



LEADER BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: EFFECT OF WORK CULTURE- A CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Aminu Yusuf Dikko & Lawal Musa Batsari

Department of Public Administration

Umaru Musa Yaradua University, Katsina

Email: aminu.yusuf@umyu.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

Examining the effect of leader behavior towards employee commitment to organization possess serious challenges in modern day workplace due to oversight on the role of culture. This led to rapid changes due to increase in employee movement from one job to another, especially with the current composition of today work environment. This study reviews empirical literatures in understanding the trend of research in the field of organizational leadership and commitment in the workplace. The review covers literatures on leadership style and organizational commitment, national culture and advancement on the nature of work in today's work environment. Work culture is incorporated to the research due to acknowledging the vast body of literatures is dominantly from the West and some part of Asia which paved the way for contextual disharmony between different contexts of the world at large. Culture as the main pillar of individuals' relationship is important in understanding how work environment should be guided by leaders. The composition of the 21st century workforce defines which leader behavior is most crucial to adapt as at when due. Therefore, the research explores the area as gray and relevant for researchers to enquire and further advance the body of knowledge.

Keyword: Leadership, Work, Culture, Behavior, Organizational commitment

INTRODUCTION

Organizations in the twenty first century are facing rapid changes due to increase in employee movement from one job to another (Daft, 2015). Employees within the organization came to understand these changes and adapt in search for better work environment. This result in the need for effective leadership in modern organizations to ensure efficiency and effectiveness, which will help in retaining qualified and committed employees. Leadership studies in contemporary times intend to highlight aspects of behavior which explain how leaders enhance the commitment of their team or work unit. Various leadership behavior researches where been conducted, but vary substantially with respect to the behavior examined. Most studies only examined one broadly defined behavior; transformational leadership (Hackett & Allen, 1995; Avolio, 2012) or from Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1953). Little percent of research examine other specific type of leader behaviors (e.g. Stogdill et al., 1962; Kim & Yukl, 1995). The dependence on define leadership behaviors in various studies has limited progress in improving our understanding of effective leadership (Yukl, 2012). Furthermore, substantial number of studies examined the meta-categories of the full range leadership behavior (Avolio, 2012; Bass, 1985; Dikko et al., 2017).

Corroborating with the above argument, reliance on single defined behavior of a leader in various literatures has limit progress in understanding effective leadership which improve its effectiveness (Yukl, 2012), as few studies which focus on the full range leadership



theory reports inconsistencies in their findings (Khan et al., 2018; Iqbal et al., 2013; Dikko et al., 2017). Thus difficult to interpret when meta-category are employed in a single study conducted in a culturally diverse societies in Africa. These behaviors are likely to differ in their relationship to subordinate outcome and situation (Yukl, 2012). As proposed by the hierarchical taxonomy of leader behaviors were subordinates has three different meta-categories as; task-oriented, relationship oriented and change-oriented behavior (Ekvall & Arvonen, 1991; Yukl et al., 2002) are important for understanding leadership in various context. Furthermore, the objective of relations-oriented behavior is to maintain subordinate commitment, confidence and cooperation. The specific relations-oriented behaviors include: supporting; developing; recognizing and rewarding; and empowering. More so, the objective of change-oriented behavior is to identify desirable changes in task outputs and work procedures for the leader's team. This specific behavior includes: advocating change, encouraging innovation and envisioning change. The component behaviors are similar to some of the component behaviors for transformational leadership (Bass, 1985), charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977) and change management (Kotter, 2012). Additionally, the objective of task-oriented behavior is to improve the efficiency and reliability of activities carried out by the leader's team. This behavior is similar to initiating structure (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957), production-centered leadership (Likert, 1961) and performance behavior (Misumi & Peterson, 1985) which in the previous version of the taxonomy, task-oriented include three components; planning work unit, clarifying roles and objectives; and monitoring operation and performance. Thus, a more recent version adds problem solving as the fourth component (Yukl, 2012). Therefore, the current research under study focuses on the task-oriented behavior which is more peculiar to the transactional style and more present in African societies. As highlight above these study investigates transactional leadership style towards commitment, the moderating effect of work culture in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Style towards Subordinates Commitment

Studies have in the past established that leadership impacts on subordinates' attitudes, commitment, performance as well as behavior (Asrar-ul-haq & Kuchinke, 2016; Phradhan & Phradhan, 2015; Zehir, Sehitoglu & Erdogan, 2012; Caillier, 2014; Aydin et al., 2013). Although literatures are still improving the framework through introducing the mediating or moderating processes between leadership style and commitment of workers, a number of instruments through which leadership influence followers have been in the rise (Dikko et al., 2017; Triana, Richard & Yucel, 2017; LePine, Zhang, Crawford & Rich, 2016; Nir & Hameiri, 2014). Studies have in the past identified mechanisms such as; Personal identification (wang et al., 2005) social identification (Fransen et al., 2015) trust (Wu, Huang, Li & Liu, 2012) procedural justice (Shin, Sung, Choi & Kim, 2015) social exchange (Casimir et al., 2014) and power distance (Dikko et al., 2017) which influence the relationship between leadership and other dependent variables.

Leader with charismatic traits are assumed to be capable of changing the way their subordinates identify themselves (Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015). Transformational



leadership is also categorized as a component of charismatic leader with features of idealized influence as well as inspirational motivation which influence his followers. This affect subordinates through the development of individual identification with their leaders as well as social identification within the workplace. This various form of identification within the work environment leads to different work outcomes (LePine et al., 2016). Individual identification with the leader can be defined as “the process whereby an individual’s belief about a person (a leader) becomes self-referential or self-defining” (Kark & Shamir, 2013, p. 78). Pratt (1998) affirms that two styles of identification were associated with individual identification.

Reminding subordinates on their self-concept leads to the recognition where they perceive comparable beliefs with their leaders. Secondly, this gave rise to subordinates’ perception in changing their self-concept towards that which their values and beliefs are the same to that of their leader. Individual identification was in the past found as mechanism to affect the relationship between transformational style of the leader and subordinates’ reliance on their leader (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003). Social identification is perceived as “the process whereby an individual’s belief about a group or organization becomes self-referential or self-defining” (Kark & Shamir, 2013, p.77). Charismatic leaders influence and strengthen connections between and among their subordinates’ self-concept as well as group which increase employees’ identification within the group (Jacquart & Antonakis, 2015; Bass & Avolio, 1994). As such, employees develop additional willingness in contributing to their group task and goal. Employees’ social identification is found as mechanism on the relationship between transformational style and employees’ self-efficacy, self-esteem as well as collective efficacy (Kark et al., 2003).

Internalization is a method in which individual person that is aimed is influenced through the inducement of behavior similar to that of his values which are intrinsically rewarding (Poile, 2017). Leadership is expected to influence employees’ who felt that intrinsic motivation in the workplace is expressed through high standards as well as expectations in setting goals, reassuring subordinates’ self-thinking, empowering them to increase self-efficacy, participating in decision making and increase autonomy (Aryee et al., 2012). Furthermore, leader style makes employees to commit in understanding important values and beliefs of their leaders which also influence them to move beyond their interest. During such process employees adopt their leader’s values which become similar to that of their own individual. Value congruence is reported to have a significant positive effect on employee (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989) and found as a mechanism mediating the relationship between transformational style and employees’ outcomes (Jung & Avolio, 2001).

Social exchange is understood to be a mechanism through which leadership affect followers. Under transformational style, these are employees experiencing individualized consideration from their leader. As such, they reciprocate in exchange through their support to the leader vision or objective as well as performing higher than expected. Thus, transformational leadership develops quality reciprocal exchange relationships between



leaders and their subordinates through influencing their performance (Wang et al., 2005). Even though the early stage of leader member exchange is transactional but can be transformational at its final stage (Bass, 1999). Transformational leadership style also influences followers through encouraging their emotions and attitude. This often influence employees by touching their emotions and use emotional influence to communicate their vision, display their ideals as well as beliefs and ensure high enthusiasm (Bass, 1985). A study has found that positive emotions affects transfer positively from leaders to their subordinates, thus influence employees' assessment of leadership effectiveness as well as attraction (Sy, Choi & Johnson, 2013; Bono & Ilies, 2006). Transactional leadership is dependent upon contractual agreement or between the leader and his subordinates. Leaders within this domain clarify expectations and employ the stick and carrot approach in exchange for employees' performance (Bass, 1985). Importantly, the main instrument or mechanism which influences such leaders is the contingent reward to appeal for subordinates' individual interest by developing influential compliance from the employees (Yukl, 2010).

Transactional Leadership

The transactional leader makes clear the standards of performance of what is anticipated from subordinates and what they get in return. Transactional leadership is referred to as reward-driven approach where leaders reward their followers for a job done and get punished for otherwise (Wu, 2009). They are considered as those that employs reward and punishment (Bass et al., 2003; Amanchukwu et al., 2015). Moreover, features of transactional leadership include contingent reward where desired employee actions are rewarded and on the other hand, undesired actions are punished. Active management-by-exception referring to a leader's active monitoring of employee performance and evaluation if the employee fails to meet the standard (Cherry, 2012; Bass, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). In contrast, leaders low in transactional style would improve an employee's sense of ambiguity and the need to seek additional information in order to determine one's position in relation to the working environment and therefore establish more intense reactions toward perceptions of leadership. The social exchange theory explains this type of leadership where the relationship between subordinate's and leaders is measured on the understanding that performance attracts economic gains (Strom, Sear & Kelly, 2014).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership tends to align subordinates' perceptions to that of collective interest of the organization towards creating committed employee in achieving organizational goals and objectives (Bass & Riggio, 2012). Transformational leaders are characterized by the four (4) I's; Idealized influence, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation and Individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Jyoti & Dev, 2015), Idealized influence encompasses the use of honor and believes in subordinates and in return they follow by example. Inspirational motivation connotes making the future goals with optimism, importance and enthusiasm. Intellectual stimulation involves innovations by the subordinates, developing new ideas and challenging them to improve their efficiency in promoting those innovative and new ideas. Finally, individualized



consideration means meeting the needs of subordinates through training and effective communication (Strom et al., 2014).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is viewed as an important concept when discussing employee performance and dedication to the organization. This concept emanates in the mid-20th century as a result of the human relation movement. Baruch (1998) assert that during that time organizations were focusing on employee's attitude and loyalty to the workplace is driven from committed individuals who contribute towards meeting institutional goals and targets (Saeed et al., 2013). This is very crucial to leaders and managers in the workplace where high level of commitment and loyalty of subordinates leads to goal attainment and otherwise to increase absenteeism, high turnover, poor productivity and job stress (Iqbal et al., 2012). Employees tend to leave the organisation when they feel leaders are not accommodating and demonstrate higher levels of commitment, followers tend to get attracted and perform at a high level (Joshi, 2009; Bass & Riggio, 2012). Moreover, organisational commitment refers to the belief of an employee on the goals and objectives that set the organisation, willingness of the subordinate to support the institution and maintain membership (Klien et al., 2009; Jackson et al., 2013). Accordingly, employee commitment is affirming to be loyalty and identification by individuals toward the organisation (Ivancevich et al., 2013), which indicates that employee attach themselves with their organisational objectives. Commitment reflects employee attitude as; identification, involvement and loyalty which relates to occupation, performance and social environment that the organisation operates (Randeree & Chaudhry, 2012).

Affective Commitment

This refers to lecturer emotional attachment to the institution (Pradhan & Pradhan, 2015). Lecturers with affective commitment identify him or herself strongly with the goals and objectives that established the university and indicate a higher level of desire to maintain membership (Saeed, Gelaidan & Ahmad, 2013). Loi *et al.* (2012) affirm that affective commitment is the individual perception about the organizational objectives and the target, which they lay down for themselves. An employee staying with the organization depends on their goal, which has to be in conformity with the institutional objectives that made them to stay (Loi et al., 2012). Individuals with high affective commitment perform better to the organization and reduce their turnover intention (Saeed et al., 2013). This indicates that lecturers with strong emotional attachment understand better their exchange relationship with their institutions. Base on the understanding, lecturers with affective commitment to their institution has a tendency to enhance their teaching and research skills, which further increases performance to achieve organizational goals.

Normative Commitment

This is view as an employee obligation and loyalty to stay with the organization (Asaari et al., 2016). Faculty obligation and loyalty to his institution make him/her feel right to stay and thereby being committed to goal attainment (Clugston, 2000; Meyer & Maltin,



2010). Marsh and Mannari (1977), Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) sees employee with 'lifetime commitment' as "one who consider it morally right to stay in the company regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfy the firm gives him over the year". Normative commitment in a study conducted by Raiz, Akram and Ijaz (2011) indicates a significant relationship with individual level of performance and they believe that step toward this is evaluated through employee attachment to the organization. This sort of commitment, for instance, lecturers will have a higher level of normative commitment if someone who serves the institution for a long period recommends to him with loyalty to the organization (Abdulrasid, Sambasivan & Johari, 2003).

NATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Hofstede cultural framework is regarded as the vital tool in understanding national culture (Yang, 2016; Matijevic et al., 2015; Kim & McLean, 2014; Gjuraj, 2013). This is because it highlights an important theoretical tool for experts and professionals as well lead them for training, development and management (Hofstede et al., 2010; Taras, Steel & Kirkman, 2012). Accordingly, Hofstede framework is relevant due to its value in understanding group of individuals (Meyer et al., 2012), thus previous literature in education and human resources make use of his taxonomy of culture (Kim & McLean, 2014). The aim this study is to integrate work and national culture dimension as factor affecting organizational commitment. This linkage lies on attitude and values that are common in a certain contextual work environment. Porter et al (1974) describe one aspect of commitment as affective which signifies individual values as Meyer and Allen (2004) pinpoint all the three scales (affective, continuance and normative) as each describing national values of individuals. Literature found that employees with collective dimension that are highly valued and remunerated in both pay and autonomy experiences high commitment level (Williamson et al., 2009). Thus, highlights the value employee receiving the tangible and intangible reward which further escalates their commitment in the workplace.

Employees in a collectivist culture recognizes their organization as family where relationship is reciprocal and responsibility of ensuring security as well as devotion exist which further influence subordinates moral intuition thereby increasing their commitment (Hofstede et al., 2010). Relationship been one of the most important element in collectivist culture, the levels at which individuals interact in the organization is one of the sources for their commitment (Eilinger, 2005; Eraut, 2004). Furthermore, relationship with leaders, expectation, encouragement as well as recognition from superior tends to increase employee commitment (Berg & Chyung, 2008; Eraut, 2004). Collectivist cultures share knowledge in order to achieve mutual understanding with others (employee/colleagues) in the organization (Jiacheng et al., 2010). Fischer and Mansell (2009) affirm that collectivism and power distance are both theoretically related to attachment as well as acceptance of groups and hierarchies that form the basis of commitment in workplace. It is argued that employees in an individualistic environment experience high turnover when they perceive their job cannot provide them opportunities to grow easier on their career (Ramesh & Gefland, 2010). It is argued that communication between leaders and



followers are two-ways which gives a pathway for engagement in organizational process that further enhances employee attachment (Loi et al., 2012; Lehman, 2009). Kim et al. (2012) assert that much consideration to hierarchical system does not increase or enhance employee commitment but rather do otherwise.

Employee behavior in the workplace is shaped by his perception on power border practice (Sargut, 2010) as such power margin is a good determinant of employee commitment (Yildirim & Deniz, 2014). Choi *et al.* (2015) posited that commitment is influenced not only by individual personality or situational traits but also by both interacting together. Considering the situational factors assist in developing strong commitment through moderating power, engaging employees in decision process, providing challenging task as well as developing effective communication channels (Meyer et al., 2012; Yildirim & Deniz, 2014; Kim & McLean, 2014; Matijevic et al., 2015). Hence, understanding national culture with its attendant values, attitude and behavior is prerequisite for organizations to succeed (Matijevic et al., 2015).

POWER DISTANCE

Power distance refers to the degree that a society accepts inequality in the distribution of power within that society (Hofstede et al., 2010). Power distance affects managerial styles, delegation and empowerment, decision-making styles and the organizational design which in turn collectively impact the organization's productivity and efficiency (Waal & Chipeta, 2013). For example, organizations in high power distance cultures are more likely to use authoritarian management styles and to exclude employees from the decision-making process. Meanwhile that in a low power distance will take their employee along and involve them in all the process of running the organization. Hence, organizations in low power distance cultures tend to have manager-employee relationships characterized by a feeling of almost being equals. Empowerment and participative management are more likely (Hofstede et al., 2010; kim & Mclean 2014).

MASCULINITY AND FEMINISM

Masculinity represent how much a culture collectively demonstrates characteristics which have been categorized as being "masculine" (for example, valuing achievement) or "feminine" (such as valuing relationships) (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005; Minkov & Blagoev, 2011; Minkov, 2013). In general, it can be said that organizations in highly masculine cultures will be more focused on achievement, competition, and the accumulation of monetary rewards. Conversely, organizations in highly feminine cultures will place more emphasis on cooperation, collaboration, harmony within the organization, and relationships. According to Meyer et al. (2012), organizations in highly masculine cultures may experience higher professional commitment, as employees perceive dedication to their profession as a way to achieve such important goals as status, money, or the acquisition of material possessions. At the same time, the high degree of competition and the general lack of regard for others can cause a decrease in organizational commitment. Specifically, employees may see the organization as simply



the means to achieve important personal goals, and may feel no loyalty or commitment to the organization itself.

WORK CULTURE

"A society without work, is a society without a center, a society lacking basic coordinates in matters, in everyday life as in politics, economics, the law and so on" (Beck, 2000, p.10). Work is seen as a socially constructed phenomenon without fixed meaning due to culture and social context in which it is practiced (Grint, 2005, p.42). Marx Weber posited that work focus on the political nature of employment relationship which has always been central to society and its meaning has constantly been "created, challenged, altered, and sustained though the contending discourses" (Grint, 2005, p.9). This is due to the contemporary shift from digital transformation which led to a transition "from a work society to a knowledge society" (Beck, 2014, p.1). Due to the elimination and transformation of many jobs "the prospects for massive job creation in the near future seem bleak" (Littler, 1985, p.280), not only are people growing insecure of their job prospects but their "skills and knowledge are growing obsolete and no one can say what they must learn in order to be needed in the future" (Beck, 2014, p.3). A 2017 report highlights that talent sourcing and recruitment are facing tremendous pressure as talent and skill shortages are widespread. Employees are demanding new careers and models. Technologies and innovations; including cognitive, artificial intelligence, social collaboration, crowds, and the sharing economy are reshaping the workforce" (Deloitte Human Capital Trends Report, 2017, pg. 39). Taylor affirms "that workers can be understood as rationally motivated, if you offer them more pay, they will work harder" (Strangleman & Warren, 2008, p.27). This theory is losing its significance in the contemporary due to much neglect on other employee motivations and highlights a narrow focus through monetary reward. Amabile and Kramer (2007) reports that employees are influenced by workday events and changes in their emotions, perceptions, and motivations for work, which then reflects on their cognitive performance and creativity in their day to day work lives.

On the other hand, Weber focused on the role of protestant ethics in the rise of modern capitalism and bureaucracy. It is interesting to compare such rationalistic view on bureaucracy based on its ideal typologies to the modern-day workplaces. Weber proposed that the modern workplace would need, "A clear cut division of labor and authority hierarchy: position of offices, clear lines of responsibility as well as established rules and regulations and continuity in spite of changes to personnel" (Strangleman & Warren, 2008, p.23). These predictions are true to the extent that there has been a shift from patriarchy to hierarchy in the modern workplace. However, with the current start-up culture, soon this hierarchical approach may also be completely replaced with a flat, close-knit structure, that incorporates a team-based approach with informal rules, fewer regulations, and greater inclusivity. Organizations also differ in their level of formality when defining work (Conger & Church, 2017, p. 203).



CONCLUSION

The study seeks to investigate the recent trend of employees in the workplace with emphasis on what motivates followers to stay on their job. Culture has being an important mechanism that affects people in their daily life as it is the main pillar of our relationship with colleagues. Work culture varies from one society to another, as literature argues that monetary incentive no longer a viable means to keep employees committed to their work environment. Moreover, the argument of Weber's hierarchical orientation no longer a factor which determine specialization in the workplace. Recent studies propose the flatten hierarchical approach to the study of organizations. Important to note at these gesture is to understand the effect and role culture institute in the work environment and analyze to incorporate in developing a framework for understanding the best way to retain committed employee in the workplace. Furthermore, understanding leadership behavior suitable for enhancing the theoretical ground is very vital. Leaders need to understand the importance of work culture in other to influence commitment. The full range leadership theory is crucial in this respect. Arguably, the transactional and transformational style of a leader needs to be understood in different context. Previous literatures are dominantly from the west which leads to African nations relying on the west assumptions which affects our context negatively and made organizations inefficient in attaining their institutional mandate. Therefore, to contribute substantially to the existing body of literature contextually understanding is vital for organizational success testing the argument empirically.

REFERENCES

- Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2007). Inner work life. *Harvard business review*, 85(5), 72-83.
- Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., Zhou, Q., & Hartnell, C. A. (2012). Transformational leadership, innovative behavior, and task performance: Test of mediation and moderation processes. *Human Performance*, 25(1), 1-25.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani banks. *Future Business Journal*, 2(1), 54-64.
- Avolio, B.J. (2012) Full range leadership development. 2nd Edition. Sage, London.
- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, S. (2013). The effect of school principals' leadership styles on teachers' organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice*, 13(2), 806-811.
- Bass, B. & Riggio, R. (2012). *Transformational leadership, 2nd ed.*, US, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Beck, U. (2014). *The brave new world of work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 317-334.
- Bycio, P., Hackett, R. D., & Allen, J. S. (1995). Further assessments of Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of applied psychology*, 80(4), 468.



- Caillier, J. G. (2014). Toward a better understanding of the relationship between transformational leadership, public service motivation, mission valence, and employee performance: A preliminary study. *Public Personnel Management*, 43(2), 218-239.
- Casimir, G., Ngee Keith Ng, Y., Yuan Wang, K., & Ooi, G. (2014). The relationships amongst leader-member exchange, perceived organizational support, affective commitment, and in-role performance: A social-exchange perspective. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(5), 366-385.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of management review*, 12(4), 637-647.
- Conger, J., & Church, A. (2017). *The High Potential's Advantage: Get Noticed, Impress Your Bosses, and Become a Top Leader*. Harvard Business Press.
- Daft, R. L. (2015). *Organization theory and design*. Cengage learning.
- Ekvall, G., & Arvonen, J. (1991). Change-centered leadership: An extension of the two-dimensional model. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 7(1), 17-26.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management* (London: Pitman, 1949). *Fayol General and industrial management 1949*.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1953). Leadership climate, human relations training, and supervisory behavior. *Personnel psychology*, 6(2), 205-222.
- Fransen, K., Haslam, S. A., Steffens, N. K., Vanbeselaere, N., De Cuyper, B., & Boen, F. (2015). Believing in "us": Exploring leaders' capacity to enhance team confidence and performance by building a sense of shared social identity. *Journal of experimental psychology: applied*, 21(1), 89.
- Gjuraj, E. (2013). The importance of national culture studies in the organizational context. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 9(11).
- Grint, K. (2005). *The sociology of work: introduction*. Polity.
- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the leader behavior descriptions. *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*, 39-51.
- Hofstede, G. Minkov, M & Hofstede, G.J. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw Hill, New York, NY
- House, R. J. (1977). A theory of charismatic leadership. *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*.
- Iqbal, J., Kiyani, K., Qureshi, S., Abbas, S., & Ambreen, S. (2012). Commitment in organizations: A review from 1988 to 2011. *Interdisciplinary journal of contemporary research in business*, 4(5), 623-641.
- Iqbal, N., Javaid, K., Ahmad, N., & Ateeq, M. (2013). Impact of Rewards and Leadership on the Employee Engagement: A Case Study from Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Management and Administrative Sciences Review ISSN*, 2308-1368.
- Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. (2007). *Organization behaviour and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Jackson, T. A., Meyer, J. P., & Wang, X. H. F. (2013). Leadership, commitment, and culture A meta-analysis. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 84-106.



- Jiacheng, W., Lu, L., & Francesco, C. A. (2010). A cognitive model of intra-organizational knowledge-sharing motivations in the view of cross-culture. *International Journal of Information Management*, 30(3), 220-230.
- Joshi, U. (2009). *Antecedents of Leadership Behaviour*. Its influence on quality of work life and organisational commitment. New Delhi: Tihar. Deep and Deep Publications.
- Jung, D.I. & Avolio, B.J. (2001), "Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions", *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 208-18.
- Kark, R., & Shamir, B. (2013). The dual effect of transformational leadership: Priming relational and collective selves and further effects on followers. In *Transformational and Charismatic Leadership: The road ahead 10th anniversary edition* (pp. 77-101). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: empowerment and dependency. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(2), 246.
- Khan S.N., Busari A.H., Abdullah S.M., Mughal Y.H.(2018) followership moderation between the relationship of transactional leadership style and employees reactions towards organizational change. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, Vol 17 issue 1, pp 131-143.
- Kim, H., & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of managerial effectiveness and advancement to self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors from the multiple-linkage mode. *The leadership quarterly*, 6(3), 361-377.
- Kim, S., & McLean, G. N. (2014). The impact of national culture on informal learning in the workplace. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 64(1), 39-59.
- Klein, H. J., Becker, T. E., & Meyer, J. P. (2009). *Commitment in organizations: accumulated wisdom and new directions*. New York: Routledge/ Psychology Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard business press.
- LePine, M. A., Zhang, Y., Crawford, E. R., & Rich, B. L. (2016). Turning their pain to gain: Charismatic leader influence on follower stress appraisal and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(3), 1036-1059.
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management.
- Matijević, S., Vrdoljak Raguž, I., & Filipović, D. (2015). The role of national culture in contemporary business environment. *DIEM*, 2(1), 457-469.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., & Adkins, C. L. (1989). A work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74(3), 424-432.
- Meyer, J. P., Malin, E. R., & Thai, S. (2012). Employee commitment and well-being. *Employee commitment and well-being, in contemporary occupational health psychology: Global perspectives on research and practice*, 2, 19-35.
- Minkov, M. (2013). *Cross-cultural analysis: the science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Misumi, J., & Peterson, M. F. (1985). *The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program*. The University of Michigan Press.



- Nir, A. E., & Hameiri, L. (2014). School principals' leadership style and school outcomes: The mediating effect of powerbase utilization. *Journal of Educational Administration, 52*(2), 210-227.
- Poile, C. (2017). Why would I help my coworker? Exploring asymmetric task dependence and the self-determination theory internalization process. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 23*(3), 354
- Pradhan, S., & Pradhan, R. K. (2015). An empirical investigation of relationship among transformational leadership, affective organizational commitment and contextual performance. *Vision, 19*(3), 227-235.
- Randeree, K., & Ghaffar Chaudhry, A. (2012). Leadership-style, satisfaction and commitment: An exploration in the United Arab Emirates' construction sector. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 19*(1), 61-85.
- Randeree, K., & Ghaffar Chaudhry, A. (2012). Leadership-style, satisfaction and commitment: An exploration in the United Arab Emirates' construction sector. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management, 19*(1), 61-85.
- Saeed, S. A. A., Gelaidan, H. M., & Ahmad, F. (2013). New leadership style and lecturers' commitment in Yemen higher education institutions. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 21*(10), 1460-1467.
- Shin, Y., Sung, S. Y., Choi, J. N., & Kim, M. S. (2015). Top management ethical leadership and firm performance: Mediating role of ethical and procedural justice climate. *Journal of Business Ethics, 129*(1), 43-57.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. *The journal of psychology, 54*(2), 259-269.
- Strangleman, T., & Warren, T. (2008). *Work and society: Sociological approaches, themes and methods*. Routledge.
- Strom, D. L., Sears, K. L., & Kelly, K. M. (2014). Work engagement the roles of organizational justice and leadership style in predicting engagement among employees. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21*(1), 71-82.
- Sy, T., Choi, J. N., & Johnson, S. K. (2013). Reciprocal interactions between group perceptions of leader charisma and group mood through mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(4), 463-476.
- Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2012). Improving national cultural indices using a longitudinal meta-analysis of Hofstede's dimensions. *Journal of World Business, 47*(3), 329-341.
- Triana, M. D. C., Richard, O. C., & Yücel, İ. (2017). Status incongruence and supervisor gender as moderators of the transformational leadership to subordinate affective organizational commitment relationship. *Personnel Psychology, 70*(2), 429-467.
- Waal, A., & Chipeta, K. (2013). *Effects of culture on the perception of South African and Tanzanian business students on high performance organizations* (No. 2013/03).
- Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of management Journal, 48*(3), 420-432.



- Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C., & Liu, W. (2012). Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership. *Management and Organization Review*, 8(1), 97-121
- Wu, M., Huang, X., Li, C., & Liu, W. (2012). Perceived interactional justice and trust-in-supervisor as mediators for paternalistic leadership. *Management and Organization Review*, 8(1), 97-121.
- Yang, M. L. (2016). Transformational leadership and Taiwanese public relations practitioners' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 40(1), 31-46.
- Yang, M. L. (2016). Transformational leadership and Taiwanese public relations practitioners' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 40(1), 31-46.
- Yildirim, B., & Deniz, A. (2014). The relationship between power distance and organizational commitment in primary schools. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(19), 750.
- Yukl, G. (2012). Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), 66-85.
- Dikko, A. Y., Abdul Mutalib, R., & Ghazali, S. (2017). Impact of leadership style on organisational commitment: The role of national culture in Nigerian Universities. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(5), 64-75.
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, 9(1), 15-32.
- Zehir, C., Sehitoglu, Y., & Erdogan, E. (2012). The effect of leadership and supervisory commitment to organizational performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 207-216.