories of leadership used to explain how tasks and subordinate characteristics affect the impact of leadership on their performance. The model informs

leader about how to choose an appropriate leadership style based on the various demands of the task and the type of subordinates that are to complete the task.

Secondly, the theory is praised in its attempt to integrate the principles of motivation of the expectancy theory into a theory of leadership. No other leadership theory does this. The theory is designed to keep the leader in constant consideration of issues of motivation.

Finally, the theory provides a practical model for leadership as it highlights important ways through which leaders can help subordinates across obstacles as they move along the path to achieve a goal.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted the descriptive research design. This was determined to be the most suitable design for the study, as it allowed the researcher gather needed data and analyze them in order to be able to generalize findings on the larger population. The descriptive design allows for an accurate depiction of the attributes of the population.

3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Technique

The population of the study was the 2,109 total number of employees of 354 SMEs in Kaduna metropolis. As this number was too large to cover, the use of a sample was therefore necessary. The stratified random sampling technique was therefore used for the study. All the businesses were therefore categorized according to their various industries (serving as strata), then a proportional sample for each industry was determined based on the sample size that was calculated. The sample size of employees was then determined from the sample of SMEs.

The study focused on the total population of SMEs in Kaduna registered with the Kaduna Investment Promotion Agency (KADIPA). This number was determined to be 354, sourced as online information from KADIPA. Information on number of employees was also gotten from this source. The Taro Yamane formula was applied in the determination of the sample size of SMEs. This is shown below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n - Minimum sample size required

N - Number of Population

e - Allowable error (5%)

Substituting the relevant values gives,

$$n = \frac{354}{1 + 354(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{354}{1 + 354(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{354}{1 + 0.885}$$

$$n = \frac{354}{1.885}$$

$$n = 187.798$$

The sample size used for SMEs was therefore 188.

Table 1: Stratified Sample of SMEs in Kaduna Metropolis

Strata (Industry)	Population of SMEs	Sample of SMEs	No. of Employees	Sample of Employees
Printing and Stationary	6	3	154	25
Manufacturing	49	26	364	58
Construction	10	5	186	30
Food and Beverages	19	10	239	38
Trade	161	86	421	67
Service	97	52	568	90
Miscellaneous	10	5	143	23
Pharmaceutical	1	1	10	2
Education	1	1	24	4
Total	**354**	**188**	**2,109**	**336**

Source: Researcher's Computation.

A sub-sample of the number of employees working in these SMEs was also necessary to give the researcher a manageable number to work with. Thus,

$$n = \frac{2109}{1 + 2109(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{2109}{1 + 2109(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{2109}{1 + 5.2725}$$

$$n = \frac{2109}{6.2725}$$

$$n = 336.230$$

The sample size for employees was therefore 336. Table 1 gives population and sample information for the study.

3.3 Method of Data Collection

The research study focused on the use of primary data collected through the distribution of questionnaires. The questionnaire was made up of two sections: Section A was designed to collect biographic information of the respondents who participated in the study. Section B, on the other hand was designed to collect primary data on the variables under consideration – components of path-goal leadership and commitment – through close-ended statements.

3.3.1 Reliability of Research Instrument

The items measured under each variable scale were tested for internal consistency through the application of the Cronbach's Alpha statistic, as this is a very common measure used in research studies to determine the extent to which questionnaire items are homogenous and reflect the same underlying construct (Cooper & Schindler, 2008).

Table 2 gives the result of the Cronbach's Alpha test carried out to determine the reliability of questionnaire items.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Leadership and Commitment Components

Variable	Number of Items	α
Directive Leadership	7	0.962
Supportive Leadership	9	0.900
Participative Leadership	6	0.942
Achievement-oriented Leadership	7	0.956
Affective Commitment	8	0.982
Continuance Commitment	8	0.973
Normative Commitment	7	0.976

Source: Computed using SPSS version 21.

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient general range between 0 and 1, and the closer to 0 the value is, the less effective the items are at measuring the same construct and therefore the lower the internal consistency of a scale and vice versa. The specific interpretation of the strength of the Cronbach statistic was determined using the following simple rule of thumb provided by Cronbach and Shavelson (2004): $\alpha \geq 0.9$ is excellent, $0.8 \leq \alpha \leq 0.9$ is good, $0.7 \leq \alpha \leq 0.8$ is acceptable, $0.6 \leq \alpha \leq 0.7$ is questionable, $0.5 \leq \alpha \leq 0.6$ is is poor, and $\alpha < 0.5$ is unacceptable.

The variable scales were determined to have high alpha values as can be seen in table implying therefore that the questionnaire items were highly internally consistent and the questionnaire was thus reliable as a research instrument and the data generated through its use could be confidently used for analysis

3.3.2 Validity of Research Instrument

The questionnaire items used in the first part of section B to measure the frequency of use of each component of leadership were adapted from Northouse (2001) where they were used in the determination of the type of path-goal leadership that an individual possesses (although with some modification to collect responses from subordinate emplooyees about their immediate supervisor, rather than the leaders themselves). Furthermore, the items used in measurement scales for the components of commitment were based on and/or adapted from the original Meyer and Allen (1997) work on their triparted organizational commitment framework. However they were applied with some incorporated modifications by Jaros (2007).

Additionally, the questionnaire underwent vetting by the supervisor to determine its potency, as well as clarity and appropriateness of language. Questionnaire items were reviewed and determined to be effective in helping collect the needed data required in investigating the research question the study was centred on, as well as testing the hypotheses formulated for the study.

Furthermore, two pilot studies were carried out to further determine the effectiveness of the questionnaire instrument in a real research situation. Feedbacks therefrom were incorporated and the questionnaire was adjusted accordingly. Some of the scales for example were reduced, as some respondents found the items to be a lot to answer. Through all these, the questionnaire as a research instrument was determined to be valid enough to be used to effectively measure the study variables.

3.4 Technique for Data Analysis

The study will proceed in the test of the stated hypotheses by examining the relationship of the four components of the path-goal leadership style on the individual components

of employee commitment, ultimately, to clearly show the nature of relationship that exist between both variables – leadership and commitment. In doing this, the study will apply the use of *Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma*.

Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma is a nonparametric measure of association between two ordinal variables. The test statistic computes the level of association between the two variables based on two sums that are obtained by constructing a cross tabulation and applying two formulas. The idea behind gamma is to measure the relative difference of concordant and discordant pairs in a sorted list of paired observations. The Gamma statistic is calculated using the following formula:

$$G = \frac{N_a - N_i}{N_a + N_i}$$

Where G - Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma coefficient

N_a - Number of concordant pairs - number of pairs of cases ranked in the same order on both variables.

N_i - Number of discordant or reversed pairs. This is the number of pairs of cases ranked in reversed order on both variables.

G is computed with the use of a cross-tabulation representing observed values for each case under consideration on both of variables. Here, the highest ranking category will be at the top among the rows and at the left, among the columns. A pair of cases is represented by taking any one case from a cell and comparing to any other casein the table. This pair of cases represents a case of agreement. Gamma computes the total

number of pairs that fit into the category of agreement by multiplying the cell frequency of a particular cell by the sum of frequencies for all cells that represent agreement. This procedure is repeated for each cell. The result is then added together to give a value for N_a (Howard & Breezeel, 2003).

A similar procedure is followed to determine the number of inversions or disagreements. This represents the number of pairs of observations where an individual rank differently on each of the variables. Calculation of the number of inversions begins in the upper right cell of the cross tabulation and multiplies the number of cases in the cell by the sum of all cells below and to the left of that cell. The results are then added together to yield a total for N_i . The formula is then applied to determine a value for G (Howard & Breezeel, 2003).

The value of Goodman and Kruskal's gamma ranges between -1 to +1.A value of -1 indicates perfect correlation between both variables. A value of -1 on the other hand indicates perfect negative correlation. However, a value of zero means that both variables do not have a relationship. Goodman and Kruskal's gamma is approximately normally distributed for large samples. Thus it is possible to calculate p-values and/or a level of significance. The statistic will be calculated with the use of the SPSS software (version 21).

3.5 Justification of Method

The justification for the use of Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma as the method of analysis owes to the fact that it is perfectly suited for a study of this nature that involves categorical ordered responses. This is substantiated by the fact that the study meets its two founding assumptions – the use of ordinal variables, and the presence of monotonic relationship between both leadership style and commitment of employees. The former is

evident from the fact that the variable Leadership style is made up of components that are made up of items with ordered responses ranging from Strongly Disagree to Agree. The latter is substantiated from review of literature that informed an a priori expectation of leadership style having either a positive or negative relationship with employee commitment to their organization.

Furthermore, Howard and Breezeel (2003) specifically recommended the use of the Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma statistic, especially as opposed to Spearman's Rho when there is need to evaluate correlation when the range of rankings is relatively narrowly constrained, and large numbers of ties are produced.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Data Presentation

In this section, the tables that follow summarize data collected in the course of the study. Table 2 gives a summary of the biographical data of the respondents that participated in the study.

Table 3: Biographical Data of Respondents

	Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sex of Respondent	Male	184	54.8
	Female	152	45.2
Educational Qualification	Primary	75	22.3
	High School	122	36.3
	OND/NCE	68	20.2
	HND/First Degree	20	6.0
	PGD/Masters	42	12.5
	Ph.D.	9	2.7
Working Experience in Current Capacity	Less than 5	67	19.9
	5 – 10	142	42.3
	10 – 20	48	14.3
	20 – 30	58	17.3
	More than 30	21	6.3

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Most of the respondents were male, making up a total of 54.8% of the collected questionnaire responses. The remaining 45.2%, making up 152 of the collected responses were female. Additionally, majority of the respondents had secondary school qualification as their highest form of qualification. This made up 36.3% of the respondents. Of the rest, those with primary school qualification made up 22.3% of the

total sample. OND/NCE, HND/First Degree, PGD/Masters and Ph.D. holders took up 20.2%, 6%, 12.5% and 2.7% respectively.

42.3% of the respondents had worked in their current capacity between 5 and 10 years. This was an attribute shared by the majority of the sample. The smallest category was found to be those who had worked more than 30 years. This was just 6.3% of the respondents. Between these two ends are the category of employees that had worked between 10 -20 years (14.3% of respondents) and those that had worked for between 20 and 30 years (17.3% of respondents).

Respondents were asked to give responses as to the directive leadership behaviour of their immediate supervisor. These formed items under a general directive leadership scale based on 5 ordinal response categories as can be seen in tables 3 to 9.

Table 4: My Immediate Supervisor Lets me Know What is Expected of me.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	36	10.76
Once in a While	96	28.6
Sometimes	75	22.3
Fairly Often	63	18.8
Frequently, if not Always	66	19.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018

As can be seen in table 3, 28.6% of the respondents reported that their immediate supervisor let them know what is required of them once in a while. This is less frequent than will be the case with a dominant directive leadership and followership relationship as is observable in 19.6% of the respondents who were of the opinion that they are made known what is expected of them in the course of their duties frequently, if not always. However, 28.6% of the respondents reported that this was the case only once in a while, 22.3% said “sometimes, and 18.8% reported “Fairly Often”.

Table 4 summarizes responses on whether the immediate supervisor gives vague explanation of what subordinates should do in the course of carrying out their duties and responsibilities. The view that this was the case once in a while and sometimes both obtained majority of the responses at 24.1%. However, the view that subordinates were always given clear explanation of what they were expected to do was supported by 11% of the respondents. On the other hand, 22% of the respondents had a problem with clarity of expectations from their immediate supervisor fairly often, while for 18.8%, this was frequently, if not always.

Table 5: My Immediate Supervisor Gives Vague Explanations of what is Expected of Subordinates on the Job.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	37	11.0
Once in a While	81	24.1
Sometimes	81	24.1
Fairly Often	74	22.0
Frequently, if not Always	63	18.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Responses of respondents relating to the availability of immediate supervisor are summarized in table 5. For the most part, the immediate superior was only available sometimes. This is determined from the responses of 27.1% of the sampled employees. However, 14.3% of collected responses pointed to the fact that the immediate supervisor was never around when needed, even as 17.6% of responses were in support of the direct opposite.

Table 6: My Immediate Supervisor is Available when Needed.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	48	14.3
Once in a While	62	18.5
Sometimes	91	27.1
Fairly Often	76	22.6
Frequently, if not Always	59	17.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Most of the respondents were of the opinion that their immediate supervisor sometimes spend time in teaching and coaching. This was determined from 23.8% of the total responses. Furthermore, 14% of the respondents opined that the immediate supervisor did not spend any time teaching and coaching, 21.4% said this only occurred once in a while. 20.5% were of the opinion that their immediate supervisor teach and coach them fairly often, while 20.2% reported that it occurred frequently, if not always.

Table 7: My Immediate Supervisor Spends Time for Teaching and Coaching.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	47	14.0
Once in a While	72	21.5
Sometimes	80	23.9
Fairly Often	68	20.3
Frequently, if not Always	68	20.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018

In table 7, the responses of employees on whether their immediate supervisor pay full attention to dealing with mistakes, complaints and failure are captured.

Table 8: My Immediate Supervisor Concentrates His/Her Full Attention on Dealing with Mistakes, Complaints and Failure

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	43	12.8
Once in a While	69	20.5
Sometimes	79	23.5
Fairly Often	72	21.4
Frequently, if not Always	73	21.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Most of the respondents (23.5%), as shown in table 7 agree that their immediate supervisor sometimes paid full attention to dealing with mistakes, complaints and failure. On the other hand, 12.8% were of the view that this did not happen at all. 21.7% opined that this happened frequently or always.

Immediate supervisors help others in developing their strengths. This was the view held by 24.1% of the respondents, who formed the majority. Table 8 contains this information. 11% of the respondents responded to this statement with "Not at all", while 18.8% selected the "Frequently, if not always" option.

Table 9: My Immediate Supervisor Helps others in Developing their Strengths.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	37	11.0
Once in a While	76	22.6
Sometimes	81	24.1
Fairly Often	79	23.5
Frequently, if not Always	63	18.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018

From the survey undertaken, it was discovered that immediate supervisors suggest new ways of approaching assignments only once in a while. This was the view held by 24.4% of the respondents making up the majority of the respondents. Table 9 shows this clearly.

Table 10: My Immediate Supervisor Suggests New Ways of Approaching Assignments.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	44	13.1
Once in a While	82	24.4
Sometimes	69	20.5
Fairly Often	71	21.1
Frequently, if not Always	70	20.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Most of the surveyed respondents (24.4% of collected responses) were of the opinion that their immediate supervisor suggests ways of approaching assignments. Of the remaining respondents, 13.1% were of the view that this never happen, while 20.8% reported that this frequently occurred, if not always.

Respondent perception of the supportive leadership attribute of their leaders was also measured. Data in this regard are summarized from table 10 to table 18.

Table 11: My Immediate Supervisor Expresses Satisfaction When His/Her Expectations Are Met.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	108	32.1
Once in a While	130	38.7
Sometimes	85	25.3
Fairly Often	12	3.6
Frequently, if not Always	1	0.3
Total	**355**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

One of the indicators of supportive leadership is to show satisfaction when duties are well done by subordinates. Table 10 therefore captures the frequency to which immediate supervisors do this among the respondents. To this, 38.7% of the employees responded that this occurred once in a while. This was the view expressed by most of the respondents. However, just 0.3% of the respondents expressed that this frequently or always happened. 32.1% of the respondents did not agree that their immediate supervisor expressed satisfaction when they accomplished what they were supposed to at all.

The effectiveness of the immediate supervisor in meeting the job related needs of others was obtained from the responses of respondents summarized in table 11. Here, as can be seen, 34.5%, the majority of respondents were of the view that their immediate supervisor was in fact effective in meeting the job related needs of others, although only sometimes. From the remaining responses only 0.3% of the respondents reported this attribute of the supervisor as the most frequent among all the categories of responses. However, 28.9% of the respondents opined that this did not happen at all.

Table 12: My Immediate Supervisor is Effective in Meeting the Job Related Needs of Others.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	97	28.9
Once in a While	116	34.5
Sometimes	110	32.7
Fairly Often	12	3.6
Frequently, if not Always	1	0.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

In table 12, the responses of respondents in relation to whether supervisors maintain a friendly working relationship are captured. Going by majority of the responses, immediate supervisors fail in the maintenance of friendly work environment. This was gathered from the responses of 36.9% of the respondents.

Table 13: My Immediate Supervisor Maintains a Friendly Working Relationship with Subordinates.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	124	36.9
Once in a While	111	33.0
Sometimes	84	25.0
Fairly Often	17	5.1
Frequently, if not Always	0	0.0
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Not far behind however, are responses in support of the fact that a friendly environment is maintained only once in a while. This made up 33% of the collected responses.

The degree of receptiveness of the immediate supervisor to worker ideas and suggestions is shown in table 13. 37.2% of the total responses here point to the fact that the immediate supervisor did not receptively listen to the ideas and suggestions of subordinates at all. The exact opposite view was held by 0.3% of the respondents. Between these two extremes, 34.55 of the respondents opined that this occurred once in

a while, 24.7% were of the view that this happened sometimes, while 3.3% of the respondents supported the view that this happened fairly often.

Table 14: My Immediate Supervisor Listens Receptively to Subordinates' Ideas and Suggestions.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	125	37.2
Once in a While	116	34.5
Sometimes	83	24.7
Fairly Often	11	3.3
Frequently, if not Always	1	0.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

According to responses collected and summarized in table 14, for the most part, the immediate supervisor did not put things in place to ensure the pleasantness of being part of a group. This was the view held by 39% of the respondents. Of the remaining responses, 31.3% of the respondents were supportive of the view that this occurred once in a while. For 25.6%, 4.2% and none of the respondents, this happened sometimes, fairly often and frequently or always respectively.

Table 15: My Immediate Supervisor Does Little Things To Make It Pleasant To Be A Member Of The Group.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	131	39.0
Once in a While	105	31.3
Sometimes	86	25.6
Fairly Often	14	4.2
Frequently, if not Always	0	0.0
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

In terms of encouraging continual improvement in the performance of subordinates, most of the respondents scored their immediate supervisor very low – 39.3% of the respondents attested to the fact that this never happened. This can be seen in table 15.

Table 16: My Immediate Supervisor Encourages Continual Improvement In Subordinates' Performance.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	132	39.3
Once in a While	101	30.1
Sometimes	89	26.5
Fairly Often	14	4.2
Frequently, if not Always	0	0.0
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

From table 15, it can be seen that the remaining responses are divided into 30.1% in support of immediate supervisors encouraging continual improvement in the performance of subordinates once in a while, 26.5% of respondents of the view that supervisors encouraged continual improvement sometimes, and 4.2% supporting the view that this was the case fairly often.

Table 16 summarizes responses as to whether the immediate supervisor say things that are hurtful to the personal feelings of subordinates.

Table 17: My Immediate Supervisor do not Say Things that are Hurtful to Subordinates' Personal Feelings.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	125	37.2
Once in a While	109	32.4
Sometimes	86	25.6
Fairly Often	15	4.5
Frequently, if not Always	1	0.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Often in the workplace, there might be cases of differing opinions across various aspects such as problem solving, as well as dissatisfaction of for instance, how work is done or a particular responsibility is handled, which might lead to confrontation. Table 16 therefore gives an indication of the frequency an immediate supervisor might say a hurtful thing to a subordinate. 37.2% of the respondents were of the view that their

immediate supervisor did in fact sat things that were hurtful all the time. 0.3% of the respondents were of the view that this was not the case. Furthermore, 32.4% opined that this happened once in a while, 25.6% reported that this happened sometimes, and 4.5% supported the fact that this was this case fairly often.

As can be seen in table 17, 36.9% of the respondents believed that their immediate supervisor put their personal needs into consideration once in a while. This reflected the views of most of the respondents. Furthermore, 25.6% of the respondents were of the view that this did not happen at all. However, 0.3% of the respondents affirmed that their immediate supervisor behaved in a manner that was thoughtful of the personal needs of subordinates.

Table 18: My Immediate Supervisor Behaves in a Manner that is Thoughtful of Subordinates' Personal Needs.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	86	25.6
Once in a While	124	36.9
Sometimes	103	30.7
Fairly Often	22	6.5
Frequently, if not Always	1	0.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The final item under the measurement of supportive leadership behavior was how frequently the immediate supervisor treated subordinates as individuals rather than just a member of a group. The responses collected in this regard are summarized in table 18. Here, the majority of responses (35.7%) was in support of immediate supervisor treating subordinates as individuals rather than just a member of a group only once in a while. However, while 33.3% selected the "Not at all" response, 28.6% reported that this was the case sometimes and 2.4% agreed to a more frequent interval, choosing the "Fairly Often" response.

Table 19: My Immediate Supervisor Treats others as Individuals Rather than Just a Member of a Group

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	112	33.3
Once in a While	120	35.7
Sometimes	96	28.6
Fairly Often	8	2.4
Frequently, if not Always	0	0.0
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Tables 19 to 24 summarize responses concerned with participative leadership behaviour based on the extent to which the leader gets subordinates involved in the work process. In table 9, most of the responses (45.8%) were in support of the opinion that the immediate supervisor consulted with subordinates when faced with a problem once in a while. However, the smallest group of respondents (7.1%) were of the view that this occurred fairy often.

Table 20: My Immediate Supervisor Consults with Subordinates when Facing a Problem.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	92	27.4
Once in a While	154	45.8
Sometimes	37	11.0
Fairly Often	24	7.1
Frequently, if not Always	29	8.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be seen in table 20, 38.4% of respondents were of the view that their immediate supervisor asked subordinates for suggestions on how to carry our assignments. 6% of the respondents reported that this frequently or always happened. Furthermore, 38.4% of respondents opined that this only occurred once in a while, 22% reported that it was sometimes, while 8.3% were of the view that their immediate supervisor consult with subordinates fairly often.

Table 21: My Immediate Supervisor Asks for Suggestions from Subordinates Concerning how to Carry out Assignments.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	85	25.3
Once in a While	129	38.4
Sometimes	74	22.0
Fairly Often	28	8.3
Frequently, if not Always	20	6.0
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

In showing doubt on a subordinate's ability to meet objectives, as contained in table 21, 31% of respondents were of the view that immediate supervisor showed doubt about the ability of subordinates always or frequently. In direct contradiction to this, 5.7% of the respondents reported that their immediate supervisor did not show doubt in the ability of subordinates.

Table 22: My Immediate Supervisor Does Not Show Doubts about Subordinate's Ability to Meet Most Objectives.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	104	31.0
Once in a While	131	39.0
Sometimes	50	14.9
Fairly Often	32	9.5
Frequently, if not Always	19	5.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Table 22 summarizes opinions of respondents as to how frequently their immediate supervisor help subordinates overcome problems that prevent them from carrying out their tasks. 42.9%, making up the majority of respondents were of the view that the immediate supervisor helped subordinates in overcoming problems once in a while. However, 31% reported that this never occurred. Furthermore, 9.8% of the respondents opined that this occurred frequently or always.

Table 23: My Immediate Supervisor Helps Subordinates Overcome Problems that Stop them from Carrying out their Tasks.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	104	31.0
Once in a While	144	42.9
Sometimes	34	10.1
Fairly Often	21	6.3
Frequently, if not Always	33	9.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be seen in table 23, 35.7% of respondents were of the opinion that their immediate supervisor would never consult subordinates before acting. However, according to 35.7% of the responses, this occurred once in a while, while 28.6% of the responses pointed to the fact that subordinates were consulted sometimes, and 2.4% were of the view that this occurred fairly often.

Table 24: My Immediate Supervisor Does not act without consulting Subordinates.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	76	22.6
Once in a While	138	41.4
Sometimes	70	20.8
Fairly Often	32	9.5
Frequently, if not Always	19	5.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

According to opinions from most of the respondents, the immediate supervisor asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should made once in a while. This can be seen in table 24, and represents the viewpoint of 40.5% of the respondents. Furthermore, 28.9% of the respondents supported the view that this was not the case at all, and 7.7% of respondents opined that this happened frequently, if not always.

Table 25: My Immediate Supervisor Asks Subordinates for Suggestions on what Assignments Should be Made.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	97	28.9
Once in a While	136	40.5
Sometimes	51	15.2
Fairly Often	26	7.7
Frequently, if not Always	26	7.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Tables 25 to 31 summarize responses based on the achievement-oriented leadership behaviour of the immediate supervisor of respondents. As can be seen from table 25, 27.4% of the respondents felt that supervisors sometimes keep focused attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards. 11.6% of the respondents were of the opinion that this was not the case at all, while 17.6% agreed that the immediate supervisor giving focused attention to these things frequently occurred, if not always.

Table 26: My Immediate Supervisor Keeps a Focused Attention on Irregularities, Mistakes, Exceptions, and Deviations from Standards.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	39	11.6
Once in a While	84	25.0
Sometimes	92	27.4
Fairly Often	62	18.5
Frequently, if not Always	59	17.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The achievement-oriented leadership behaviour of informing subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done is measured by the summarized responses in table 26. Giving subordinates a guideline on what needs to be done and how it is to be done gives clarity to subordinates in the performance of their functions and also improves their performance towards the achievement of goals and objectives.

Table 27: My Immediate Supervisor Informs Subordinates about what Needs to be Done and how it Needs to be Done.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	39	11.6
Once in a While	76	22.6
Sometimes	101	30.1
Fairly Often	79	23.5
Frequently, if not Always	41	12.2
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Froom the responses summarized in table 26, it can be seen that 30.1% of the respondents perceived that their immediate supervisor sometimes inform subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done. The lowest group of respondents (11.6%) however disagreed that this was ever the case, as 12.2% felt that such information from immediate supervisor was frequent, if not always.

Table 28: My Immediate Supervisor Asks Subordinates to Follow Standard Rules and Regulations.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	53	15.8
Once in a While	78	23.2
Sometimes	82	24.4
Fairly Often	75	22.3
Frequently, if not Always	48	14.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Table 27 summarizes responses on whether the immediate supervisor asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations. The majority of the respondents (24.4%) believed that that happened sometimes. However, 14.3% of the respondents were of the view that this always happened. Additionally, 23.2%, 24.4% and 22.3% of respondents opined that this occurred once in a while, sometimes and fairly often respectively.

In the explanation of the expected level of performance for subordinates, 27.4% of the respondents attested that this applied to their immediate supervisor, as can be seen in table 28.

Table 29: My Immediate Supervisor Explains the Level of Performance that is Expected of Subordinates.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	57	17.0
Once in a While	58	17.3
Sometimes	92	27.4
Fairly Often	71	21.1
Frequently, if not Always	58	17.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Of the remaining responses, 17% of the respondents reported that their immediate supervisor do not explain the level of performance expected of them at all. Also, 17.3% said this occurred once in a while, while for 21.1% and 17.3% of the respondents this was fairly often and frequently or always respectively.

Table 29 summarizes responses as to how frequently the immediate supervisor makes subordinates know of the expectation for them to perform at their highest level.

Table 30: My Immediate Supervisor Lets Subordinates Know of the Expectation for them to Perform at their Highest Level.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	49	14.6
Once in a While	85	19.3
Sometimes	88	26.2
Fairly Often	83	24.7
Frequently, if not Always	51	15.2
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

14.6% of the respondents reported that this was never the case, 19.3% were of the view that this occurred once in a while, 26.2% were in favour of “sometimes”, 24.7% opined

that this occurred fairly often, while to 15.2% of the respondents, this was frequent or always.

Immediate supervisors sometimes set goals for subordinates that are quite challenging. This was the view held by the majority of the respondents (28.3%). However, 10.1% of the respondents reported that this was not the case at all. Furthermore, 12.5% of the respondents were of the view that this frequently or always happened.

Table 31: My Immediate Supervisor Sets Goals for Subordinates' Performance that are Quite Challenging.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	34	10.1
Once in a While	91	27.1
Sometimes	95	28.3
Fairly Often	74	22.0
Frequently, if not Always	42	12.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

An important component of achievement-oriented leadership is the maintenance of instituted standards in an organization. The responses summarized in table 31 indicate how frequently respondents perceive this was done by their immediate supervisor.

Table 32: The Immediate Supervisor Directs Attention towards Failures to Meet Standards

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Not at All	44	13.1
Once in a While	78	23.2
Sometimes	89	26.5
Fairly Often	73	21.7
Frequently, if not Always	52	15.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

26.5% of responses, making up the majority pointed to the fact that supervisors direct their attention towards failure to meet standards sometimes. 13.1% of the responses

however centre on the view that this was not the case at all. 15.5% of respondents, on the other hand opined that this was frequent or always occurred.

The remaining tables in this section summarize items used to measure commitment among respondents across the selected businesses used in the study. The study looked at commitment in its three main components. Tables 32 to 39 give responses of respondents with regards to their level of affective commitment. Table 32 measures the happiness of respondents to be part of the organization. 48.8% in total, made up of 24.4% of respondents that strongly agreed and 24.4% of respondents that agreed were in favour of being happy to be part of the organization in which they worked, implying that most people were happy to be part of the organization they belonged to.

Table 33: I am Happy to be Part of this Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	82	24.4
Agree	82	24.4
Undecided	51	15.2
Disagree	59	17.6
Strongly Disagree	62	18.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

However, 17.6% of respondents disagreed that they were happy to be part of the organization and 18.5% strongly disagreed. The remaining 15.2% were undecided.

Most of the respondents were happy discussing with people outside their organization about where they worked. This can be seen in table 33 where 24.7% of the respondents strongly agreed to this statement, supported by 26.2% who also agreed. On the other hand, 20.5% of the respondents disagreed, while 15.8% strongly disagreed. 12.8% were undecided.

Table 34: I Enjoy Discussing about my Organization with People Outside it.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	83	24.7
Agree	88	26.2
Undecided	43	12.8
Disagree	69	20.5
Strongly Disagree	53	15.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be seen from table 34, most of the respondents (28%) agree with the statement that they really felt like the organization's problems were also their own. This was supported by 21.7% of the respondents who strongly agreed that this was the case. 14% of the respondents were undecided, while 18.8% disagreed and 17.6% strongly disagreed.

Table 35: I really feel as if this Organization's Problems are my Own.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	73	21.7
Agree	94	28.0
Undecided	47	14.0
Disagree	63	18.8
Strongly Disagree	59	17.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The majority of collected responses implied that most of the respondents felt some form of attachment with their current place of work. As can be seen from table 35, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that they did not think they could easily become attached to another organization. 24.4% of respondents also agreed to this. However, 15.8% of respondents believed this not to be so, with 18.2% strongly in favour.

Table 36: I Think that I Could not Easily Become as Attached to Another Organization as I Am to this One.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	80	23.8
Agree	82	24.4
Undecided	60	17.9
Disagree	53	15.8
Strongly Disagree	61	18.2
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Responding to the statement on whether they felt like part of the family in their organization, 23.5% of respondents strongly agreed and 25.6% of respondents agreed. This information is contained in table 36.

Table 37: I Feel Like Part of the Family at my Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	79	23.5
Agree	86	25.6
Undecided	51	15.2
Disagree	57	17.0
Strongly Disagree	63	18.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

However, 18.8% strongly disagreed that they felt like part of the organization and 17.0% strongly disagreed. 15.2% were undecided.

Table 38: I feel Emotionally Attached to this Organization

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	80	23.8
Agree	85	25.3
Undecided	57	17.0
Disagree	53	15.8
Strongly Disagree	61	18.2
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Most of the respondents feel emotionally attached to their organization, as can be seen in table 37. Here, in response to the statement of feeling emotionally attached to their organization, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agreed, while 25.23% agreed.

Table 38 contains summarized responses on the organization having great deal of personal meaning for the respondents. Here, it can be seen that 21.2% of the respondents were strongly of the view that this was the case, while 29.2% agreed. These were in direct contradiction to 167% of respondents that strongly disagreed and 19.3% of respondents that disagreed respectively.

Table 39: This Organization has Great Deal of Personal Meaning for Me.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	71	21.1
Agree	98	29.2
Undecided	46	13.7
Disagree	65	19.3
Strongly Disagree	56	16.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Table 39 summarizes subordinate feeling of belonging to the organization. Here, it can be seen that 23.8% of respondents strongly agreed that they felt a sense of belonging to their organization. To this also, 25% agreed. However, 17.6% strongly disagreed and 17.9% agreed.

Table 40: I do not feel a Strong Sense of Belonging to My Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	59	17.6
Agree	60	17.9
Undecided	53	15.8
Disagree	84	25.0
Strongly Disagree	80	23.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The items from tables 40 to 47 measure the continuance commitment of the respondents to their organization. From the information in table 40, it can be seen that 30.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed to the statement that they were loyal to the organization because of so much emotional, social and economic investment they put into it. In the same vein, 26.5% of the respondents disagreed.

Table 41: I am Loyal to this Organization because I have So Much Emotional, Social and Economic Investment in it.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	20	6.0
Agree	44	13.1
Undecided	53	23.8
Disagree	89	26.5
Strongly Disagree	103	30.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

However, 6% of the respondents strongly agreed that this was indeed so, a similar standpoint was taken by 13.1% of respondents who agreed.

6% of the respondents were of the strong view that they were dedicated to the organization due to the fear of what they have to lose in it. 15.8% of respondents also agreed to this. However, 32.4% disagreed that this was the case. Similarly, 23.5% strongly disagreed. 22.3% were undecided. This information is summarized in table 41.

Table 42: I am dedicated to this organization because I fear what I have to lose in it.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	20	6.0
Agree	53	15.8
Undecided	75	22.3
Disagree	109	32.4
Strongly Disagree	79	23.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The responses summarized in table 42 are in association with the statement that respondents worry about what might happen if something were to happen to their

organization and they were no longer members. Here, 6.5% of the respondents strongly agree that they did in fact worried about what might happen. 8.9% of the respondents also agreed to this. On the other hand, 26.8% of respondents strongly disagreed that they sometimes worried about what might happen. Closely related to this were the responses of 30.1% of the respondents who disagreed.

Table 43: Sometimes I Worry About what Might Happen if Something was to Happen to the Organization and I was No Longer a Member.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	22	6.5
Agree	30	8.9
Undecided	93	27.7
Disagree	101	30.1
Strongly Disagree	90	26.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be gathered from table 43, 5.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that if they were no longer a member of the organization, they would be sad because their lives would be disrupted. Similarly, 10.1% agreed.

Table 44: If I Wasn't a Member of this Organization, I would be Sad Because my Life Will be Disrupted.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	19	5.7
Agree	34	10.1
Undecided	103	30.7
Disagree	88	26.2
Strongly Disagree	92	27.4
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

From the remaining responses, it can be seen that 27,4%, 26.2% and 30.7% of the respondents strongly disagreed, disagreed and were undecided respectively.

In terms of investments made in the organization as a component of continuance commitment, most of the respondents (29.2%) disagreed that they worried about them.

This can be seen in table 44. Close to this in magnitude were responses that strongly disagreed. These made up 26.5%.

Table 45: I Worry about the Investments I Have Made in this Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	18	5.4
Agree	38	11.3
Undecided	93	27.7
Disagree	98	29.2
Strongly Disagree	89	26.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Majority of the respondents (31%) disagreed that they often felt anxious about what they had to lose with the organization. 24.1% of the respondents strongly disagreed to this. In the minority, 5.4% of respondents strongly agreed, while 11.9% agreed. 27.7% were undecided. This is summarized in table 45.

Table 46: I often feel Anxious about What I Have to Lose with this Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	18	5.4
Agree	40	11.9
Undecided	93	27.7
Disagree	104	31.0
Strongly Disagree	81	24.1
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be seen in table 46, 5.7% of the respondents strongly agreed that personal sacrifice in terms of personal benefits was one of the reasons they continued to work at their organization. Additionally, 15.8% agreed to this. 27.7% strongly disagreed, while 30.1 disagreed.

Table 47: One of the Major Reasons I Continue to Work for this Organization is that Leaving Would Require Considerable Personal Sacrifice – Another Organization May Not Match the Overall Benefits I Have Here.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	19	5.7
Agree	53	15.8
Undecided	70	20.8
Disagree	101	30.1
Strongly Disagree	93	27.7
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

The scarcity of available alternatives is not among one of the few serious consequences of leaving the organization. This is a view held by majority of the respondents as shown in table 47, with 25.3% of the respondents strongly agreeing with this and 28.9% of respondents agreeing. However, 5.7% of the responses were in strong disagreement, while 11.9% of the responses were in agreement.

Table 48: One of the Few Serious Consequences of Leaving this Organization would be the Scarcity of Available Alternatives.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	19	5.7
Agree	40	11.9
Undecided	95	28.3
Disagree	97	28.9
Strongly Disagree	85	25.3
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Tables 48 to 54 contain response items used to measure normative commitment among the respondents that took part in the study. Table 48 summarizes responses as to whether respondents felt they owe their organization. Most of the respondents (26.2%) were undecided. 12.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and 19.3 agreed. On the other hand, 19.6% and 22% of the respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively.

Table 49: I Feel That I owe this Organization Quite a Bit Because of what it Has Done for Me.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	43	12.8
Agree	65	19.3
Undecided	88	26.2
Disagree	74	22.0
Strongly Disagree	66	19.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

From the responses contained in table 49, it can be seen that 17.6% of respondents strongly agree that their organization had treated them well enough to deserve their loyalty. This was directly contradicted by the views of 23.8% of respondents who felt strongly in the opposite direction.

Table 50: My Organization Deserves My Loyalty because of its Treatment Towards Me.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	45	17.6
Agree	72	17.9
Undecided	80	15.8
Disagree	71	25.0
Strongly Disagree	68	23.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Additionally, in contradiction to the views of 17.9% of the respondents that agreed to the fact that their organization deserved their loyalty because of the way it treated them, 25% of respondents disagreed that this was so.

The items in table 50 represent responses of respondents to the statement of whether they felt they would be letting their co-workers down if they weren't members of the organization. Here, 12.5% of respondents strongly agreed to the statement while 20.2% agreed. However, 17.9% strongly disagreed, while 23.2 disagreed. 26.2% were undecided.

Table 51: I feel I would be Letting my Co-Workers Down if I wasn't a Member of this Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	42	12.5
Agree	68	20.2
Undecided	88	26.2
Disagree	78	23.2
Strongly Disagree	60	17.9
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

As can be seen in table 51, 10.7% of the respondents who strongly agree, and 19.6% of respondents who agree, would not feel it was right to leave their organization if they got a better job elsewhere. 19.3% of the respondents however felt this was not the case, 22.6% felt strongly so.

Table 52: If I Got Another Offer for a Better Job Elsewhere, I would Not Feel it Was Right to Leave my Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	36	10.7
Agree	66	19.6
Undecided	93	27.7
Disagree	65	19.3
Strongly Disagree	76	22.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Table 52 contain responses to the statement that things were better in the days when people remained in one organization for most of their careers.

Table 53: Things were Better in the Days when People Stayed in One Organization for Most of their Careers.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	49	14.6
Agree	56	16.7
Undecided	90	26.8
Disagree	78	23.2
Strongly Disagree	63	18.8
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

Here, it can be seen that 14.6% strongly agree and 16.7% agree. Additionally, 26.8% of respondents were undecided, while 23.2% and 18.8% of respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

From the information summarized in table 53, it can be seen that 13.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that they felt a sense of moral obligation to remain stemming from the loyalty they have with the organization. To this also, 23.5% of the respondents agreed. Among the remaining responses, 20.5% of respondents were undecided, 24.4% disagreed and 18.5% strongly disagreed.

Table 54: One of the Major Reasons I Continue to Work in this Organization is that I Believe Loyalty is Important and therefore feel a Sense of Moral Obligation to Remain.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	44	13.1
Agree	79	23.5
Undecided	69	20.5
Disagree	82	24.4
Strongly Disagree	62	18.5
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

From the responses summarized in table 54, it can be gathered that 11% of the respondents strongly agreed that an individual should always be loyal to their organization, a view to which 22% of the respondents agreed to.

Table 55: I Believe that a Person Must Always be Loyal to His Or Her Organization.

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	37	11.0
Agree	74	22.0
Undecided	86	25.6
Disagree	63	18.8
Strongly Disagree	76	22.6
Total	**336**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2018.

22.6% of the respondents, on the other hand strongly disagreed that individuals should always be loyal to their organization, while 25.6% of the respondents were undecided.

4.2 Data Analysis and Results

The analysis of the data collected in the course of the study is necessary to test the hypotheses formulated for the study.

4.2.1 Test of Research Hypothesis I

H_{O1}: There is no significant relationship between directive leadership and employee commitment.

The result of the Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma analysis carried out to determine the level and direction of association between directive leadership and the components of employee commitment is summarized in table 55.

Table 56: Association between Directive Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment

	Commitment		
Directive Leadership	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment
	0.77**	-0.48**	-0.011

** - Significant at 0.05

Source: SPSS Output.

Directive leadership was found to have a strong statistically significant positive correlation with affective commitment. Better directive leadership would therefore be associated with better affective commitment on the part of subordinates. The correlation between directive leadership and continuance commitment was however found to be weak and negative, although statistically significant. Furthermore, directive leadership

was found to have a weak and very low correlation with normative commitment among subordinates that was not statistically significant.

We therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there exists a significant relationship between directive leadership and commitment, however, only in the affective and continuance components.

4.2.2 Test of Hypothesis II

H_{O2}: There is no significant relationship between supportive leadership and employee commitment.

Table 56 contains the Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma coefficients indicating the nature of relationship between supportive leadership and commitment among subordinates.

Table 57: Association between Supportive Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment

	Commitment		
Supportive Leadership	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment
	0.88**	-0.38**	-0.001

** - Significant at 0.05

Source: SPSS Output.

From the analysis undertaken, it was determined that supportive leadership had a strong and significant correlation with affective commitment. This derives from the high gamma value of 0.88 and a significant *p* value of less than 0.05. Additionally, supportive leadership was calculated as having a significant but negative relationship with continuance commitment, although with a low value of - 0.38. Supportive commitment was however found to have a low, negative and non-statistically significant correlation with normative commitment.

The null hypothesis in this case is also rejected and we conclude that with the exception of normative commitment, supportive leadership has a statistically significant relationship with employee commitment.

4.2.3 Test of Hypothesis III

H_{O3}: There is no significant relationship between participative leadership and employee commitment.

Table 57 contains gamma coefficients for correlations between participative leadership and the three main components of employee commitment.

Table 58: Association between Participative Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment

	Commitment		
Participative Leadership	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment
	-0.33**	0.46**	0.017

** - Significant at 0.05

Source: SPSS Output.

The gamma coefficient for the correlation between participative leadership and affective commitment was calculated as – 0.33 indicating a statistically significant, but negative correlation between participative leadership and affective commitment. The gamma coefficient for the correlation between participative leadership and continuance commitment was gotten as a low and positive statistically significant value of 0.46, indicating that better participative commitment will be associated with better continuance commitment. Normative commitment however was found to have a very low and non-statistically significant correlation with participative leadership.

4.3.4 Test of Hypothesis IV

H_{O4}: There is no significant relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and employee commitment.

The result of the Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma analysis undertaken to determine the nature of relationship that exist between achievement-oriented leadership and employee commitment is summarized in table 58.

Table 59: Association between Achievement-Oriented Leadership and Components of Employee Commitment

	Commitment		
Achievement-Oriented Leadership	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment
	0.027	-0.005	0.64**

** - Significant at 0.05

Source: SPSS Output.

The gamma coefficients obtained for the relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and the components of employee commitment indicate very low and non-statistically significant correlation between the achievement-oriented leadership and affective and continuance components of employee commitment. While the direction of relationship was positive in the former, with the latter this was found to be negative. Furthermore, the achievement-oriented leadership style was found to have a strong and positive statistically significant correlation with normative commitment, owing to its high coefficient value of 0.64, with its *p* value lower than 0.05.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The findings from the study indicated that directive leadership has a high positive correlation with affective commitment, but low negative correlation with both

continuance and normative commit, however with the latter, the relationship was found not to be statistically significant. This finding contradict those of studies such as Wiza and Hlanganipai (2014) Mahdi, and Mohd and Almsafir (2014) which were in favour of directive leadership having positive relationship with continuance commitment. It however agrees with findings of studies such as Bangkok, Tanchaisak (2009) in favour of strong positive relationship between directive leadership and affective commitment.

With regards to supportive leadership, the study found that there exists a strong positive relationship between supportive leadership and affective commitment. This finding contradicts results by Mclaggan, Bezuidenhout and Botha (2013) which found just a moderate positive relationship between the two variables. Additionally, it was found that supportive leadership had a low significant negative relationship with continuance commitment, and a low non significant relationship with normative commitment.

Furthermore, participative leadership style was found to have a low negative relationship with affective commitment. This was in contradiction to findings of studies such as Wu, Tsai, Fey and Wu (2006) and Asgari (2014) which indicated strong positive relationship between participative leadership and employee commitment. Participative leadership was also found to have weak positive statistically significant relationship with continuance commitment. This is a finding that conforms with the result of Chipunza, Samuel and Mariri's 2011 study in South Africa. A very low, but statistically non-significant relationship was also found between participative leadership and normative commitment.

Finally, achievement-oriented leadership was found to have a strong, positive. statisticlly significant correlation with normative commitment, but non significant relationships with the other two components of commitment – affective and continuance. With the former, the relationship was found to be negative, while it was

positive with the latter. The positive significant relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and normative commitment agrees with the findings of studies such as Githuka's (2017). However, although the positive relationship between achievement-oriented leadership and affective commitment agrees with the findings of Zabihi and Hashemzehi (2012), the correlation between the two was not significant as found in the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The research study was focused on empirically investigating the relationship between effective leadership and commitment among employees of Small and Medium Scale businesses in Kaduna. Research hypotheses were drawn up for the study and pertinent data was collected and analyzed for the purpose of looking into the research problem identified. The concept of effective leadership was examined through the four main components of the path-goal leadership style to critically study how well, or to what extent leaders' behaviours in these leadership capacities are associated with the three main components of commitment among their followers or subordinates. The general direction of this study is to effectively determine how good leaders are, through their styles of leading in ensuring that employees under them would want to have a long-lasting relationship with the organization and would want to remain with that organization.

5.2 Conclusion

The study applied the Goodman and Kruskal's Gamma statistic in analyzing the correlation that exists between the variables under consideration. The result obtained showed that directive leadership had strong positive correlation with affective leadership, with low negative correlation with continuance and normative commitment (with normative, this was not statistically significant). Supportive leadership, like with directive leadership, was found to have a strong positive relationship with affective

commitment and low negative relationship with both continuance and normative components of commitment (normative also not statistically significant).

However, participative leadership was found to have low significant negative correlation with affective commitment, and low positive correlation with the other components – continuance and normative (significant with the former, not significant with the latter). Achievement-Oriented leadership on the other hand, was found to have a strong positive relationship with normative commitment, a very low and non-significant correlation with affective commitment, and a negative non-significant relationship with continuance commitment. The findings were used as basis for putting recommendations forward as to ways of improving commitment among employees through the effectiveness of their leaders.

With the fact that the components of path-goal leadership style have different magnitudes and direction of relationship with the particular components of commitment, it is apparent that care must be taken in the application of leadership styles to situations and on employees within the organization. For leaders, and, indeed, the organization to be effective therefore, they must understand their subordinates and must equip themselves with information of what form of commitment is dormant among individual employees, and thus what leadership style will best suit them in making them commit to the organization and remain therein for a satisfactorily long amount of time.

A way in which the dominant commitment component can be identified might be through regular psychological tests of employees to identify what form of commitment they are more oriented towards. The knowledge of what form of commitment employees bend towards more will enable the organization better place employees productively within itself. It might be important in such areas as team selection for

example, in organization where certain duties need to be done in teams headed by a leader or supervisor.

5.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forward based on the relationship determined between the types of path-goal leadership and components of commitment.

i. The directive leadership style is an inferior alternative to the supportive style in bringing about positive changes in employee affective commitment. Thus, the supportive style should be chosen over the directive style in dealing with subordinates that are affectively commitment to the organization. This is supported by the fact that although directive leadership was found to have a high positive correlation with affective commitment, the relationship with supportive leadership was found to be higher. The directive leadership style was found to be the most ineffective style with regards to being associated with components of commitment.

ii. The supportive leadership style should be practiced to ensure that employees achieve identification within the organization and develop a rewarding relationship with their leaders and the organization as a whole. The strong positive relationship supportive leadership has with affective commitment will ensure that things such as management receptiveness, the promotion of personal importance, peer cohesion, the maintenance of friendly work relationship and leader encouragement of subordinate personal improvement will go a long way in ensuring that the expectations of employees are met, which in turn would encourage the employee identify with the goals and objectives of the organization, and also help the organization meet its targets.

iii. Participative leadership should be used as a tool to facilitate an employee's attachment to the organization. As it was found to be the only path-goal leadership style that had a positive and significant correlation with continuance commitment, getting employees more actively involved in carrying out duties within the organization, and consulting them on how to carry out certain roles, especially in cases where subordinates are older, promotes self-importance and will ensure that employees are invested in the job.

iv. Employees that are normatively committed seem to be more effective at adhering to standards and particular levels of performance required of them. This might not be unrelated to the fact that such individuals feel they owe the organization and need to give back, and will therefore put in their best in the performance of given duties. The achievement-oriented style should therefore be applied towards encouraging employee attachment to the organization normatively, as it was found to be the only component of path-goal leadership with strong significant positive correlation with normative commitment.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

A study of this nature is not without limitations. The researcher was faced with some constraints in the process of carrying out the research study. For example some respondents were reluctant to give out information, some declined to take part in the study. These extended the stud period more than what was initially planned

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

The current research study covers businesses across a variety of industries. Other prospective research studies in related areas can look at specific industries in order to

determine how leadership styles affects the commitment of employees based on industry.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi, M. S., Abubakar, A., Aliyu, R. L., Umar, K., Umar, M. B., Sabiu, I. T., . . . Abubakar, L. S. (2015). The Nature of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs): Government and Financial Institutions Support in Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 5*(3), 525-537.

Amahundu, H. (2016). *The influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention: a case study of the big four audit firms in Kenya (masters dissertation).* United States International University -Africa.

Amstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource managment practice (10th ed.).* London: Kogan Page Limited.

Asgari, M. R. (2014). The effect of leadership styles on employees commitment to services quality in bank Melli branches of Isfahan. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 3*(12), 113-129.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*(8), 951-968.

Barbuto, J. E., & Cummins-Brown, L. L. (2007, October). Full range leadership. *NebGuide*.

Bass, B. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: theory, research and managerial applications (3rd ed.).* New York: The Free Press.

Beck, K., & Wilson, C. (2000). Development of affective organizational commitment. a cross-sequential examination of change with tenure. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 56*, 114 – 136.

Bell, C., & Mjoli, T. (2014). The effects of participative leadership on organizational commitment: comparing its effects on two gender groups among bank clerks. *Academic Journal of Business Management, 8*(12), 451-459.

Berger, J. B. (2013). *Leadership: a concise conceptual overview*. Boston: Massachusetts Community College Leadership Academy.

Bertocci, D. I. (2009). *Leadership in organizations: is there a difference between leaders and managers.* Lanham: University Pres of America.

Bess, J. L., & Dee, J. R. (2012). *Understanding college and university organization: theories for effective policy and practice (volume II - Dynamics of the system).* Stylus Publishing.

Bryman, A. (2013). *Leadership and organizations.* Routledge.

Buble, M., Juras, A., & Matić, I. (2014). The relationship between managers' leadership styles and motivation. *Management, 19*(1), 161-193.

Chipunza, C., Samuel, M. O., & Mariri, T. (2011). Leadership style, employee motivation and commitment: empirical evidence from a consolidated retail bank operating in a depressed economy. *African Journal of Business Management, 5*(20), 337-8346.

Clegg, S., Kronberger, M., & Pitsis, T. (2005). *Managing and organizations: an introduction to theory and practice.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Çokluk, Ö., & Yılmaz, K. (2010). The relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *Bilig - Turk Dunyasi Social Sciences Magazine, 54*, 75-92.

Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. S. (2008). *Business research Methods (9th ed.).* New Delhi, 2008: The Megrow Hill Companies.

Cronbach, L. J., & Shavelson, R. J. (2004). My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 64*, 391-218.

DuBrin, A. J. (2013). *Leadership: research findings, practice, and skills (8th ed.).* Boston: Cengage Learning.

Edoka, J. (2012). *Effective leadership and organizational performance: A case study of national youth service corps (NYSC) Kogi state (Masters dissertation).* Univeristy of Nigeria, Nsukka.

El Dahshan, M. E., Youssef, H. A., Aljouaid, M., Babkeir, R. A., & Hassan, W. B. (2017). Effect of nurse managers' leadership styles on organizational commitment of nurses working at taif governmental hospitals in kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Nursing and Health Science, 6*(2), 35-46.

Eskandaricharati, A. (2014). *The study of teachers organizational commitment and the factors effective on organizational commitment (doctorate thesis).* Osmania University, Hyderabad, India.

Githuka, L. (2017). *Effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in non-governmental organizations: a case study of christian aid (masters dissertation).* United States International University-Africa.

Hilda, A. (2016). *The influence of path-goal leadership styles on employee retention: a case study of the big four audit firms in Kenya (masters dissertation).* United States International University -Africa.

Howard, T. M., & Breezeel, G. S. (2003). *Sequential statistical steps: a brief introduction to basic statistics for research applications (2nd ed.).* Searcy: Harding Press Print & Copy.

Hsu, J., Huang, S. Y., Leong, L., & Li, A. M. (2003). Are leadership styles linked to turnover intention?: an examination in Mainland China. *Journal of American Academy of Business, 3*(1), 37.

Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review, 5*(5), 1-6. doi:10.4172/2223-5833.1000146

Ispas, A., & Băbăiță, C. (2012). The effects of leadership style on the employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment from the hotel industry. *Approaches in Organisational Management,* (pp. 254-262). Bucharest.

Jaros, S. (2007). Meyer and Allen model of organizational commitment: measurement issues. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour,* 7-25.

Jex, S. M. (2002). *Organizational psychology: a scientist-practitioner approach.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kaiman, H. (2013). Leadership behavior and commitment. The effect to employee job satisfaction and employee performance on department of population and civil registration Jakarta, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2*(9), 57-62.

Kanste, O., Kaariainen, M., & Kyngas, H. (2009). Statistical testing of the full-range leadership theory in nursing. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 775-782.

Kasimu, P. (2016). *The influence of employee perception of the leader's path-goal leadership behaviors on organizational commitment: a case study of East African Breweries limited (EABL) (masters dissertation).* United States International University-Africa.

Kavanagh, E. (2014, August 3). *Three Leadership Models: Kurt Lewin, Hershey and Blanchard, and Edwin Friedman.* Retrieved from http://www.earonkavanagh.ca/article_kavanagh-three.pdf

Kit, C. M., Hui, L. Z., Yun, L. Y., Ling, O. S., & Gie, Y. A. (2015). *The effectiveness of leadership on organizational commitment in banking industry (Bachelor research project).* Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Petaling Jaya, Malaysia.

Lacoma, T. (n.d.). *Definition of supportive leadership style*. Retrieved November 2017, from Smallbusiness.chron.com: http://smallbusiness.chron.com/definition-supportive-leadership-style-21835.html

Leng, C. S., Xuan, C. L., Sin, N. K., Leng, W. K., & Yan, W. W. (2014). *The impact of leadership styles on employee commitment in retail industry (bachelor project).* Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Pataling Jaya, Malaysia.

LFHE. (2007). *Effective leadership in higher education.* London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Lincoln, A. (2012). Nature of leadership practices of Nigerian female entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3*(10), 51-59.

Lo, M., Ramayah, T., & Min, H. (2009). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: A test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. *African Journal of Marketing Management, 1*, 133-139.

Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2012). *Leadership: theory, application, & skill development (5th ed.).* Boston: Cangage Learning.

Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2016). *Leadership: theory, application and skill development (6th ed.).* Boston: Cangage Learning.

Madanchain, M., Hussein, N., Noordin, F., & Taherdoost, H. (2017). Leadership effectivenss measurement and its effect on organization outcomes. *Procedia Engineering, 121*, 1043-1048.

Mahdi, O. R., Mohd, S. E., & Almsafir, M. K. (2014). Empirical study on the impact of leadership behavior on organizational commitment in plantation companies in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 109*, 1076 – 1087.

Manetje, O. M. (2009). *The impact of organisational culture on organisational commitment (masters dissertation).* University of South Africa, Pretori.

Manning, G., & Kurtis, K. (2009). *The art of leadership.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mathebula, M. (2004). *Modelling the relationship between organizational commitment. leadership style, human resources, management practices and organizaitonal commitment (doctora thesis).* University of Pretoria.

McDonald, D. J., & Makin, P. J. (2000). The psychological contract, organisational commitment and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 21*(2), 118 – 234.

Mclaggan, E., Bezuidenhout, A., & Botha, C. T. (2013). Leadership style and organisational commitment in the mining industry in Mpumalanga. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 11*(1), 1-9.

Meierhans, D., Rietmann, B., & Jonas, K. (2008). Influence of fair and supportive leadership behavior on commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 67*, 131-141. doi:10.1024/1421-0185.67.3.131

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: theory, research and application.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied, 89*, 991-1007.

Mishra, G. P. (2005). ROLE OF EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT IN ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS. *Delhi Business Review, 6*(2), 89-93.

Mohammed, U. D., & Obeleagu-Nzelibe, C. G. (2014). Entrepreneurial skills and profitability of small and medium enterprises (smes): resource acquisition strategies for new ventures in nigeria. *25th International Business Research Conference.* Cape Town.

Neagu, C. (2015). Leadership and effectiveness. *Romanian Journal of Statistics, 6*, 93-96.

Nevarez, C., Wood, J. L., & Penrose, R. (2013). *Leadership theory and the community college.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Northouse, G. P. (2007). *Leadership: theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: theory and practice (2nd ed.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership theory and practice (5th ed.).* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Nwokocha, I., & Iheriohanma, E. (2015). Nexus between leadership styles and employee retention and performance in organizations in Nigeria. *Europen Scientific Journal, 11*(13), 185-209.

Perez, J. W. (2014). *Impact of nurse managers' leadership styles on staff nurses' intent to turnover (Unpublished Masters Dissertation).* Gardner-Webb University.

Poddar, P. K. (2012). *A study of the relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment: an empirical study of private un-aided B-schools of Maharashtra (doctorate thesis).* Padmashree Dr. D. Y. Patil University, Mumbai.

Sanusi, J. O. (2003). Overview of government's efforts in the development of smes and the emergence of small and medium industries equity investment scheme (SMIEIS). *NATIONAL SUMMIT ON SMIEIS* (pp. 1-20). Lagos: Bankers' Committee/Lagos Chambers of Commerce and Industry.

Saqer, H. O. (2009). *The effects of the perceived leadership style on organiational commitment: an empirical study on UNRWA staff (masters dissertation).* Islamic University, Gaza.

Silverthorne, C. (2001). A test of the path-goal leadership theory in Taiwan. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 22*(4), 151-158.

Siyanbola, T. O., & Gilman, M. W. (2017). Extent of employee turnover in Nigerian SMEs. *Employee Relations, 39*(7), 967-985.

Smith, I. C., & Swan, J. (2002). Wanted public sector leaders. *Canadian HR reporter, 15*(15), 15-19.

Sperry, L. (2002). *Effective leadership: Strategies for maximizing executive productivity and health.* New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Suliman, A. M., & Iles, P. A. (2000). The multi-dimensional nature of organisational commitment in a non-western context. *Journal of Management Development, 19*, 224 – 248.

Suri, S. (2016). Influence of leadership style on employee motivation and performance. *International Journal of Research in Management, 6*(5), 65-71.

Tanchaisak, K. (2009). The relationship between leadership style and entry level employee commitment to organizations. *Au Journal of Management, 7*(2), 45-55.

Tandon, V. C. (2011). *Effect of leadership behaviours on employee performance in Guinness Ghana Breweries Limited (Unpublished masters dissertation).* Institute of Distance Learning, Kwamw Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana.

Teshome, T. (2011). *The relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment in private higher education institutions at Addis Ababa city (masters dissertation).* Addis Ababa University, Ethopia.

Tom, E. E., Glory, B., & Alfred, U. J. (2016). An appraisal of nigeria's micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMES): growth, challenges and prospects. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research, 4*(4), 1-15.

Turner, J. (2008). Developing executive leadership in the public sector. *Public Manager, 36*(4), 50-55.

Werner, A. (2007). *Organisational behaviour: a contemporary South African perspective.* Pretoria: Van Schaick.

Wiza, M., & Hlanganipai, N. (2014). The impact of leadership styles on employee organisational commitment in higher learning institutions. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(4), 135-143.

Wu, T.-F., Tsai, M.-H., Fey, Y.-H., & Wu, R. T. (2006). A Study of the Relationship between Manager's Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment in Taiwan's International Tourist Hotels. *Asian Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences, 1*(3), 434-452.

Yuki, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations (6th ed.).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Yuki, G. (2008). How leaders influence organizational effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(6), 708-722.

Zabihi, M., & Hashemzehi, R. (2012). The relationship between leadership styles and organizational citizenship behavior. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(9), 3310-3319.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Department of Business
Administration,
Faculty of Administration,
Nasarawa State University,
Keffi,
Nasarawa State.

Dear Respondent,

REQUEST FOR COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ACADEMIC RESEARCH STUDY

I humbly request your participation in filling out the attached questionnaire. I am a postgraduate student of Business Administration with Nasarawa State University carrying out a research study on the relationship between effective leadership and commitment among employees of Small and Medium Scale businesses in kaduna, being a mandatory requirement of the academic programme. Your responses to the items therein will serve as primary data needed for effectively investigating the research problem.

All information provided will be solely used for the purpose of the research, and treated with utmost confidentiality. Thank you for your time.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Agbo
NSU/MSC/BUS/0024/16/17

APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

Instruction:

Kindly tick the appropriate option.

SEX	Male	Female

EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	Primary	High School	OND/NCE	HND/First Degree	PGD/Masters	Ph.D.

WORKING EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT CAPACITY IN YEARS	Less than 5	5-10	10-20	20-30	>30

SECTION B

PATH-GOAL LEADERSHIP

Items contained in the table below give describe different forms of path-goal leadership. Please indicate by ticking the appropriate response box how frequent each statement applies to your relationship with your immediate supervisor.

0 = Not at all 3 = Fairly Often

1 = Once in a while 4 = Frequently, if not always

2 = Sometimes

	DIRECTIVE LEADERSHIP	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
1.	My immediate supervisor lets me know what is expected of me.					

2.	My immediate supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of subordinates on the job.					
3.	My immediate supervisor is available when needed					
4.	My immediate supervisor spends time for teaching and coaching.					
5.	My immediate supervisor concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failure					
6.	My immediate supervisor helps others in developing their strengths.					
7.	My immediate supervisor suggests new ways of approaching assignments.					
	SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
1.	My immediate supervisor expresses satisfaction when his/her expectations are met.					
2.	My immediate supervisor is effective in meeting the job related needs of others.					
3.	My immediate supervisor maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates.					
4.	My immediate supervisor listens receptively to subordinates' ideas and suggestions.					
5.	My immediate supervisor does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.					
6.	My immediate supervisor encourages continual improvement in subordinates' performance.					
7.	My immediate supervisor says things that are hurtful to subordinates' personal feelings.					
8.	My immediate supervisor behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs.					
9.	My immediate supervisor treats others as individuals rather than just a member of a group					
	PARTICIPATIVE LEADERSHIP	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
1.	My immediate supervisor consults with subordinates when facing a problem.					
2.	My immediate supervisor asks for suggestions from subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.					
3.	My immediate supervisor shows doubts about subordinate's ability to meet most objectives.					
4.	My immediate supervisor helps subordinates overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks.					
5.	My immediate supervisor acts without consulting subordinates.					
6.	My immediate supervisor asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made.					
	ACHIEVEMENT-ORIENTED LEADERSHIP	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
1.	My immediate supervisor keeps a focused attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards					

2.	My immediate supervisor informs subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.					
3.	My immediate supervisor asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations.					
4.	My immediate supervisor explains the level of performance that is expected of subordinates.					
5.	My immediate supervisor lets subordinates know of the expectation for them to perform at their highest level.					
6.	My immediate supervisor sets goals for subordinates' performance that are quite challenging.					
7.	He directs his/her attention towards failures to meet standards					

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Key

5 = Strongly Agree
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

	AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1.	I am happy to be part of this organization.					
2.	I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it.					
3.	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.					
4.	I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one					
5.	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization					
6.	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization					
7.	This organization has great deal of personal meaning for me.					
8.	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.					
	CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1.	I am loyal to this organization because I have so much emotional, social and economic investment in it.					
2.	I am dedicated to this organization because I fear what I have to lose in it.					
3.	Sometimes I worry about what might happen it something was to happen to the organization and I					

	was no longer a member.					
4.	If I wasn't a member of this organization, I would be sad because my life will be disrupted					
5.	I worry about the investments I have made in this organization.					
6.	I often feel anxious about what I have to lose with this organization.					
7.	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.					
8.	One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.					
	NORMATIVE COMMITMENT	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1.	I feel that I owe this organization quite a bit because of what it has done for me.					
2.	My organization deserves my loyalty because of its treatment towards me.					
3.	I feel I would be letting my co-workers down if I wasn't a member of this organization					
4.	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.					
5.	Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.					
6.	One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty if important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.					
7.	I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.					

APPENDIX III

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Alrissalah Printing & Publishing Co. Nig Ltd	594
Atman Limited	459
Chyre-Olive Integrated Resources Ltd	997
Munir Agro Allied Package	1044
Chemtek Project Industry Limited	1063
Ahmeco Nigeria Limited Chamber	416
Almaun Enterprises Nig. Limited Chamber	273
Bran & Lubbe Water Engineering Nig. Ltd	311
Bus – Refrigerated Van Manuf. Co. Chamber	297
Chellco Industries Limited	213
Kaduna Machine Works Limited	557
Lemaco Enterprises Limited	291
Lemagric International Limited	289
Ronade Limited	676
Speciality Link Limited	672
Kadmark Ventures Limited	843
A. B. Enterprises Limited	628
Ginger & Food Processing Co. Limited	513
Nortex Nigeria Limited	019
Broad Indcomm Investment Limited	312
Rezex International Resources Ltd	
BOC Gases Nigeria Plc	079
Queen Amina Construction Co. Ltd	114
Renyam Nigeria Limited	789
A. B. Enterprises Limited	171
A. B. Otaru & Sons	42
Abam International Limited	462
Abmed International Investment Limited	773
ABG Communications Limited	77
Abubakar Sa'ad Enterprises	380
Abudal Enterprises Nig. Limited	485
Abuja Capital Motors	419
Adfolis International Nigeria Limited	758
Alh. Yusuf Shuaibu	559
Alhamra Nigeria Limited	532
Alheri – Minab Nigeria Limited	529
Al – Fasaha Global Associates Limited	821
Amico Enterprises Limited	268
Allestrees Ventures Nig. Limited	625
Allied Ranch Nig. Limited	376
Alpha Services Limited	333
Alraine Nigeria Limited	506
Ammani Enterprises Limited	285
Armstrade Ventures Limited	428

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Asashe & Son Nigeria Ltd	358
ASD Motors Nigeria Limited	399
Asudo Nigeria Enterprises	707
Ayita Investment Limited	694
Balm Holding Company Limited	308
Bamali & Company Nig. Limited	102
Ben King Ventures WA Limited	819
Benmore Nigeria Limited	596
C. A. Eze & Bros. Limited	135
Cash Affairs Limited	504
Central Support Engineering Ltd	701
Chanchangi Airlines Limited	086
Chediya Nigeria Limited	377
Cibi Nigeria Limited	571
Commercial Knowledge Int'l Nig. Ltd	668
Compech Ventures Ltd	522
Complex Universal Company Ltd	674
Continental Petroleum Dev. & Chamber	757
CPL Ventures Limited	502
Cotton & Agricultural Processing Ltd	744
Cremotrade Company Limited	030
Dabo Motors Limited	654
Dala Agricultural Business Ent. Ltd.	271
Dangaji Agricultural Holdings Ltd.	496
De – Lace International Nigeria Ltd	784
Dizza Enterprises Nig. Ltd.	960
El – Din Nigeria Limited	814
Emoric Limited	580
Emmco Holdings Limited	524
Emwai Company Limited	387
Esilo Enterprises Limited	649
Elson Nigeria Limited	197
Express Technical Services Co. Ltd	404
Famsco Nigeria Limited	514
Fatima Nigeria Limited	702
Feli – Ga Nigeria Limited	663
Fertilizer & Chemicals Limited	547
Funtua Cotton Seed Crushing Co. Limited	061
Gabasawa Enterprises Nig. Ltd.	382
Gbabico Nigeria Limited	678
Geobek International Limited	752
Fidnons Nigeria Limited	663
General Supply & Distribution Agency Ltd	229
Giza Ventures Nigeria Limited	378
Global Network Ventures Ltd.	660
Gloria Moria Company Limited	

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Gora Nigeria Limited	256
Green Apples Nigeria Limited	415
Green Fingers Limited	398
Gumbi Enterprises Nigeria Ltd.	597
Halim Resources	807
Hanayaz Nigeria Limited	685
Hassan Integrated Limited	525
Heritage Nigeria Limited	656
Hisham & Associates	793
Home Fresh Yoghurt Limited	813
Huk Fama Farms Ltd.	445
Hostac Nigeria Limited	453
Humphery Kolison (W. A.) Limited	578
Hyelpa Engineering Services Limited	832
Ibrasuta Nigeria Limited	665
Idristec Groups Nigeria Limited	373
Ikara Nigeria Limited	484
Imrana Usman Jubril	729
Independence Way Motors	655
Industrial Suppliers & Technical Services Ltd.	587
I – Net Global Services Limited	745
Inland Containers Nigeria Limited	302
International Beer & Beverages Ind.	397
Fishers Nigeria Limited	
Isakol Nigeria Limited	
Islas Investments Limited	
Jimmy King Nigeria Limited	593
Jinabco International Limited	684
Johvic Engineering & Commercial	430
Joshua Ishola (Omo Jesu) Nig. Ltd.	804
Jossy & Ephraim Int'l Co. Ltd.	452
Jowako Hospital Aslad Nig. Ltd.	829
Joyaagi & Sons Limited	393
Jubal Limited	731
K. C. Holdings Limited	574
Kabi – Kabi Nigeria Limited	497
Kachia Food Company Limited	635
Kad. Palmkernel Processing Industry	705
Kaduna Textiles Limited	016
Kafarda Engineering Nigeria Limited	749
Kubau Investment Limited	799
Kraus Investment Limited	714
Kura Ventures Limited	489
Kurna Service Nigeria Limited	548
La – Mirage Restaurant Chamber	433
Lamp Holdings Company Limited	531

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Lasocha Nigeria Limited	797
Lemaco Enterprises Limited	282
Lenny Okey Brothers Co. Limited	383
Lereco Nigeria Limited	345
L. I. & Sons Nigeria Limited	
Limsara Nigeria Limited	639
Lotalan Nigeria Limited	492
Magaji Ashafura	185
Maidubu & Co. Limited	599
Makarfi Services Limited	420
Malex Nigeria Limited	170
Manema Universal Limited	537
Manjadda Food & Drinks Industries Ltd.	823
Marhaba Nigeria Limited	264
Marinuel Nigeria Limited	610
Mogavis Investment Limited	
Mohammed Kabir & Associates	449
Mo – Bel Limited Chamber	726
Moriya Agricon Nigeria Limited	317
Mubarak International Nigeria Ltd.	507
Nagaida Nigeria Enterprises	413
Na – Aka Air Services Limited	815
Nasara Investment Limited	693
National Research Institute for Chemical Technology	720
Negic Ventures Limited	671
Nigerian Seed Cotton Co. Limited	312
Nitrade Nigeria Limited	410
NNIL Commercial Company Limited	021
Novo selo Feeds Limited	820
Nuvallam Nigeria Limited	824
Niyya Food & Drinks Company Ltd.	785
Obadaki Press Limited	094
Omosa Travels Limited	842
Rayan Travels Limited	838
Petro Atlantic Resources Limited	839
Pigeon Travels & Tours Limited	764
Pleasure Travel & Tours Limited	841
Practicing Farmers Association of Nigeria	681
Prime Air Services Limited	840
Pun Nigeria Limited	500
Pyramid Merchants Limited	528
Ras Raj Nigeria Limited	809
Romkaj Nigeria Limited	530
Sa'abunite Co. Nigeria Limited	788
Saleton International Limited	759
Sani Bello & Company	478

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
S. N. Obison International	716
Sarat Nigeria Limited	550
Seepc Nigeria Limited	316
Sesan Commercial Co. Limited	614
Shukura Holdings Nigeria Limited	448
Shukura Printers Chamber	447
Simplex Package & Allied Resources Ltd.	795
Snap Ventures Limited	682
Spin Factor Nigeria Limited	695
Sugau Lere Nigeria Limited	562
Sulgab Nigeria Limited	800
Sun Machinery & Co. Nig. Ltd.	600
Sunjus Nigeria Limited	753
Swiss Mart International Limited	727
Tasiri Nigeria Limited	523
Taurani Nigeria Limited	555
Technoplastic Nigeria Limited	644
Tobson Enterprise	741
Tombulco Nigeria Limited	719
Tomy & Sons	713
Toppex Industry & Investment Ltd.	629
Transtime Nigeria Limited	790
Treasury Managers Limited	563
UAC of Nigeria Plc.	375
Ugochukwu Chemical Ind. Ltd.	361
V. I. Okezue & Brother Nigeria Ltd.	125
Vai – Talo Enterprises Limited	356
Vaga Nigeria Limited	082
Venep Nigeria Limited	806
Veno – Mike Enterprises Nig. Ltd.	521
West Africa Chicken Processing Co Nig. Ltd.	622
Yalis Services Nigeria Limited	725
Zee Petroleum & Gas Co. Limited	689
Datesman & Mainstream Petrochemicals Ltd.	746
Dalib Intergrated Services Ltd.	837
Anns Fabrics	835
Armcols Nigeria Limited	782
A. A. M. Plastic Nigeria Limited	778
Hashbal Ventures	776
Insterteck Products Nigeria Limited	775
Solar foam & Chemical Industry Ltd	772
Agromatrix Nigeria Limited	437
Al – Saab Ventures Limited	689
Faida International	683
Nathy Trust Link Co. Nigeria Ltd.	661
Sovanel Ventures Incorporated	479

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
United Gabasawa Enterprises	394
Cybernetics Nigeria Limited	374
Rayan Travels Limited	838
Asma Pharmaceutical Limited	844
Prince Air Services	840
Abbas System Limited	847
Kinetics Consult Limited	848
Pleasure Travel & Tours Limited Chamber	841
Omosa Travels Limited Chamber	842
Rahullah Ventures Limited	845
Yamhabilmus Enterprises Nigeria Limited	846
DM. Int'l. Import & Export Co.	853
Alh. Hussaini Baba & Son Nigeria Limited	852
S. A. Abdulazeez International Resources	850
Bin – Suleiman Ventures	854
Mcelyon Nigeria Limited	861
Stalex Food Precision & Packaging Co. Ltd.	859
Asma Pharmaceutical Limited	
Vytex International Ltd.	873
Wifen Ventures Limited	876
CK & K Global Ventures Ltd.	877
Top Quality Link Limited	881
Cannan Global Resources Ltd.	887
Batijay Travels Ltd.	890
Salim Investment Co. Ltd.	892
G.N. Investment Ltd.	893
Faslam Ventures	894
Zahny's & Co. Ventures	897
U.M. Agro Allied Services Limited	898
Ric Flour Mills W.A. Ltd.	899
ITC Technical Services Ltd.	903
Little Bird Nigeria Ltd.	904
MKB Halmunir Limited	905
El-Betama Nigeria Ltd.	909
Ardo Plastics Limited	913
Linkside El-Hyatt Limited	
Wamaco Enterprises Limited	916
Yanis Farms & Agric Equipment	919A
Majestic Inteiore Limited	920
Leostar Shipping Limited	921
TIE Investment Limited	922
Concept Construction & Engineering Ltd.	923
Inter City Investment Nig. Limited	924
Capegate Investment Company Ltd.	927
Messrs Belexim Nigeria Limited	929
Nasara Ranch Limited	973

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Yisheng Ventures Limited	977
Mustras International Nigeria Limited	978
Hajjeves Limited	980
Fritjeco Nigerian Ltd.	982
Annytex Nigeria Limited	983
Uchetex Global Ventures	984
Al-Babello Trading Company	989
Hairi Farm & Poultry	990
De-Ugo Marketing & Agency Ltd.	991
Ahmandan Nig. Ltd.	995
Gimbiya Hassana Enterprises	996
Salisu & Sons Nigeria Limited	998
Kay Truimph Nig. Limited	1001
Smart Merchants Ltd.	1003
Madallah Travel & Tours Ltd.	1004
Amams Integrated Services Ltd.	1007
Worldview Electronics	1008
Chrisbon International Nigeria Limited	1009
Victorious Chuks Invstment Co. Ltd.	1010
Inter-Product Link Ltd.	1011
Mbs Merchants Ltd.	1012
Mass International Equipment Ltd.	
Ruja Nigeria Ltd.	1015
Kateez Integrated Resources Ltd.	1016
Dechorhood Classic Chamber Reg.	1017
Gurbabiya Transport And Petroleum Limited	1018
Chuck Tyres Services Ltd.	1019
De-Siwaco Industrial	1020
De Rock Fabrics Link Ventures	1021
Mai Fara'a Enterprise	1022
Innotex International Co. Ltd.	1024
Sasco Limited Chamber Reg.	1026
Winsol Energy Nigeria Limited	1027
A.B. United Enterprises	1028
Trust Services Investment Limited	1029
Oakwood Machinery Nigeria Ltd.	1031
Kanasco Nigeria Limited	1032
Future View International Services Ltd.	1033
Haske Resources Ltd.	1033
Heneks Auto Supply Co. Ltd.	1035
Rezex International Resources Ltd	1052
Tonex International Resources Ltd.	1036
Athens Global Resources Ltd.	1041
Marylaz Global Resources Ltd.	1042
Dah Petroleum & Energy Ltd.	1043
Chuzay Industries Ltd Chamber Reg. No.: 1047	1047

Business Name	Chamber Registration Number
Gomez Global Links Ventures	1048
Molenks Global Trading Co.	1054
Menchas Nigeria Limited	1055
Emma Collins Ventures	1056
Rf Pro Sports/Rock Fruit International Ltd.	
Millnext Limited	1059
Blueocean Great Interlink Chamber	1060
Standard Grains Nigeria Ltd.	1062
Moini Schools	1064
Al-Murmuja Confectionary	1065
Royal Stone Global Investment Limited	1066
P.Solid Investment Nigeria Limited	1068
Ummi Salama International	1069
Sycorax Nigeria Limited	1070
Bawuro Group of Companies Nigeria Ltd.	1071
Blueluster Global Investment Ltd.	1072
Afromedia Nigeria Limited	055
Agric. Industries Zaria Limited	613
Agric. & Livestock System Nig. Limited	354
Ahamco Nigeria Limited	539
Air Transrapide Travel Agency Limited	426
Al – Hayat Gems Limited	611
Alawoki International Limited	
Alh. Abdullahi Adamu Lere	503
Alh. Imrana Usman Jibrin	729
Alh. Lawal A. T. K	252
Alh. Mohammed Lawal Zaria	648
Al – Haj Han Nigeria Limited	638

Source: KADIPA Online SME Database

APPENDIX IV

```
FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=SEX EDU EXP Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 DL Q8 Q9 Q10
Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 SL Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 PL Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26
Q27 Q26_A Q27_A AOL Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 AC Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39
Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 CC Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 NC
  /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
```

Frequencies

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:26:29
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data.
Syntax		FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=SEX EDU EXP Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 DL Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 SL Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 PL Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q26_A Q27_A AOL Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 AC Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 CC Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 NC /ORDER=ANALYSIS.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.06
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04

Frequency Table

Sex of Respondent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	184	54.8	54.8	54.8
	Female	152	45.2	45.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Level of Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Primary	75	22.3	22.3	22.3
	High School	122	36.3	36.3	58.6
	OND/NCE	68	20.2	20.2	78.9
	HND/First Degree	20	6.0	6.0	84.8
	PGD/Masters	42	12.5	12.5	97.3
	Ph.D.	9	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Working Experience in Present Capacity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 5	67	19.9	19.9	19.9
	5 - 10	142	42.3	42.3	62.2
	10 - 20	48	14.3	14.3	76.5
	20 - 30	58	17.3	17.3	93.8
	More than 30	21	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor lets me know what is expected of me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	36	10.7	10.7	10.7
	Once in a while	96	28.6	28.6	39.3
	Sometimes	75	22.3	22.3	61.6
	Fairly often	63	18.8	18.8	80.4
	Frequently, if not always	66	19.6	19.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of subordinates on the job.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all	37	11.0	11.0	11.0
Once in a while	81	24.1	24.1	35.1
Sometimes	81	24.1	24.1	59.2
Fairly often	74	22.0	22.0	81.3
Frequently, if not always	63	18.8	18.8	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor is absent when needed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	48	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Once in a while	62	18.5	18.5	32.7
	Sometimes	91	27.1	27.1	59.8
	Fairly often	76	22.6	22.6	82.4
	Frequently, if not always	59	17.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor spends time for teaching and coaching.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	47	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Once in a while	72	21.4	21.4	35.4
	Sometimes	80	23.8	23.8	59.2
	Fairly often	69	20.5	20.5	79.8
	Frequently, if not always	68	20.2	20.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	43	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Once in a while	69	20.5	20.5	33.3
	Sometimes	79	23.5	23.5	56.8
	Fairly often	72	21.4	21.4	78.3
	Frequently, if not always	73	21.7	21.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor helps others in developing their strengths.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	37	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Once in a while	76	22.6	22.6	33.6
	Sometimes	81	24.1	24.1	57.7
	Fairly often	79	23.5	23.5	81.3
	Frequently, if not always	63	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor suggests new ways of approaching assignments.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	44	13.1	13.1	13.1
	Once in a while	82	24.4	24.4	37.5
	Sometimes	69	20.5	20.5	58.0
	Fairly often	71	21.1	21.1	79.2
	Frequently, if not always	70	20.8	20.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Directive Leadership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	56	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Once in a while	59	17.6	17.6	34.2
	Sometimes	57	17.0	17.0	51.2
	Fairly often	72	21.4	21.4	72.6
	Frequently, if not always	92	27.4	27.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor expresses satisfaction when his/her expectations are met.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	108	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Once in a while	130	38.7	38.7	70.8
	Sometimes	85	25.3	25.3	96.1
	Fairly often	12	3.6	3.6	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor is effective in meeting the job related needs of others.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	97	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Once in a while	116	34.5	34.5	63.4
	Sometimes	110	32.7	32.7	96.1
	Fairly often	12	3.6	3.6	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	124	36.9	36.9	36.9
	Once in a while	111	33.0	33.0	69.9
	Sometimes	84	25.0	25.0	94.9
	Fairly often	17	5.1	5.1	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor listens receptively to subordinates' ideas and suggestions.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	125	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Once in a while	116	34.5	34.5	71.7
	Sometimes	83	24.7	24.7	96.4
	Fairly often	11	3.3	3.3	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	131	39.0	39.0	39.0
	Once in a while	105	31.3	31.3	70.2
	Sometimes	86	25.6	25.6	95.8
	Fairly often	14	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor encourages continual improvement in subordinates' performance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	132	39.3	39.3	39.3
	Once in a while	101	30.1	30.1	69.3
	Sometimes	89	26.5	26.5	95.8
	Fairly often	14	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor says things that are hurtful to subordinates' personal feelings.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	125	37.2	37.2	37.2
	Once in a while	109	32.4	32.4	69.6
	Sometimes	86	25.6	25.6	95.2
	Fairly often	15	4.5	4.5	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	86	25.6	25.6	25.6
	Once in a while	124	36.9	36.9	62.5
	Sometimes	103	30.7	30.7	93.2
	Fairly often	22	6.5	6.5	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor treats others as individuals rather than just a member of a group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	112	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Once in a while	120	35.7	35.7	69.0
	Sometimes	96	28.6	28.6	97.6
	Fairly often	8	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Supportive Leadership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	159	47.3	47.3	47.3
	Once in a while	94	28.0	28.0	75.3
	Sometimes	82	24.4	24.4	99.7
	Frequently, if not always	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor consults with subordinates when facing a problem.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	92	27.4	27.4	27.4
	Once in a while	154	45.8	45.8	73.2
	Sometimes	37	11.0	11.0	84.2
	Fairly often	24	7.1	7.1	91.4
	Frequently, if not always	29	8.6	8.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor asks for suggestions from subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	85	25.3	25.3	25.3
	Once in a while	129	38.4	38.4	63.7
	Sometimes	74	22.0	22.0	85.7
	Fairly often	28	8.3	8.3	94.0
	Frequently, if not always	20	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor shows doubts about subordinate's ability to meet most objectives.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	104	30.0	31.0	31.0
	Once in a while	131	39.0	39.0	69.9
	Sometimes	50	14.9	14.9	84.8
	Fairly often	32	9.5	9.5	94.3
	Frequently, if not always	19	5.4	5.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor helps subordinates overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	104	31.0	31.0	31.0
	Once in a while	144	42.9	42.9	73.8
	Sometimes	34	10.1	10.1	83.9
	Fairly often	21	6.3	6.3	90.2
	Frequently, if not always	33	9.8	9.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor acts without consulting subordinates.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	76	22.6	22.6	22.6
	Once in a while	139	41.4	41.4	64.0
	Sometimes	70	20.8	20.8	84.8
	Fairly often	32	9.5	9.5	94.3
	Frequently, if not always	19	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	97	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Once in a while	136	40.5	40.5	69.3
	Sometimes	51	15.2	15.2	84.5
	Fairly often	26	7.7	7.7	92.3
	Frequently, if not always	26	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Participative Leadership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	130	38.7	38.7	38.7
	Once in a while	148	44.0	44.0	82.7
	Sometimes	1	.3	.3	83.0
	Fairly often	22	6.5	6.5	89.6
	Frequently, if not always	35	10.4	10.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor keeps a focused attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	39	11.6	11.6	11.6
	Once in a while	84	25.0	25.0	36.6
	Sometimes	92	27.4	27.4	64.0
	Fairly often	62	18.5	18.5	82.4
	Frequently, if not always	59	17.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor informs subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	39	11.6	11.6	11.6
	Once in a while	76	22.6	22.6	34.2
	Sometimes	101	30.1	30.1	64.3
	Fairly often	79	23.5	23.5	87.8
	Frequently, if not always	41	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	53	15.8	15.8	15.8
	Once in a while	78	23.2	23.2	39.0
	Sometimes	82	24.4	24.4	63.4
	Fairly often	75	22.3	22.3	85.7
	Frequently, if not always	48	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor explains the level of performance that is expected of subordinates.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	57	17.0	17.0	17.0
	Once in a while	58	17.3	17.3	34.2
	Sometimes	92	27.4	27.4	61.6
	Fairly often	71	21.1	21.1	82.7
	Frequently, if not always	58	17.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor lets subordinates know of the expectation for them to perform at their highest level.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	49	14.6	14.6	14.6
	Once in a while	65	19.3	19.3	33.9
	Sometimes	88	26.2	26.2	60.1
	Fairly often	83	24.7	24.7	84.8
	Frequently, if not always	51	15.2	15.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor sets goals for subordinates' performance that are quite challenging.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	34	10.1	10.1	10.1
	Once in a while	91	27.1	27.1	37.2
	Sometimes	95	28.3	28.3	65.5
	Fairly often	74	22.0	22.0	87.5
	Frequently, if not always	42	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My immediate supervisor directs his/her attention towards failures to meet standards

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	44	13.1	13.1	13.1
	Once in a while	78	23.2	23.2	36.3
	Sometimes	89	26.5	26.5	62.8
	Fairly often	73	21.7	21.7	84.5
	Frequently, if not always	52	15.5	15.5	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Achievement Oriented Leadership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not at all	63	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Once in a while	63	18.8	18.8	37.5
	Sometimes	73	21.7	21.7	59.2
	Fairly often	71	21.1	21.1	80.4
	Frequently, if not always	66	19.6	19.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I am happy to be part of this organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	82	24.4	24.4	24.4
	Disagree	82	24.4	24.4	48.8
	Undecided	51	15.2	15.2	64.0
	Agree	59	17.6	17.6	81.5
	Strongly Agree	62	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.3	.3	.3
	Strongly Disagree	82	24.4	24.4	24.7
	Disagree	88	26.2	26.2	50.9
	Undecided	43	12.8	12.8	63.7
	Agree	69	20.5	20.5	84.2
	Strongly Agree	53	15.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	73	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Disagree	94	28.0	28.0	49.7
	Undecided	47	14.0	14.0	63.7
	Agree	63	18.8	18.8	82.4
	Strongly Agree	59	17.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	80	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Disagree	82	24.4	24.4	48.2
	Undecided	60	17.9	17.9	66.1
	Agree	53	15.8	15.8	81.8
	Strongly Agree	61	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I do not feel like part of the family at my organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	79	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Disagree	86	25.6	25.6	49.1
	Undecided	51	15.2	15.2	64.3
	Agree	57	17.0	17.0	81.3
	Strongly Agree	63	18.8	18.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	80	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Disagree	85	25.3	25.3	49.1
	Undecided	57	17.0	17.0	66.1
	Agree	53	15.8	15.8	81.8
	Strongly Agree	61	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

This organization has great deal of personal meaning for me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Strongly Disagree	71	21.1	21.1	21.1
	Disagree	98	29.2	29.2	50.3
	Undecided	46	13.7	13.7	64.0
	Agree	65	19.3	19.3	83.3
	Strongly Agree	56	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	80	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Disagree	84	25.0	25.0	48.8
	Undecided	53	15.8	15.8	64.6
	Agree	60	17.9	17.9	82.4
	Strongly Agree	59	17.6	17.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Affective Commitment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	79	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Disagree	81	24.1	24.1	47.6
	Undecided	60	17.9	17.9	65.5
	Agree	50	14.9	14.9	80.4
	Strongly Agree	66	19.6	19.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I am loyal to this organization because I have so much emotional, social and economic investment in it.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	103	30.7	30.7	30.7
	Disagree	89	26.5	26.5	57.1
	Undecided	80	23.8	23.8	81.0
	Agree	44	13.1	13.1	94.0
	Strongly Agree	20	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I am dedicated to this organization because I fear what I have to lose in it.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	79	23.5	23.5	23.5
	Disagree	109	32.4	32.4	56.0
	Undecided	75	22.3	22.3	78.3
	Agree	53	15.8	15.8	94.0
	Strongly Agree	20	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Sometimes I worry about what might happen it something was to happen to the organization and I was no longer a member.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	90	26.8	26.8	26.8
	Disagree	101	30.1	30.1	56.8
	Undecided	93	27.7	27.7	84.5
	Agree	30	8.9	8.9	93.5
	Strongly Agree	22	6.5	6.5	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

If I wasn't a member of this organization, I would be sad because my life will be disrupted

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	92	27.4	27.4	27.4
	Disagree	88	26.2	26.2	53.6
	Undecided	103	30.7	30.7	84.2
	Agree	34	10.1	10.1	94.3
	Strongly Agree	19	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I worry about the investments I have made in this organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	89	26.5	26.5	26.5
	Disagree	98	29.2	29.2	55.7
	Undecided	93	27.7	27.7	83.3
	Agree	38	11.3	11.3	94.6
	Strongly Agree	18	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I often feel anxious about what I have to lose with this organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	81	24.1	24.1	24.1
	Disagree	104	31.0	31.0	55.1
	Undecided	93	27.7	27.7	82.7
	Agree	40	11.9	11.9	94.6
	Strongly Agree	18	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	93	27.7	27.7	27.7
	Disagree	101	30.1	30.1	57.7
	Undecided	70	20.8	20.8	78.6
	Agree	53	15.8	15.8	94.3
	Strongly Agree	19	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	85	25.3	25.3	25.3
	Disagree	97	28.9	28.9	54.2
	Undecided	95	28.3	28.3	82.4
	Agree	40	11.9	11.9	94.3
	Strongly Agree	19	5.7	5.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Continuance Commitment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	88	26.2	26.2	26.2
	Disagree	88	26.2	26.2	52.4
	Undecided	113	33.6	33.6	86.0
	Agree	29	8.6	8.6	94.6
	Strongly Agree	18	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I feel that I owe this organization quite a bit because of what it has done for me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	66	19.6	19.6	19.6
	Disagree	74	22.0	22.0	41.7
	Undecided	88	26.2	26.2	67.9
	Agree	65	19.3	19.3	87.2
	Strongly Agree	43	12.8	12.8	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

My organization deserves my loyalty because of its treatment towards me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	68	20.2	20.2	20.2
	Disagree	71	21.1	21.1	41.4
	Undecided	80	23.8	23.8	65.2
	Agree	72	21.4	21.4	86.6
	Strongly Agree	45	13.4	13.4	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I feel I would be letting my co-workers down if I wasn't a member of this organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	60	17.9	17.9	17.9
	Disagree	78	23.2	23.2	41.1
	Undecided	88	26.2	26.2	67.3
	Agree	68	20.2	20.2	87.5
	Strongly Agree	42	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	76	22.6	22.6	22.6
	Disagree	65	19.3	19.3	42.0
	Undecided	93	27.7	27.7	69.6
	Agree	66	19.6	19.6	89.3
	Strongly Agree	36	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	63	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Disagree	78	23.2	23.2	42.0
	Undecided	90	26.8	26.8	68.8
	Agree	56	16.7	16.7	85.4
	Strongly Agree	49	14.6	14.6	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty if important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	62	18.5	18.5	18.5
	Disagree	82	24.4	24.4	42.9
	Undecided	69	20.5	20.5	63.4
	Agree	79	23.5	23.5	86.9
	Strongly Agree	44	13.1	13.1	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

I believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	76	22.6	22.6	22.6
Disagree	63	18.8	18.8	41.4
Undecided	86	25.6	25.6	67.0
Agree	74	22.0	22.0	89.0
Strongly Agree	37	11.0	11.0	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

Normative Commitment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	66	19.6	19.6	19.6
	Disagree	68	20.2	20.2	39.9
	Undecided	111	33.0	33.0	72.9
	Agree	53	15.8	15.8	88.7
	Strongly Agree	38	11.3	11.3	100.0
	Total	336	100.0	100.0	

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=DL BY AC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:54:32
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=DL BY AC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

Dimensions Requested	2
Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Directive Leadership * Affective Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Directive Leadership * Affective Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Affective Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Directive Leadership	Not at all	31	25	0	0	0	56
	Once in a while	26	30	2	0	1	59
	Sometimes	22	26	5	3	1	57
	Fairly often	0	0	26	20	26	72
	Frequently, if not always	0	0	27	27	38	92
Total		79	81	60	50	66	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.770	.022	33.177	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=DL BY CC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:54:47
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=DL BY CC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Directive Leadership * Continuance Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Directive Leadership * Continuance Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Continuance Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Directive Leadership	Not at all	0	0	19	20	17	56
	Once in a while	12	14	30	3	0	59
	Sometimes	22	15	18	1	1	57
	Fairly often	24	28	17	3	0	72
	Frequently, if not always	30	31	29	2	0	92
Total		88	88	113	29	18	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.478	.051	-8.617	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=DL BY NC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:56:18
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336

Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=DL BY NC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Directive Leadership * Normative Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Directive Leadership * Normative Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Normative Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Directive Leadership	Not at all	11	13	18	7	7	56
	Once in a while	13	7	18	13	8	59
	Sometimes	10	15	20	6	6	57
	Fairly often	13	14	27	10	8	72
	Frequently, if not always	19	19	28	17	9	92
Total		66	68	111	53	38	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.011	.057	-.190	.849
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=SL BY AC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:58:03
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=SL BY AC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Supportive Leadership * Affective Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Supportive Leadership * Affective Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Affective Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Supportive Leadership	Not at all	79	80	0	0	0	159
	Once in a while	0	1	36	27	30	94
	Sometimes	0	0	24	23	35	82
	Frequently, if not always	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total		79	81	60	50	66	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.877	.021	46.310	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=SL BY CC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:58:16
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=SL BY CC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Supportive Leadership * Continuance Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Supportive Leadership * Continuance Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Continuance Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Supportive Leadership	Not at all	28	27	63	23	18	159
	Once in a while	36	33	20	5	0	94
	Sometimes	24	28	30	0	0	82
	Frequently, if not always	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total		88	88	113	29	18	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.377	.061	-6.074	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=SL BY NC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:58:28
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
		CROSSTABS /TABLES=SL BY NC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Supportive Leadership * Normative Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Supportive Leadership * Normative Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Normative Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Supportive Leadership	Not at all	31	33	50	24	21	159
	Once in a while	21	18	33	12	10	94
	Sometimes	14	16	28	17	7	82
	Frequently, if not always	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total		66	68	111	53	38	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.001	.066	-.021	.983
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=PL BY AC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:59:30
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=PL BY AC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02

	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Participative Leadership * Affective Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Participative Leadership * Affective Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Affective Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Participative Leadership	Not at all	24	26	28	25	27	130
	Once in a while	24	29	31	25	39	148
	Sometimes	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Fairly often	10	12	0	0	0	22
	Frequently, if not always	21	14	0	0	0	35
Total		79	81	60	50	66	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.330	.059	-5.249	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=PL BY CC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
```

```
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 02:59:47
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=PL BY CC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.05
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Participative Leadership * Continuance Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Participative Leadership * Continuance Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Continuance Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Participative Leadership	Not at all	41	40	43	5	1	130
	Once in a while	46	48	51	3	0	148
	Sometimes	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Fairly often	0	0	6	6	10	22
	Frequently, if not always	0	0	13	15	7	35
Total		88	88	113	29	18	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.462	.059	6.846	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=PL BY NC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:00:14
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.

Syntax	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table. CROSSTABS /TABLES=PL BY NC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Participative Leadership * Normative Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Participative Leadership * Normative Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Normative Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Participative Leadership	Not at all	25	30	41	20	14	130
	Once in a while	30	24	51	26	17	148
	Sometimes	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Fairly often	6	5	8	0	3	22
	Frequently, if not always	5	8	11	7	4	35
Total		66	68	111	53	38	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.017	.065	.264	.792
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=AOL BY AC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:01:45
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=AOL BY AC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02

	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Achievement Oriented Leadership * Affective Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Achievement Oriented Leadership * Affective Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Affective Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Achievement Oriented Leadership	Not at all	20	9	11	8	15	63
	Once in a while	11	19	14	10	9	63
	Sometimes	18	16	16	12	11	73
	Fairly often	17	19	10	7	18	71
	Frequently, if not always	13	18	9	13	13	66
Total		79	81	60	50	66	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.027	.057	.474	.635
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
```

```
/TABLES=AOL BY CC
/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=GAMMA
/CELLS=COUNT
/COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:02:04
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=AOL BY CC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent

Achievement Oriented Leadership * Continuance Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Achievement Oriented Leadership * Continuance Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Continuance Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Achievement Oriented Leadership	Not at all	20	10	25	5	3	63
	Once in a while	16	18	21	5	3	63
	Sometimes	20	15	26	6	6	73
	Fairly often	17	21	24	6	3	71
	Frequently, if not always	15	24	17	7	3	66
Total		88	88	113	29	18	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	-.005	.058	-.082	.935
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
CROSSTABS
  /TABLES=AOL BY NC
  /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
  /STATISTICS=GAMMA
  /CELLS=COUNT
  /COUNT ROUND CELL.
```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:02:27
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>

Missing Value Handling	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=AOL BY NC /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=GAMMA /CELLS=COUNT /COUNT ROUND CELL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	174734

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Achievement Oriented Leadership * Normative Commitment	336	100.0%	0	0.0%	336	100.0%

Achievement Oriented Leadership * Normative Commitment Crosstabulation

Count

		Normative Commitment					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Achievement Oriented Leadership	Not at all	22	18	22	1	0	63
	Once in a while	19	26	14	4	0	63
	Sometimes	25	23	25	0	0	73
	Fairly often	0	1	26	24	20	71
	Frequently, if not always	0	0	24	24	18	66
Total		66	68	111	53	38	336

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error[a]	Approx. T[b]	Approx. Sig.
Ordinal by Ordinal	Gamma	.643	.032	18.613	.000
N of Valid Cases		336			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7
  /SCALE('Directive Leardership') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:06:24
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data	336
	File	
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.

Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 /SCALE('Directive Leardership') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.02

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Scale: Directive Leardership

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.962	7

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My immediate supervisor lets me know what is expected of me.	12.83	50.565	.868	.956

My immediate supervisor gives vague explanations of what is expected of subordinates on the job.	12.78	51.063	.851	.957
My immediate supervisor is absent when needed	12.80	50.618	.867	.956
My immediate supervisor spends time for teaching and coaching.	12.79	50.134	.866	.956
My immediate supervisor concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failure	12.72	49.843	.887	.954
My immediate supervisor helps others in developing their strengths.	12.75	51.354	.836	.958
My immediate supervisor suggests new ways of approaching assignments.	12.79	49.773	.881	.954

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
14.91	68.273	8.263	7

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16
  /SCALE('Supportive Leardership') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:06:57
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.
Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q8 Q9 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q13 Q14 Q15 Q16 /SCALE('Supportive Leardership') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

Scale: Supportive Leardership

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.900	9

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My immediate supervisor expresses satisfaction when his/her expectations are met.	8.13	28.691	.663	.889
My immediate supervisor is effective in meeting the job related needs of others.	8.02	29.800	.520	.899
My immediate supervisor maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates.	8.16	27.990	.704	.885
My immediate supervisor listens receptively to subordinates' ideas and suggestions.	8.19	28.155	.710	.885
My immediate supervisor does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.	8.19	27.731	.740	.883
My immediate supervisor encourages continual improvement in subordinates' performance.	8.18	27.924	.711	.885
My immediate supervisor says things that are hurtful to subordinates' personal feelings.	8.16	27.829	.716	.884
My immediate supervisor behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of subordinates' personal needs.	7.95	29.027	.588	.894

My immediate supervisor treats others as individuals rather than just a member of a group	8.14	28.980	.645	.890

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
9.14	35.571	5.964	9

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22
  /SCALE('Participative Leardership') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:07:36
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.

Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q17 Q18 Q19 Q20 Q21 Q22 /SCALE('Participative Leardership') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

Scale: Participative Leardership

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.942	6

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted

My immediate supervisor consults with subordinates when facing a problem.	6.32	25.807	.874	.925
My immediate supervisor asks for suggestions from subordinates concerning how to carry out assignments.	6.25	27.303	.782	.936
My immediate supervisor shows doubts about subordinate's ability to meet most objectives.	6.36	26.547	.825	.931
My immediate supervisor helps subordinates overcome problems that stop them from carrying out their tasks.	6.35	25.344	.878	.925
My immediate supervisor acts without consulting subordinates.	6.22	27.741	.754	.940
My immediate supervisor asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made.	6.31	26.100	.840	.930

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
7.56	37.686	6.139	6

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q26_A Q27_A
  /SCALE('Achivement Oriented Leardership') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:08:29
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.
Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q23 Q24 Q25 Q26 Q27 Q26_A Q27_A /SCALE('Achivement Oriented Leardership') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Scale: Achivement Oriented Leardership

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.956	7

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My immediate supervisor keeps a focused attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards	12.14	45.478	.862	.948
My immediate supervisor informs subordinates about what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.	12.18	47.783	.770	.955
My immediate supervisor asks subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations.	12.24	45.581	.846	.949
My immediate supervisor explains the level of performance that is expected of subordinates.	12.15	44.239	.901	.944
My immediate supervisor lets subordinates know of the expectation for them to perform at their highest level.	12.14	45.243	.882	.946
My immediate supervisor sets goals for subordinates' performance that are quite challenging.	12.20	47.553	.792	.953
He directs his/her attention towards failures to meet standards	12.17	45.528	.875	.947

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
14.21	62.038	7.876	7

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35
  /SCALE('Affective Commitment') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:09:12
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data	336
	File	
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.
Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q28 Q29 Q30 Q31 Q32 Q33 Q34 Q35 /SCALE('Affective Commitment') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Scale: Affective Commitment

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.982	8

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I am happy to be part of this organization.	19.61	88.692	.933	.979
I enjoy discussing about my organization with people outside it.	19.66	90.111	.888	.981
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	19.60	89.268	.933	.979
I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one	19.62	89.096	.931	.979
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization	19.60	88.479	.946	.978
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization	19.63	89.087	.930	.979
This organization has great deal of personal meaning for me.	19.61	90.357	.895	.981

I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	19.62	89.054	.932	.979

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
22.42	116.293	10.784	8

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43
  /SCALE('Continuance Commitment') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:09:47
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.

Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q36 Q37 Q38 Q39 Q40 Q41 Q42 Q43 /SCALE('Continuance Commitment') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.02
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

```
[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
```

Scale: Continuance Commitment

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.973	8

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I am loyal to this organization because I have so much emotional, social and economic investment in it.	16.96	56.142	.879	.970
I am dedicated to this organization because I fear what I have to lose in it.	16.85	56.834	.861	.971
Sometimes I worry about what might happen it something was to happen to the organization and I was no longer a member.	16.95	56.469	.903	.968
If I wasn't a member of this organization, I would be sad because my life will be disrupted	16.93	56.344	.917	.968
I worry about the investments I have made in this organization.	16.93	56.297	.925	.967
I often feel anxious about what I have to lose with this organization.	16.90	57.025	.889	.969
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	16.91	56.587	.856	.971
One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	16.89	56.717	.893	.969

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
19.33	73.577	8.578	8

```
RELIABILITY
  /VARIABLES=Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50
  /SCALE('Normative Commitment') ALL
  /MODEL=ALPHA
  /STATISTICS=SCALE
  /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
```

Reliability

Notes

Output Created		13-OCT-2018 03:10:11
Comments		
Input	Data	C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	336
	Matrix Input	
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on all cases with valid data for all variables in the procedure.
Syntax		RELIABILITY /VARIABLES=Q44 Q45 Q46 Q47 Q48 Q49 Q50 /SCALE('Normative Commitment') ALL /MODEL=ALPHA /STATISTICS=SCALE /SUMMARY=TOTAL.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.01

[DataSet1] C:\Users\O.O\Desktop\helen data.sav

Scale: Normative Commitment

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	336	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	336	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.976	7

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I feel that I owe this organization quite a bit because of what it has done for me.	17.03	53.898	.912	.972
My organization deserves my loyalty because of its treatment towards me.	17.00	53.797	.896	.973
I feel I would be letting my co-workers down if I wasn't a member of this organization	17.00	53.985	.924	.971
If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	17.10	53.691	.930	.971

Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.	17.01	53.656	.918	.972
One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty if important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.	16.98	54.143	.883	.974
I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.	17.07	53.691	.915	.972

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
19.87	72.988	8.543	7