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Abstract

Connie R. Mitchell. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A CORRELATION STUDY IN TWO MIDWESTERN ORGANIZATIONS. (Under the direction of Dr. Andrew T. Alexson) Tennessee Temple University, April, 2013.

This study was a quantitative descriptive statistical analysis that answered the question: How does a leader’s perceived leadership practices impact organizational commitment? Data were collected from two Midwest organizations (n=57) using the Meyer and Allen (TCM) Commitment Survey and Kouzes & Posner’s Five Exemplary Leadership Practices (LPI) to determine if there was a relationship between the three components (Affective, Continuance, and Normative) of organizational commitment and the Five Exemplary Leadership Practices (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable others to Act, and Encourage the Heart).

The original intent of this study was to examine the statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and the leadership practices aggregately, along with selected personal characteristics. This researcher amended the original plans in order to examine the relationship of each of the leadership practices with each of the organizational commitment components individually, excluding personal characteristics. This study found a positive relationship between Affective and Normative commitment and all Five Leadership Practices with a range of r=.35-r=.4 and r=.31-r=.39 respectively. The relationship between Continuance commitment and all Five Leadership Practices showed a weak positive relationship with a range of r=.07-r=.15. Statistical data and implications for findings are included.
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Chapter 1 Introduction to the Study

In this chapter, the research discussed the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment. A statement of the problem, the research questions, and hypotheses were presented. Also included are the significance of the study, overview of methodology, definitions, and further organization of the study.

Background of the Study

Leadership is a relationship between the leader and those who choose to follow, (Kouzes & Posner, 2011) and it is the fundamental task of leaders to “prime good feeling in those they lead” (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKe, 2002, p. ix). It is not all about numbers; it is also emotional. If the focus is only on the task, the interpersonal relationships leaders need to build and maintain suffer. Leadership is not all about intellectual ability or technical expertise; it is about how well leaders manage themselves and others.

Successful leaders “must be flexible to adapt to the ever changing workforce” due to the switch from highly intellectual management to highly emotional management (Alston, 2009). The practice of “strict, hierarchal work structures are often replaced by autonomous, team based structures”, and organizations are becoming more “reliant on employees’ initiative, conscientiousness, and readiness to cooperate” (Meierhans, Rietmann, & Jonas, 2008, p. 131). Steers and Spencer echo that sentiment, but they wrote about the autonomy and job design more than 30 years ago (1977).

Organizational commitment is something that organizations have sought to understand for decades, internationally and nationally (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006; Klein, Becker, & Meyer, 2009). Three authors did a study in 1947 that considered
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demographics as a construct when measuring turnover. Their findings advised that the turnover frequency was lower in workers who were over the age of 30, had completed 10 years of formal education, were married; and had at least one dependent (Tiffin, Parker, & Habersat, 1947). Organizational commitment, also known as company loyalty, has been studied extensively by many notable authors. A committed employee is evidence of an engaged employee (Kruse, 2012).

Statement of the Problem

Organizational commitment has significantly declined in the recent history. According to the Department of Labor, “younger baby boomers held an average of 11 jobs from ages 18 to 44. On average, men held 11.4 jobs and women held 10.7 jobs” (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The problem is how we as leaders impact organizational commitment. Thus, the research problem led to the research questions: Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment? Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment? Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

Purpose of the Study

With globalization, competition increases and the leader has to find his niche. Bossidy and Charan accurately assert “virtually every business is now a player on the global stage” (Bossidy & Charan, 2004, p. 29). It has always been a factor, but not in the way an organization experiences now. According to Ulrich and Smallwood, “the world is a global village, and all of the issues of relating to globalization are important elements of
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the managerial choice” (Hesselbein & Goldsmith, 2009, p. 15). There is a definite fiscal impact resulting from organizational commitment. A small increase in employee commitment translates into customer commitment, resulting in profitability (Ulrich, 2000).

Research Questions

The surveys used were the Meyer and Allen Three Component Employee Commitment Survey (TCM) and Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). Along with the leadership and commitment surveys, a survey with demographical and position classification questions was distributed to respondents for completion. The surveys provided the employee’s perception of his manager’s leadership practices in relation to his own level of organizational commitment, within his respective organization.

Organizational commitment directly relates to performance, retention, and attendance (Hedges, 1983; Klein et al., 2009; Steers & Spencer, 1977). This study further contributed to the research available by determining if the leadership practices exhibited by leaders had a positive relationship with the employee’s level of organizational commitment. The results of this study were used to accept or reject the hypotheses and answer the following questions:

1. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment?
2. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment?
3. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

**Conceptual Framework**

Organizational commitment affects an employee’s behavior through employee retention, performance, and attendance (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Steers & Spencer, 1977). All of these affected behaviors will result in a fiscal impact to the organization. The original intent of this study was to examine the statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and the leadership practices aggregately, along with selected personal characteristics.

The leaders’ perceived leadership practices were examined to determine if they exhibited a correlation with the individual’s level of organizational commitment, in two Midwestern organizations. When a positive relationship is evident between the leader’s perceived leadership practice and organizational commitment along with certain demographic characteristics, the level of organizational commitment will result in a more committed employee. This will then contribute to a competitive advantage in the marketplace.

Determining if any relationship exists may increase discernability when recruiting and developing employees in the leadership positions. This theoretical position is putting the onus of organizational commitment on the leader.
Significance of Study

This study added to the discourse concerning leadership and organizational commitment. The leader affects the climate of the organization, “roughly 50 to 70 percent of how employees perceive their organization’s climate can be traced to the actions of one person: the leader” (Goleman et al., 2002, p. 18). Leadership Practices are likely to have an impact on organizational commitment; there is an excellent opportunity to contribute to more research to substantiate this theory. Organizational commitment has continued to see a significant decline in the recent history.

According to the Department of Labor, a study conducted in 2010 examined the number of jobs people held who were from 1957 to 1964. It was found that “younger baby boomers held an average of 11 jobs from ages 18 to 44. On average, men held 11.4 jobs and women held 10.7 jobs” (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The same longitudinal study, referred to as National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY1979), found that this same age range of people also experiences an average of 5.2 spells of unemployment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).
There are numerous books and articles available on employee commitment, loyalty, and engagement. It is a topic of interest to many; the fiscal impact felt by an organization resulting from organizational commitment, the positive and negative, helps justify any investment made into identifying and improving the trend. It was found that how people feel about the company they work accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the business performance (Goleman et al., 2002). The leader’s actions affect how the subordinates feel and therefore perform (Goleman et al., 2002).

Overview of Methodology

The researcher used a correlation design in an attempt to address the problem of this study and answer the research questions. To determine the variables of the study, the researcher used Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), and the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. Additionally, there was a demographic survey composed of qualifiers relevant to the particular organizations. The researcher sent one survey packet to each possible participant which consisted of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), Three Component Model (TCM) Employment Commitment Survey and the demographic survey, all found in the appendix.

A total of 194 survey packets were distributed within facets of two different organizations, Midwest Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. The survey packets were distributed via hard copy and electronic means, dependent upon the possible respondent’s needs and availability. The researcher used the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) to identify the leader’s leadership practices as perceived by those he
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leads. The Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey was used to determine the level commitment representative of the employees.

Definitions

This section contains the definitions used to design the research study. These operational definitions are provided to offer the reader a better understanding of the concepts that were examined.

Leadership- as defined by Northouse is: “…a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (2007, p. 3). He also goes on to mention that leadership involves influence and occurs in groups, and putting it all together, it is about a group of people trying to achieve something together (2007).

Webster defines a leader as “one that goes along to guide others, one that is foremost, sets an example” (1980, p. 509). Leadership is a relationship between the leader and those who choose to follow (Kouzes & Posner, 2011).

The Five Exemplary Leadership Practices are based on over 25 years of research. Leadership can be learned, and these five practices are evident in successful leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Each of the five practices contains two elements designed to define the actions the leaders take in order to exemplify the leadership practice:

1) Model the way by finding one’s voice and setting the example, 2) inspire a shared vision by envisioning the future and enlisting others, 3) challenge the process by searching for opportunities and experimenting and taking risks, 4) enable others to act by fostering collaboration and strengthening others, and 5) encourage the heart by recognizing contributions and celebrating the values and victories (Alston, 2009, p. 5).
Commitment- Webster defines commitment or commit as: “to give in trust, to pledge or assign to a particular course or use” (Webster, 1980, p. 178) and Herscovitch and Meyer define it as: “…a force [mind set] that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets” (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002, p. 475).

Mowday, Porter, and Steers define organizational commitment as:

…the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa, also assert that the binding relationship may include a relationship with another individual, group, or organization (1986).

Meyer and Allen developed a three-component approach to measuring organizational commitment. The three components include Affective (desire based), Continuance (cost-based), and Normative (obligation based) commitment. Employees with a strong Affective commitment remain because they want to stay; employees with a strong Continuance commitment stay because they feel the need to stay, and employees with a strong Normative commitment feel they should stay out of obligation (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Globalization is “the increasing movements of goods, services, and capital across national borders, a process that is an ongoing series of interrelated events” (Lawrence & Weber, 2008, p. 139).
Organization of Study

The researcher included five chapters in this dissertation. In the first chapter, the researcher introduced the background of the research, stated the problem, the conceptual framework, and presented the research questions to investigate the significance of the research, as well as provide an overview of the study along with the definitions. In chapter 2, she provided a literature review of leadership, and organizational commitment. The literature review was summarized in Chapter 2.

In chapter 3, the researcher provided the methodology utilized in the study of the relationship between leadership and organizational commitments. In this, she laid out the research questions, the hypotheses, the perspective and a review of the participants in the research. There is also an overview of the surveys used in the research, the procedures used in the research, and a summary.

Chapter 4 contains the demographic data, the reliability of the surveys that were used, descriptive statistics, and results of the correlation analyses, the hypotheses results, and a summary.

In Chapter 5, the researcher reviewed the purpose of the research, presented the results and discussed the implication of the findings while presenting the limitations of the study. In addition, there are recommendations for future research along with a conclusion.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

Leadership

Leadership, as defined by Northouse: “…a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (2007, p. 3). He also goes on to mention that leadership involves influence and occurs in groups, and putting it all together, it is about a group of people trying to achieve something together (2007).

Leadership is abundantly written about, but still remains a complex subject. Perhaps what adds to the complexity is that leadership involves not only the leader but the followers. The climate of the organization can be traced back to the leader; “the boss creates the conditions that determine the people’s ability to work well” (Goleman et al., 2002).

Kotterman puts into words what many people grapple with, because understanding the differences between leadership and management have always been difficult. The two disciplines often are used interchangeably in the workplace, creating confusion (2006). Management and leadership are decidedly different practices and actions (Kotterman, 2006). Leadership is not meant for someone to use the position for self-seeking benefits and to motivate others to achieve one’s own self interests (Maciariello, 2003).

Leadership is a relationship of mutual understanding or trust between people with one of them having the responsibility priming the good feeling in those they lead (Goleman et al., 2002). For a leader to find their method successfully applied, they must find an emotional connection to those they are leading. Otherwise, they are only going to be managing, not leading. The text says it exceedingly appropriately: “Without a healthy
dose of heart, a supposed “leader” may manage—but he does not lead” (Goleman et al., 2002, p. 21).

A leader is responsible for leading their subordinates to accomplish the vision that they set forth for them. It is the leadership’s responsibility to communicate their vision clearly to the managers. “Leadership does not provide direction to a well-oiled team. Leadership instead provides the vision of the end result” (Krumle & Kelly, 2000).

Leaders have a significant influence on those they lead, Kouzes and Posner write about Irwin Federman’s thoughts on inspiring loyalty and commitment:

You don’t love someone because of who they are, you love them because of the way they make you feel. This axiom applies equally in a company setting. It may seem inappropriate to use words such as love and affection in relation to business. Conventional wisdom has it that management is not a popularity contest…I contend, however, that all things being equal, we will work harder and more effectively for people we like. And will like them in direct proportion to how they make us feel (Kouzes & Posner, 2011, p. 27).

The extra effort given by an employee who feels a fondness to the leader will translate into organizational commitment so that the business, community, and economy can be regenerated (Kouzes & Posner, 2011).

Leadership Styles

Some view leadership as a power relationship while others see it as a transformational process. Additionally, there are those that view leadership as a skills perspective (Northouse, 2007). Leadership styles are discussed in Primal Leadership. The aspects of leadership discussed are generated from emotional connection using
scientific concepts to explain why humans react, whether positively or negatively to those emotional connections (Goleman et al., 2002).

Trait Approach. The trait theory is one that considers a leader is born with their leadership traits, and they have “…special or innate or inborn characteristics or qualities that make them leaders and it is these qualities that differentiate them from nonleaders” (Northouse, 2007, p. 4). It has been researched extensively and has been substantiated by research. The trait approach allows for assessors to have a benchmark to measure other individuals against and an opportunity to prove the effectiveness of the leader’s strengths and weaknesses (Northouse, 2007). It is further explained as: “This approach emphasizes that having a leader with a certain set of traits is crucial to having effective leadership” (Northouse, 2007, p. 32). Although, it is a plausible leadership approach, only assuming one is born with leadership ability could be considered to be quite restrictive when looking at some of the other leadership theories.

Skills Approach. The skills approach asserts that a leader is leading because of the skills he possesses. This approach focuses on the skills that are used and those that need developed within the leader. This leadership approach is accessible to all that are willing to learn and develop, not only those who are born with innate leadership skills.

There are three skills related to this approach: technical, human and conceptual. In addition to the skills above, there are also three competencies listed by Northouse relating to this leadership approach: problem solving, social judgment skills, and knowledge. All three are intertwined and interrelated; each is necessary to develop the skills approach competently. A leader must have a certain degree of all three competencies in order to lead effectively.
Situational Approach. Every situation is different and requires leadership to evolve to fit the situation. Northouse says it efficiently: “The premise of the theory is that different situations demand different kinds of leadership” (Northouse, 2007, p. 91). An additional aspect of the leader’s responsibility that lends itself to the situational approach is when one recognizes the needs of the employees and he makes adaptations to meet those needs (Northouse, 2007). This approach is comprised of a lot of direction giving along with coaching, it is not dictatorial. Coach leaders identify people’s strengths and weaknesses to help promote their personal and career ambitions; they delegate challenging tasks to subordinate for stimulation (Goleman et al., 2002).

Contingency Theory. This theory, “leader-match theory, tries to match leaders to appropriate situations” (Northouse, 2007, p. 113). The contingency aspect of the theory suggests that a leader’s effectiveness depends on how well the style fits the context. This theory is different from the situational approach in that the leader is not changing styles to fit the situation (Northouse, 2007). The organization is placing the leader in what they deem to be an effective role. One advantage to this theory is that if a leader has exhibited this theory in one position, it is easier to know if that particular leader could be effective in another role, in a similar position (Northouse, 2007).

Path-Goal Theory. The path-goal leadership theory’s objective is motivating subordinates to accomplish the leader’s goals in the condition they are finding themselves facing (Northouse, 2007). It is recommended that the leader choose a leadership style that fits the needs of his followers and the task at hand (Northouse, 2007).

R. J. House and others introduced the path-goal leadership theories in the 1970’s and described it as a leadership style that requires the leader to be flexible and
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compassionate. He asserts that an effective leader will assist those he leads on the path which will ultimately lead to organizationally-desired and individually-valued outcomes (House, 1971).

This theory focuses on the effective leaders’ styles and methods changing depending on the subordinates and the situation (Mello, 1999). In 1996, House clarified some assumptions that were made in the earlier writings. The first writings put many assumptions on the level of the leader, and that they would have the cognitive ability to discern what level of motivation was necessary. In this latest writing, he emphasizes that the situation will more likely dictate the motivation needed rather than the subordinates (House, 1996).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX). LMX is a process that is centered on the interactions between the leader and his followers (Northouse, 2007). LMX is related to organizational commitment, performance, and empowerment, resulting in positive organizational outcomes (Northouse, 2007). One concern would be partiality. If the relationship was centered and focused to include one member or one group, many opportunities could be missed. This is not to say that there would not be certain situations that would require a certain individual or group, but care must be taken not to exclude others.

Transformational Leadership. This could be the most popular and most highly regarded leadership practice because it is a leadership process that transforms people (Northouse, 2007). He says: “Transformational leadership is the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (Northouse, 2007, p. 176). Through a
leader’s behavior, leading by example, they have the ability to build and sustain trust from their subordinates (Joseph & Winston, 2005).

One of the criticisms regarding this practice is that is primarily based on a personality trait rather than behavior which someone could be instructed to achieve (Northouse, 2007). This is something that could be overcome if the leader is willing to make the effort. Many times, with the proper tools and effort, new practices can be learned; perhaps transformational leadership could be learned as well. Personalities, on a smaller scale, are somewhat like behaviors; they can be altered and developed.

Team Leadership. A leader making decisions based on what would allow for the greatest effectiveness of the team (Northouse, 2007). This is a practice that exhibits top down leadership, but not in a dictatorial manner. It is for the good of the team, but the team is not part of the decision making. They are driving the decisions of the leader based on their effectiveness. The leader could easily become any member of the team, not necessarily the pre-established leader.

Psychodynamic Approach. This approach is based on personalities, of the leader and the followers. In the text, it is described as: “In the psychodynamic approach, personality types are emphasized, and evidence is presented that suggests that different personality types are better suited to certain leadership positions or situations” (Northouse, 2007, p. 237). Additionally, the text states that: “The psychodynamic approach begins with an examination of the roots of the individual in the family” (Northouse, 2007, p. 238).

Leadership Ethics. Ethics is concerned with the “virtuousness of individuals and their motives” (Northouse, 2007, p. 342). This leads to credibility; which is one trait
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known to foster the motivation to follow the leaders. Honesty has been consistently selected as the most salient trait by all respondents to Kouzes and Posner’s twenty-five years of research (2007, p. 30). In order for a leader to be able to be successful at leading, they must first show themselves to be credible.

Five Exemplary Leadership Principles

Kouzes and Posner assert that these practices have been seen in successful settings, but they are not necessarily coming from extraordinary people. They have been seen in every type of organization; everyone is capable of implementing the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership. “Leadership is not about personality; it’s about behavior” (Kouzes & Posner, The Leadership Challenge, 2007, p. 15).

Kouzes and Posner’s Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership are transformational in nature: “Transformational leadership is the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (Northouse, 2007, p. 176). This is done through behavior as will be delineated below. Leaders lead by example; spending time and attention wisely demonstrate what is important to the leader (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Kouzes and Posner examine leadership based on behavior. This is reflected in the belief that leadership is not innate; it can be learned. “Are leaders born or made? Surely, both. On one hand, leadership is an “elusive and electric quality” that comes directly from God. On the other, leadership skills are distributed widely among every community and should be cultivated and developed” (Sanders, 2007, p. 29).
According to the over 25 years of research done by Kouzes and Posner, an effective leader will Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable others to Act, or Encourage the Heart in his leadership endeavors. These five practices are independent yet dependent upon one another and leaders could exhibit more than one. It is about behavior, not innate characteristics. All Five Exemplary Leadership Practices are explained below:

Model the Way refers to leading by example; exemplary leaders motivate followers by setting the example through direct involvement in the organization’s mission. Inspire a Shared Vision means the leader is able to formulate, verbalize, and create enthusiasm for a vision of the organization. To create a desire to strive for the organization’s goals, the leader must motivate the followers by relating to their personal goals and ambitions. Challenge the Process is the leader’s ability to look for and choose innovative ways to improve the organization. The leader must study the organization and its people to determine the best course of improvement to lead the organization to become more. The category Enable Others to Act is the leader’s ability to create teamwork and trust and to empower followers to work toward the organization’s goals. Lastly, Encourage the Heart refers to the leader’s resilience to keep motivating and encouraging the followers through the exhaustion and frustration that often occurs with change (Rowland, 2008, p. 13).

Organizational Commitment

It is not surprising that the subject of organizational commitment has been written about extensively. Klein et al., maintain “commitment is one of the most frequently examined constructs in the study of organizational phenomena” because it is necessary
and relevant. It is found to have a direct relation to the outcome of turnover, absenteeism, and performance within an organization (2009, p. 3). Herscovitch and Meyer attribute that phenomenon to the changes that the 21st century brought about as well as the fact that it is arguably one of the most important factors involved in employees’ support for change initiatives (2002). A committed employee is described as “one who stays with the organization through thick and thin, attends work regularly, puts in a full day (and maybe more), protects company goals, and so on” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 3). A committed employee is evidence of an engaged employee (Kruse, 2012).

Organizational commitment affects an employee’s behavior through employee retention, performance, and attendance (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Studies have also shown that feedback affects the employee’s emotion which in turn affects organizational commitment in direct relationship to behavior and turnover (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2009). All of these affected behaviors will have a fiscal impact on the organization, “high levels of organizational commitment lead to several favorable organizational outcomes” (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006).

Greater discernment will be able to be practiced when recruiting and developing individuals if it is determined that the leadership practices have a direct cause and effect relationship on an individual’s organizational commitment. It was found in one research piece that the trend of the last 20 years was to reward people that are quick studies, more than what was done in the past (Gentry, Griggs, Deal, Mondrue, & Cox, 2011).

Fiscal Impact

Performance. Research has maintained that the level of commitment possessed by an individual is reflected in his job performance (Beer, 2009). An employee’s work
performance is related to his work attitude, but one must look further than attitude and find out what nurtures the attitude. Job satisfaction is evident in a work attitude and work attitude transcends into job performance (Kammeyer-Mueller, 2005).

Retention/Turnover. Turnover is significantly influenced by age, tenure, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job security (Shore & Martin, 1989; Arnold, 1982). Turnover rates are higher during the first few years of employee’s tenure (Weller, 2009). Employee turnover is representative of employees’ organizational commitment (Chadna & Krishnan, 2009).

Turnover expenses such as recruitment and training of new employees account for a generous portion of most organizations’ budgets. Reducing these expenditures will benefit the company fiscally, and allow for the monies to appropriated for professional development opportunities within the organization, thus enhancing employee commitment (Klein et al., 2009). Turnover rates have been found to be fairly consistent among organizations of varied sizes (Porter & Steers, 1973).

Some organizations are beginning to approach retention from the front end, when a potential employee is considered for hire. There is a pervasive need to understand retention and turnover because of the potential costs associated with voluntary turnover (Barrick, 2005). According to Human Resource magazines and websites it is more beneficial to retain an employee than to recruit and train a replacement. It was also shown in one study that voluntary separation is easier to recover from than involuntary separation (Park, 2012). Besides the loss of productivity when an employee leaves an organization, there is the cost of advertising, back ground checks, Human Resources’
time to review applicants, and possibly, the cost of overtime for the employees to complete the work the vacated employee would have done (Gunter, 1997).

According to the United States Department of Labor, the average separation rate for non-farm category field is 3.5% per month since January of 2002. Voluntary and involuntary separations are included. However, when only non-farm quit rates are examined for the last ten years, this percentage averages out to 1.8 a month (Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey, 2012).

Attendance. Mowday et al., assert that there are two factors that affect attendance, the motivation to attend, and the ability to attend (1982). Assuming the employee has the ability to attend, the motivation to attend rests on two variables. That is: “an employee’s affective response to the job situation and various internal and external pressures to attend” (Mowday et al., 1982, pp. 82-83). It seems in today’s work environment workers are feeling more at liberty to miss work; this decreases productivity, which in turn could negatively impact customer satisfaction. It is also understood that legitimate absenteeism and flagrant absenteeism are not easily distinguishable (Hedges, 1983). When studying organizations of varying sizes, it was found that absenteeism is significantly higher in larger organizations than smaller ones (Porter & Steers, 1973).

Three Component Models of Employee Commitment

Meyer and Allen developed a three-component approach to measuring organizational commitment. The three components are Affective (desire based), Continuance (cost-based), and Normative (obligation based) commitment. Employees with a strong Affective commitment remain because they want to stay; employees with a strong Continuance commitment stay because they feel the need to stay, and employees
with a strong Normative commitment feel they should stay out of obligation (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Affective Commitment. The strongest correlation in one study was found to be between Affective commitment and overall job satisfaction (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Allen and Meyer’s questionnaire focuses primarily on the Affective component when measuring organizational commitment (Solinger, van Olffen, & Roe, 2008) as Affective commitment refers to how an employee identifies himself within the organization and his involvement and emotional attachment (Schmidt, 2007). Affective commitment can be seen to positively affect job performance, retention, and attendance, areas that have been identified to have a fiscal impact on an organization.

Continuance Commitment. This model will be evidenced by an employee who stays with the company because of the costs associated with leaving; the costs are too high to leave. Commitment of this sort would breed resentment and frustration that could result in poor performance (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Continuance commitment is not thought to have a positive impact on job performance unless the employee also feels an Affective commitment to the organization. This model unquestionably impacts attendance and retention due to the cost implications the employee would suffer if he were to voluntarily leave the organization.

Normative Commitment. An employee exhibiting this type of commitment will stay with the organization out of duty. This will many times motivate an employee to “behave appropriately and do what is right for the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 25). There are mixed results as to how Normative commitment affects attendance, but for the most part, it is generally thought that the obligation to do the right thing will drive
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a Normative committed employee to high attendance. The correlations are somewhat similar with Affective commitment in terms of job performance and retention, extremely positively related (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The negative aspect from this model of commitment could be seen in resentment, likely not to the point of impacting the performance of particular job duties, only evident in his willingness to go above and beyond his established job duties.

Possible Factors Impacting Organizational Commitment

Globalization. According to Ulrich and Smallwood, “the world is a global village, and all of the issues of relating to globalization are important elements of the managerial choice” (Hesselbein & Goldsmith, 2009, p. 15). With globalization, competition increases and the leader has to find his niche. Bossidy and Charan accurately assert “virtually every business is now a play on the global stage” (2004, p. 29). Globalization has always been a factor, but not in the way an organization experiences now. Due to the effects of globalization and the transition from highly intellectual management to highly emotional management, successful leaders “must be flexible to adapt to the ever changing workforce” (Alston, 2009). Many organizations are experiencing the effects of globalization and the additional competition that comes with it (Hesselbein & Goldsmith, 2009).

People Investment. Professional development opportunities are usually provided through human resource specialists within a company (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005). Larger organizations generally have the resources to commit Human Resource specialists to an organizational plan and smaller organizations do not have the expertise or people to implement Human Resource Development (p. 593). It is crucial for smaller organizations
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to ensure they are “able to attract, retain and motivate high quality employees with effective transferable skills through the existence of a strategic training plan and a specific budget for training” (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005, p. 593).

The fiscal impact of organizational commitment is likely felt by smaller organizations much sooner than larger organizations. “Major contributing factors to the failure of many small firms are a lack of attention given to the development of a robust business plan, goals and objectives, organizing and resourcing for the new venture and development of people assets” (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005, p. 592). It is essential for smaller organizations to “attract, retain and motivate high quality employees with effective transferable skills through the existence of a strategic training plan and a specific budget for training” (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005, p. 592).

Milne writes that knowing how to motivate and know what motivates employees are two decidedly different things. A manager may never be able to motivate an employee, but for him to determine the motivating factor can help to pair an employee’s motivations with that of the organization’s (2007). Determining what motivates an individual fosters contentment and will pay dividends, “Strong companies know the kinds of people they want and hire those who fit the mold” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 143). They have been known to risk a lot because they believed in someone and his capabilities. Another well-known author words the process as this: “…first get the right people on the bus, the wrong people off the bus, and the right people in the right seats – and then they figured out where to drive it” (Collins, 2001, p. 13).

In one study conducted with Herman Miller Furniture, it was evident that the organization has a philosophy which places importance on the individual and his task.
However, since they are a commercial enterprise, the customer is the center stage, and it is the goal of the company to find where or if the individual fits according to the commercial enterprise (Manz, Manz, Adams, & Shipper, 2010). In another study, it was found that job scope positively influences organizational commitment and job performance (Steers & Spencer, 1977).

Personal Characteristics. Age and gender have been found to have an impact on organizational commitment. Women tend to work less in a lifetime, but their commitment levels are higher (Hedges, 1983). However, the same study found that married men demonstrated a higher level of commitment when considering organization commitment comparative to a desire to work as many hours as possible (Hedges, 1983).

Economy Driven. “Downsizing is becoming more common in the United States”, this was a comment made in 1991 (Cameron, Freeman, & Mishra, 1991), and 32 years later, the mass layoffs rates are higher than in 1991 (Mass Layoff Statistics Home Page, 2013). When the Cameron et al., research was published, the unemployment rate fluctuated between 6.4% and 7% and in 2012; the rate fluctuated between 7.8% and 8.3% (Mass Layoff Statistics Home Page, 2013).

Absences, directly related to organizational commitment, have slightly declined relative to the increase in unemployment. When Hedges completed her research, it was thought that this improved work ethic was attributed to the fact that employees need to protect their jobs (Hedges, 1983). The same could be said of the current situation when looking at the trend of the unemployment rates although there has been a decrease in mass layoff events and worker separations from 2009 to 2011.
The data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the mass layoffs events for 2009 as 3,835, 2010 as 1,412, and 2011 as 1,196 in the manufacturing field. The mass layoff events resulted in actual separation numbers of 668,265, 224,182, and 194,458 in the same years (Mass Layoff Statistics Home Page, 2013). It noteworthy that even though manufacturing accounted for the “largest number of workers separated by extended layoffs among all major industry sectors in 2011, this sector recorded its lowest annual number of separations since BLS began recording MLS data in 1996” (Mass Layoff Statistics Home Page, 2013, p. 1).

When white and blue collar workers of a large manufacturing firm were respondents in a quantitative research project, the results indicated that the negative work attitudes were more prevalent in employees who had repeated contact with mass layoffs (Moore, Grunberg, & Greenberg, 2004). This would likely be more evident when layoffs are at a higher rate.

One study focused on employees’ commitment levels and the turnover intentions prior to a downsizing resulting in a layoff and after the layoff took place. The study looked at the perceived commitment of the organization to its employees and the commitment the employees felt toward the organization, only considering Affective and Continuance commitment (Armstrong-Stassen, 2004). Armstrong-Stassen’s findings demonstrate that the “perceived commitment of the organization to employees play an important role in how employees respond to the organizational downsizing” (2004, p. 57). When Affective commitment and organizational support measured after the layoff, there was a significant relationship with those antecedents and intention to remain with the organization. The employees responded less negatively if downsizing occurs than
employees whose organizations have not demonstrated such commitment to the employees. Conversely, the Continuance commitment employees exhibited a greater negative reaction at the threat of downsizing (Armstrong-Stassen, 2004).

Actual Work. One motivator that has been seen when studying organizational commitment is the work itself (Brockner, Wiesenfeld, Reed, Grover, & Martin, 1993). This study measured organizational commitment after the layoff. It was determined that the survivors were influenced by how the layoff was handled, how the organization has changed post layoff, and the intrinsic quality of the job they held. There was also a direct relationship between organizational commitment and the employee’s perceived job quality (Brockner et al., 1993).

Manufacturing

In one study involving a steel manufacturing facility, the employees who felt greater loyalty (commitment) to the organization were of the subset who perceived high levels of support (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). In fact, the authors assert that for the employees’ need for approval, affiliation, and esteem to be met, they need to form a global view concerning the organization’s commitment to them. Doing this, they will be more likely to have increased performance by “(a) raising the tendency to interpret the organization's gains and losses as the employee's own, (b) creating evaluation biases in judging the organization's actions and characteristics, and (c) increasing the internalization of the organization's values and norms” (Eisenberger et al., 1990, p. 57).

It was found that how pay freezes were communicated to salaried employees of a manufacturing firm made the difference on how it was received. The facilitator was
evaluated at the end of the workshop and rated on the effectiveness in relationship to other variables, commitment being one of them. There were two groups in this research. The first group was a control group, consisting of individuals whose statements and concerns were acknowledged, but resulted in no interjection by the facilitator. The second, a group of individuals were given canned dialogue by the facilitator when they made statements or raised concerns. The demographics were not significantly different between the two groups, but the reception was notably different. This study resulted in evidence showing that

…resentment toward perceived harm resulting from organizational change can be mitigated by an explanation that justifies company procedures. Economic hardship was positively related to job dissatisfaction, lack of commitment, and turnover intentions, but only among people who did not receive the explanation (Schaubroeck, May, & Brown, 1994).

The facilitator’s response was canned, but it provided the inquiring employees some further explanation as to why the pay freeze was implemented. It allowed them to be empathetic and be willing to have the global view the first study discussed, primarily “raising the tendency to interpret the organization’s gains or losses as the employee’s own” (Eisenberger et al., 1990).

The employees’ organizational commitment is influenced by their perception of the organization’s support to them (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The study was conducted with 66 employees of a manufacturing firm combined with other industries for a total sample size of 361 respondents. The results showed that the employees often times reciprocated perceived organizational support by altering their efforts to meet
organizational goals (Eisenberger et al., 1986). It becomes apparent that it is not just the employees of a manufacturing firm that have higher levels of organizational commitment when they perceive that the organization is committed to them; it could be any industry or organization.

Summary of Literature

Chapter 2 provided a review of literature relating to leadership, organizational commitment and various factors that impact commitment. Neither leadership nor organizational commitment is a novel study subject. Organizations increasingly need to find their competitive edge; it may be identified in the asset of people, finding what will make them stay committed to the organization and putting them in the right positions (Collins, 2001). Leaders must connect with the hearts of their employees in order to expect commitment. “How much desire do they have to sacrifice for the mission? Not very far, and not very much. They might be “committed” to their duty, but they were not committed to following him” (Cloud, 2006, p. 54). There might be a need to find the motivator, possibly job design or rewards.

There have been multiple influences on organizational commitment researched. Some variants that have been studied are the work itself, communication, effects of the economy and employee development. One recurrent variant studied by many was the perceived organizational commitment and how that impacts the level of organizational commitment felt by an employee (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Schaubroeck et al., 1994; Armstrong-Stassen, 2004).

There are a great deal of studies available examining the relationship that organizational commitment has with many variants. This study contributed to the
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repertoire by looking at the relationship between the Five Leadership Practices as identified by Kouzes and Posner and the components of commitment as propagated by Meyer and Allen. With the effects of globalization and the recession era economy, organizations are looking to maintain their competitive advantage. Identifying what positively impacts of organizational commitment in their organizations may achieve that. Two Midwestern organizations have graciously allowed this research to take place using their employees and leaders.
Chapter 3 Methodology

In this chapter, the researcher described the research methodology used to test the hypotheses and the rationale behind it. This chapter was used to explain the methodology of the research in order to answer the research questions posed as significant questions investigated empirically (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Detailed information was provided to explain the context of the study, the organizations, the participants, the instruments, and methods used in gathering the data. The chapter ended with an explanation of the analysis of the data.

The researcher conducted a study to determine if any relationship existed between leadership and organizational commitment. To investigate the problem, the following research questions and alternate hypotheses were analyzed:

1. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment?

   \[ H_{1a} \] There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Model the Way and the employee’s Affective organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   \[ H_{2a} \] There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision and the employee’s Affective organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   \[ H_{3a} \] There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Challenge the Process and the employee’s Affective organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.
H₄a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Enable Others to Act and the employee’s Affective organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

H₅a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Encourage the Heart and the employee’s Affective organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

2. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment?

H₆a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Model the Way and the employee’s Continuance organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

H₇a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision and the employee’s Continuance organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

H₈a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Challenge the Process and the employee’s Continuance organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

H₉a  There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Enable Others to Act and the employee’s Continuance organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

H₁₀a There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Encourage the Heart and the employee’s Continuance organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.
3. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

   H11a There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Model the Way and the employee’s Normative organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   H12a There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Inspire a Shared Vision and the employee’s Normative organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   H13a There is a positive relationship between leader’s leadership practice of Challenge the Process and the employee’s Normative organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   H14a There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Enable Others to Act and the employee’s Normative organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

   H15a There is a positive relationship between the leader’s leadership practice of Encourage the Heart and the employee’s Normative organizational commitment at Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company.

Research Perspective

The research was quantitative and used a correlation design. In an attempt to answer the research questions and evaluate the hypotheses, two surveys were used. In the correlation study, the researcher used the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) examined the Five Exemplary Leadership
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Practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. While the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey examined three components of organizational commitment, Affective commitment, Continuance commitment, and Normative commitment.

The researcher obtained permission to use both of these validated surveys. Permission for the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is found in appendix H, and permission for the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey is for one time academic purpose, no formal permission was necessary. The researcher also used a self-constructed demographic survey to obtain the following information from the participant at Midwest Manufacturing Facility: gender, age range, highest level of education completed, current shift working, job classification, and length of time worked for current employer. The following demographic information was presented on the survey for the participants of Publishing Company: gender, age range, highest level of education completed, current shift working, current job status, job classification, and length of time worked for current employer.

The researcher calculated correlation coefficients for the relationship of all three components of organizational commitment and all five of the leadership practices. The method used consisted of the selection of the research method; population and sampling; survey selection; data collection; data capturing; and data statistical analysis.

Ethical Considerations

The participants and organizations alike were assured that anonymity would be maintained. The letters to the participants advised each one that his participation was
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strictly voluntary, and considerations would be taken to maintain confidentiality. The researcher linked participants to their respective organizations, beyond that the participants remained anonymous.

Research Participants

Two organizations participated, both wish to remain anonymous. One organization is a manufacturing facility, a subsidiary of a Fortune 500 company with other North American sister plants throughout the Midwest, Canada, and Mexico. The other organization is a publishing company which is a family owned and operated. Both of the organizations surveyed for this study would be characterized as small.

The manufacturing organization will be identified as Midwestern Manufacturing Facility hereinafter. This organization employs approximately 1000 people at the subject locale, with most departments experiencing seasonal production reductions resulting in personnel lay-offs. The department that participated in this research consisted of approximately 149 team members, comprised of a year round day and night shift. In order to reach the entire population of a department, including all shifts, it was thought that this department would be the only one that would meet the parameters established by this researcher. This sample population was sufficiently reflective of the permanent full time employees, even though the results were not from the entire population of the facility.

The second organization will be identified as Publishing Company hereinafter. It is family owned and operated, and part of a varied and extensive media conglomeration throughout the region. There are approximately 47 employees in Publishing Company, with 45 possible respondents.
The population of the department used for Midwestern Manufacturing Facility was 149 employees. The surveys were distributed by hand, in a sealed envelope stapled to the weekly pay stubs. After the three week survey period, 28 surveys were collected with 26 completed. Internet access was not available at Midwest Manufacturing Facility for the participants.

The population of Publishing Company was 45. There were 28 electronic surveys and 17 paper surveys distributed. Some of the participants at Publishing Company had access to complete the survey electronically, and some did not. Both capabilities were taken into account for survey distribution at Publishing Company.

A second survey period was established due to the timing of the survey period. The assistant publisher felt that he could promote research in a manner that would foster greater participation; he felt that participation lacked the first time and wanted to distribute the survey again. The participation numbers and percentages can be seen in Table 3.1.

The first survey period was ten days with a total of 16 respondents; resulting in 14 completed surveys, all from the electronic source. The second survey period was for three days, requesting only those who did not participate the first time to participate this time. A new electronic survey link was generated for distribution to 28 possible respondents, and 17 new paper surveys were placed in sealed envelopes.

Between the two organizations, there was a population of 194 with a participant rate of 29% with 57 respondents submitting completed surveys. There were four surveys removed prior to analysis due to incomplete responses.

Table 3.1
Participant Numbers and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MWM</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Percentage</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments Used in Data Collection

Two previously validated surveys were used along with one general demographic survey constructed by this researcher relevant to each organization. Examples of all three surveys can be found in the Appendix. The permission letter from Wiley allowing the researcher to use the observer version of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is also in the Appendix. The publisher of the TCM Employee Commitment survey (2004) allows one use in an academic research study.

Participant Letters

The participant letters were developed to be relevant to the details of each organization’s specifics. The survey dates and the collection methods were different. In addition to the participant letter that went out with the hard copy surveys, there was a letter included as the opening page for the electronic survey participants. All of the participant letters are in the appendix.

Surveys

Leadership Practices. The first survey, representative of the one of the independent variables was the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). This survey measured the leaders in five areas of leadership, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.
The researcher used the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) due to its ability to assess the five leadership practices of the leaders of the organizations. The survey was comprised of 30 questions with a 10 point Likert scale: (1) Almost Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Seldom, (4) Once in a While, (5) Occasionally, (6) Sometimes, (7) Fairly Often, (8) Usually, (9) Very Frequently, and (10) Almost Always. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) has two versions, “self” and “observer”. This researcher used “observer” in this study.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Categories and Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 8 13, 18, 23, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these five practices contains two elements designed to define the actions the leaders takes in order to exemplify the leadership practice:

1) Model the way by finding one’s voice and setting the example, 2) inspire a shared vision by envisioning the future and enlisting others, 3) challenge the process by searching for opportunities and experimenting and taking risks, 4) enable others to act by fostering collaboration and strengthening others, and 5)
encourage the heart by recognizing contributions and celebrating the values and victories” (Alston, 2009, p. 5).

For the observer version of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), the mean item ranged from 5.35-6.07. The standard deviation range was consistent across the five practices with a range of 2.00-2.69.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>194.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Commitment. Commitment is a ‘bond’ one has with a target, whether perceived or not. However, a bond that is not perceived might be problematic to measure. By supplying the subjects with a survey to complete, they have to reflect on commitment and the bond which they are measuring now becomes perceived (2009). The second survey, by commitment experts Meyer and Allen, consists of 18 questions in the revised edition; the TCM Employee Commitment Survey. Four of these questions were originally reverse keyed. For the purposes of this survey, they were transposed to follow the same format of the other 14 questions (Meyer & Allen, TCM Employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004, 2004).
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Table 3.3

*LPI Mean/Mode/Std. Deviation*

The researcher used the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey to measure the level of commitment related to each component that an employee feels towards his organization. This survey measures three components of commitment, Affective, Normative, and Continuance using a seven point Likert scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Moderately Disagree, (3) Slightly Disagree, (4) Neither Disagree or Agree, (5) Slightly Agree, (6) Moderately Agree, and (7) Strongly Agree.

Table 3.4

*Three Component Model Commitment Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>7,8,9,10,11,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>13,14,15,16,17,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse Keyed Questions Transposed</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey measured three components of organizational commitment: Affective, Continuance, and Normative. Affective commitment refers to how an employee identifies himself within the organization and his involvement and emotional attachment (Schmidt, 2007). Affective commitment can be seen to positively affect all areas that have been identified to have a fiscal impact on an organization, job
performance, retention, and attendance. Continuance commitment is not thought to have a positive impact on job performance unless the employee also feels an Affective commitment to the organizations. Continuance commitment would breed resentment and frustration that could result in poor performance (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Normative commitment impacts attendance and retention due to the cost implications the employee would suffer with either type of behavior. An employee exhibiting this type of commitment will stay with the organization out of duty. This will many times motivate an employee to “behave appropriately and do what is right for the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 25).

Meyers and Allen shortened the original survey from eight measures per component to six measures per component (1997). This researcher opted to use the revised version of the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey due to length of surveys and the additional analysis that the original version may have required. The greatest analytical difference in the two versions can be seen in the Normative component. The original version with eight questions representative of Normative commitment, measuring obligation, tend to include information about the basis of the obligation whereas the revised version focuses on the obligation without looking at the basis (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Meyer and Allen recommend that a correlation study be done when comparing commitment across groups.

It has previously been seen in research that employees who want to stay with the organizations (higher Affective scores) tend to perform better than employees who do not want to stay (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Employees who feel obligated to remain (high Normative score) tend to outperform those who feel no obligation to stay (Meyer &
Allen, 2004). Meyer and Allen suggest that when Continuance scores are high, the employee feels trapped. High Continuance scores may result in lower turnover rates. Their research showed that Continuance committed employees will do only what is required of them (2004).

When considering the three components separately, the mean ranged from 5.06-5.41 with the standard deviation range of .99 to 1.52. A stronger level of commitment is represented by a higher score.

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCM Mean/Mode/Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics

This researcher constructed a survey requesting demographic information. The demographic survey is included in Appendix F and G. The demographic surveys were altered to fit each organization’s structural make up. This survey consisted of six questions for Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and seven questions for Publishing Company.

Procedures Used

When the process began, this researcher was advised there were 206 possible respondents. The surveys were distributed in envelopes stapled to the weekly paystub
with directions and control numbers from 1-206 were assigned to each set of surveys. The researcher was granted access to a single department at Midwest Manufacturing Facility consisting of a population of 149 not 206.

The surveys were organized to prevent multiple completions by respondents; each survey packet was numbered uniquely with all three surveys having the same number. Midwestern Manufacturing facility determined that distributing hard copies would garner more favorable completion results than by electronic distribution. It was advised that there were a significant number of employees who did not have internet access and would eliminate them from participation.

The researcher also had access to an entire entity in a publishing conglomerate within Publishing Company; the population was 45. The population consisted of salaried and hourly employees within the organizations. The two different organizations were analyzed separately for informational purposes. The analyses done in this research will be a combination of both organizations.

Publishing Company consisted of a sector of employees that had internet access at work and encouraged completion of the survey while on the job. There was also a sector of employees who did not have internet access at work. It was necessary to the leaders that the employees have access to the surveys while they were at work; paper surveys were deemed to be most appropriate for this group.

The resource for creating and distributing the electronic surveys was a website called: eSurvey Creator (Surveys, 2013). A two month service fee was paid by the researcher, and she was able to create a survey designed like the paper surveys, including a letter to the participant that can be seen in Appendix D, both versions. The participant
was to select an answer to the question with the Likert scale type designations as a multiple choice survey. The researcher only allowed the survey to be completed once from an IP address to ensure that a participant could not complete a survey more than one.

Data Collection

The electronic survey used on: eSurvey Creator (Surveys, 2013), provided results in an Excel format which the researcher added to when entering the results from the hard copy surveys. Once the deadline had passed on all three survey periods, the researcher closed the electronic survey and collected hard copies and assigned numeric values to each of the possible answers. The two surveys, which used Likert scale scoring, provided the numeric values necessary and numeric values were created to account for the demographic survey choices.

Data Analysis

The researcher obtained the data and used statistical techniques to analyze the data as this study was quantitative in nature. Using Excel and Minitab, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used test each hypothesis. The correlation analysis helped determine the relationship between the organizational commitment felt by the employees and the leadership practices exhibited by the Team Leaders at Midwest Manufacturing Facility and the Department Heads and Assistant Publisher at Publishing Company. Scores from Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) provided values for 30 items for identifying leadership practices and the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey provided values on 18 items for organizational commitment. The correlation between
organizational commitment and the demographic quantifiers was examined using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r).

The researcher tabulated the response data on the leadership practices from the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) portion of the instrument and the organizational commitment characteristics form the results of the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey portion of the instrument and the general demographic survey.

Summary of Methodology

This chapter presents the methodology of research and the process of data collection and analysis. The researcher presented the research questions, the hypothesis of the research along with the research tools. Both of the instruments used in this research for basis of research were discussed in detail. Information about the sample size of each organization and both organizations combined was discussed. Finally, the researcher presented an overview of the data collection and the statistical analysis of the hypotheses.

The previous chapters presented theoretical background of the research topic and this chapter presented the research methods process and the methods used to obtain the information and the results. The intended results of this study were to contribute to research in leadership and organizational commitment. By reviewing the correlation between leadership practices and organizational commitment, this study contributed to the future research that may use these variables as well. The following chapter presented the results from the correlation analyses conducted in order to answer the research questions and test the research alternate hypotheses.
Chapter 4 Results

Introduction

The previous chapters have provided a background, literature review, and a detailed methodology of the study. In chapter 4, the researcher described the data as obtained through the methodology outlined in Chapter 3.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a relationship between the five leadership practices and the three components of organizational commitment. The researcher used this study to determine if any significant correlation existed between the leadership practices of a leader and the organizational commitment of those he leads. The research questions for this study were:

1. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment?
2. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment?
3. Is there relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

Demographic of Survey Study Participants

The researcher distributed the survey to 197 employees in two organizations; Midwest Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. The survey periods were different for each organization, and Publishing Company had a second survey period. Midwest Manufacturing Facility’s survey period ran from January 30-February 20, 2013, Publishing Company survey period ran from February 12-February 22, 2013, and March 4-March 6, 2013. This resulted in 28 and 34 surveys returned, however, five of those
were incomplete and deemed unusable. The final usable count was 26 from Midwest Manufacturing Facility and 31 from Publishing Company, totaling, 57 completed surveys.

Gender

Female participation consisted of more than twice that of the male sample, 39 females compared to 18 males, 68% and 32% respectively. In other studies, females possessed a higher level of organizational commitment than men (Hedges, 1983; Nicholson, 2009); this study did not examine that construct.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

Rhodes cites that of 17 bivariate analyses; older workers are more committed to the organization than younger workers, but the results of multivariate studies are less conclusive (1983). The results in this study revealed that the significant age range was 30-39 and 40-49 years old. The age range for participants 29 and younger, and over 50 was much smaller. There were six participants in the 20-29 age range, 11%, and eight participants in the 50-59 age range boasting 14%. Relatively closely represented was the 60+ with seven participants, 12%.
Table 4.2  

*Age Distribution of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Level

The education levels most prevalent were Completed GED/High School and Some College. The College Degree participant numbers were smaller, and those who had not completed GED or High School, even smaller with none of the participants having a graduate degree. There were 24 participants with a GED/High School, 42%, and 23 participants, 40% with Some College. Making up the rest of the sample, there was one, 2% not having completed GED/High School with eight having a college degree, resulting in 14%.
Table 4.3

*Education Distribution of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete GED/High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure

Turnover occurred at a higher rate during the first few years of employment (Weller, 2009). The tenure level producing the highest numbers was over 12 years with 25 respondents, 44%. Six respondents had been with their respective organization for one year or less, representing 11%. Two respondents had been with their respective organization for one to three years, representing 4% of the study participants. Nine participants were identified as having been with their organization for three to six years, and six to nine years, and 16% of the respondents for each category. Lastly, six participants had been with the organization for nine to twelve years, 11% of the study participants.
Table 4.4

*Tenure Distribution of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to six years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to nine years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine to 12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Classification

This research yielded more non leaders than leaders, 89% and 11% respectively.

Since the observer version of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was used, the leaders that participated were measured by their subordinates who measured their leaders.

Table 4.5

*Job Classification Distribution of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Leader</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

Reliability does not test for validity. “Reliability is the consistency with which a measuring instrument yields a certain, consistent result when the entity being measured has not changed” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test is a test that
determines agreement of answers on questions targeted to a specific trait; answers that are on a scale rather than a right or wrong (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). It was recommended to use Cronbach’s Alpha when there are at least three questions per trait; the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) consist of six questions per practice, and thereby allowing the reliability to be tested effectively using Cronbach’s Alpha.

To estimate the reliability of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were calculated. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability ranges between 0 and 1; the closer the coefficient is to 1, the more reliable the data. When using Cronbach’s Alpha, >.9 is excellent, >.8 is good, and >.7 acceptable. Experts agree that .8 is a reasonable goal (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Scores for Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Survey

To estimate the reliability of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were calculated. The instrument measured the leader’s exhibition of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. Table 4.6 provided the results for the Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficients for Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) five leadership practices.
Table 4.6

*Leadership Practices Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Constructs</th>
<th>N=6</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model the Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspire a Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge the Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enable Others to Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage the Heart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This researcher used the observer version of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), and the reliability statistics proved to be strong. This researcher compared
Nicholson’s (2009) reliability findings with the findings of this research. Nicholson’s measurement for Model the Way was .89 compared to present research of .903. Nicholson’s Inspire a Shared Vision was .92 compared to present research of .926, Nicholson’s findings for Challenge the Process was .91 compared to present research of .932; Nicholson’s measurement for Enable Others to Act was .89 compared present research of .900; Nicholson’s measurement of Encourage the Heart was .94 compared to present research of .939. The results revealed that all five practices of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) had a high reliability for this research (Nicholson, 2009).

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Scores for Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability coefficients were calculated to estimate the reliability of the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey instrument. The instrument measured Affective commitment, Continuance commitment, and Normative commitment. Table 4.7 provided results for Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability coefficients for the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey three constructs.
### Table 4.7

*Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCM Constructs</th>
<th>N=6</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that the Affective and Normative commitments were above the .70 and that Continuance was below the .70 mark of a good reliability score. Woods’ and Nicholson’s research revealed reliability scores for Affective commitment of .759 and .83 respectively, .694 and .77 for Continuance commitment respectively, and .796 and .90 for Normative respectively (2011; 2009). Continuance commitment had a lower
reliability score than Affective or Normative commitment, but the results were similar to
the other studies.

The information provided from this study, along with other studies using the
Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey,
revealed that the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee
Commitment instrument was reliable to conduct this survey. The Continuance
commitment Cronbach’s Alpha reliability score was lower than a .70, an acceptable
reliability score. This was similar trending reliability results by Nicholson (2009) and
Rimes (2011), the research has revealed the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model
(TCM) Employee Commitment Survey was reliable to conduct this research.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics transform a set of numbers into data that summarize or
characterize the data (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The Meyer and Allen Three
Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey scores ranged from 1 to 7, and
the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) ranged in scores from 1 to 10.

Table 4.8 contains description data for the five Leadership Practices Inventory
(LPI) and the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment
Survey constructs. The Leadership Practices subscales are (1) Model the Way, (2) Inspire
a Shared Vision, (3) Challenge the Process, (4) Encourage the Heart, (5) Enable Others to
Act. The organizational commitment constructs are (1) Affective commitment, (2)
Continuance commitment, and (3) Normative commitment.
Table 4.8

**Descriptive Statistics of Survey Tools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean is a measure of central tendency, an average of all of the scores (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The variance in a distribution will be evident when there is an extreme high or low score. Nicholson’s (2009) means for the five subscales of the LPI were as follows, Model the Way=7.44, Inspire a Shared Vision=6.99, Challenge the Process=6.86, Enable Others to Act=7.72, and Encourage the Heart=7.49.

The present research mean score for the subscales of the LPI were Model the Way=6.07, Inspire a Shared Vision=5.35, Challenge the Process=5.62, Enable Others to Act=6.73 and Encourage the Heart=5.73. From the information provided, mean scores were above the mid-point (5) of the scale. The highest mean score was Enable Others to Act scoring 6.73 while the lowest was Inspire a Shared Vision at 5.35. When compared to the mean scores of Nicholson (2009), the mean scores of his research were higher.
Nicholson’s (2009) research provided a mean score for Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey as follows: Affective=4.22, Continuance=4.3, and Normative= 4.15. Affective commitment was expected to have the strongest positive relation, and most desirable construct followed by Normative. Continuance commitment was expected to be unrelated to Affective and Normative (Meyer et al., 2002). Table 4.8 indicated that the Continuance mean was slightly higher than Affective and the Normative mean was slightly lower than Affective mean, reflective of Nicholson’s (2009) results.

Results of the Correlation Analysis

The hypotheses of this study were concerned with determining if there were positive relationships between a leader’s perceived leadership practice and organizational commitment. The Pearson r product moment correlation method was used to determine whether the variables of leadership and organizational commitment were associated with the each other. The resulting statistic was a correlation coefficient; it was a number between -1, and +1, most of the correlation coefficients will always be decimals. The formula was designed to reflect two things, the direction of the trend and the strength of the relationship; if there was one (Leedy & Ormrod, 2013). A high positive value represented a high positive relationship, and conversely, a low negative number represented a low positive relationship, or absence of a relationship. The results may have produced an evidence of a high negative relationship, such as -1. This number showed that there was a relationship, just not a positive relationship among the two variables.

The Pearson r product moment correlation coefficient was converted to the $r^2$. This was the Pearson r result squared; it turns the resulting data into a percent variability
explanation. The correlation results were easier to communicate and understand using this additional process.

This researcher used the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), measuring five practices of leadership: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The researcher also used the Meyer and Allen’s scales measuring three constructs of commitment: Affective, Continuance, and Normative (2004). This study also included demographic information survey.

Research Question 1

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment?

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data provided in Table 4.9 indicated that there was a positive relationship between all five of the leadership practices and Affective commitment, but not a statistically significant relationship. A positive relationship was evident at the .01 level.
The researcher accepted the alternate hypotheses $H_{a1}$, $H_{a2}$, $H_{a3}$, $H_{a4}$, and $H_{a5}$. The researcher concluded that there was sufficient evidence at the 1% level of correlation to show a positive relationship between all five subscales of the Leadership Practices and Affective commitment. Affective commitment had a positive correlation with Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

Research Question 2

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment?

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data provided in Table 4.10 indicated that there was a positive relationship between all five of the leadership practices and Normative commitment. A positive relationship was evident at the .01 level. The researcher accepted the alternate hypotheses $H_{a6}$, $H_{a7}$, $H_{a8}$, $H_{a9}$, and $H_{a10}$. The researcher concluded that there was sufficient evidence at the 1% level of correlation to show a positive relationship between all five subscales of
the leadership practices and Continuance commitment. Continuance commitment had a positive correlation with Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. However, the positive correlation was slight between Challenge the Process and Continuance commitment. The reliability test score on this component was below the .70 standard but was in agreement with other studies of this nature.

Research Question 3

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.11, there was a positive relationship between the leadership practices and Normative commitment. A positive relationship was evident at the .01 level. The researcher accepted the alternate hypotheses $H_{a11}$, $H_{a12}$, $H_{a13}$, $H_{a14}$, and $H_{a15}$. The researcher concluded that there was sufficient evidence at the 1% level of correlation to show a positive relationship between all five subscales of the leadership practices and Normative commitment. Normative commitment had a positive correlation with Model
the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.
Table 4.12

Mean/St. Dev./Min./Max of Demographic Commitment Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Class.</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Leaders</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to six years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to nine years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine to 12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GED/HS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/High School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The preceding chapter presented the data derived from the employees of Midwest Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. Along with descriptive statistics and reliability analysis, empirical results of the research were presented. The researcher presented the following significant results.

1. There was a positive relationship between Affective commitment and the Leadership Practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

2. There was a positive relationship between Continuance commitment and the Leadership Practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

3. There was a positive relationship between Normative commitment and the Leadership Practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

In the Chapter 5 Discussion, the researcher will present the purpose, implications of the findings, limitations, recommendations of future research, and the conclusion.
Chapter 5 Discussion

In Chapter 5, the researcher included the purpose, implications of the findings, limitations, recommendations for future research, and the conclusion.

Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the relationship between leadership practices and organizational commitment in Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. The researcher sought to discover the following: The relationship between leadership and organizational commitment. The following research questions are presented once again to properly evaluate the problem:

1. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment?
2. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment?
3. Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment?

The findings of the study provide a valuable addition to the field of leadership and organizational commitment studies. They address the limited research of leadership and organizational commitment in the two organizations, Midwest Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. To answer these questions, three surveys were used for two diverse organizations, with a combined population of 194 resulting in 57 respondents. The 57 participants rated their leaders using the observer version of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and completed the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey measuring their commitment to the organization.
The researcher obtained the data and used correlation to analyze the data. The researcher then calculated the correlation coefficients for the sub-score for each survey as each category of each survey compared with each category of the other using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient (Pearson r). The first survey, previously validated by Kouzes and Posner, was the Leadership Practices Inventory (2003), comprised of 30 questions, Likert scale type answers measuring the subscales of: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. The second survey, previously validated by commitment experts Meyer and Allen, consists of 18 questions in the revised edition; the TCM Employee Commitment Survey (2004). This survey measures three components of commitment, Affective, Normative, and Continuance using the Likert scale type answers. Four of these questions were originally reverse keyed. For the purposes of this survey, they were transposed to follow the same format of the other 14 questions (2004).

The third survey was constructed by this researcher based on the structure of the organization asking for responses relating to the persons demographics. This survey consisted of six questions for Midwestern Manufacturing Facility and seven questions for Publishing Company.

The research mean score for the subscales of the LPI were Model the Way=6.07, Inspire a Shared Vision=5.35, Challenge the Process=5.62, Enable Others to Act=6.73, and Encourage the Heart=5.73. From the information provided, mean scores were above the mid-point (5) of the scale. The highest mean score was Enable Others to Act scoring 6.73 while the lowest was Inspire a Shared Vision at 5.35. From the information
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provided, mean scores were above the mid-point (5) of the scale. When compared to the mean scores of Nicholson (2009), the mean scores of his research were higher.

The Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey construct mean scores for this research were as follows: Affective commitment was 5.3, Continuance commitment, 5.41, and Normative 5.06. When compared to Nicholson’s and Rimes’ scores for the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, results were reflective of Nicholson’s (2009) results.

Implications of Findings

Research Findings 1

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Affective organizational commitment? The results showed there was a positive relationship between Affective commitment and all five leadership practices, with a range of r=.3-r=.4. For alternate hypotheses H_{a1}, H_{a2}, H_{a3}, H_{a4}, and H_{a5}, the data provided showed that there was a positive correlation between the leaders perceived practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart and Affective commitment to the organization. According to the data, the alternate hypotheses were accepted.

According to Meyer and Allen, research shows that employees who score higher in the Affective commitment component want to stay; and perform at a higher level than those who score low in Affective commitment (2004). A leader can influence his subordinates and their commitment to the organization. A leader will advance moral as well as organizational commitment if he effectively utilizes one or more of Kouzes and Posner’s Five Exemplary Leadership Practices (2007). This influence is dependent on his
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stance regarding the investment in each one as an individual and his credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Research Findings 2

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Continuance organizational commitment? The relationship between Continuance commitment and the five leadership practices was positive in nature but scored much lower than the other components with a range of $r=.07 - r=.15$. For alternate hypotheses $H_a6$, $H_a7$, $H_a8$, $H_a9$, and $H_a10$, the data provided showed that there was a positive correlation between the leaders perceived practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart and Continuance commitment to the organization. According to the data, the alternate hypotheses were accepted.

According to Meyer and Allen, research shows that those who score higher in the Continuance component, generally stay with an organization because they have to do so (2004). They tend to do what they have to do and nothing more. That does not mean they are not good workers, just that they will not go above and beyond their scope of work (2004).

Research Findings 3

Is there a relationship between what an employee perceives his leader’s leadership practices to be and Normative organizational commitment? The results showed there was a positive relationship between all five leadership practices and Normative commitment, with a range of $r=.31 - r=.39$. The researcher accepted the alternate hypotheses $H_a11$, $H_a12$, $H_a13$, $H_a14$, and $H_a15$. The data provided showed that there was a positive correlation
between the leaders perceived practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart and Normative commitment to the organization.

Meyer and Allen advise that employees who score higher in the Normative commitment component generally stay with an organization because they feel they ought to stay (2004). In addition to the feeling of obligation, they tend to outperform those who stay because they want to stay, the higher scoring Affective commitment employee (2004).

Limitations

The findings of this study have certain limitations. One limitation is the sample. The sample included only two organizations in the Midwest.

Another limitation could be the tool to measure commitment. Klein et al., raise the question whether the commitment measurement and theories of decades passed are relevant today due to the need for global thinking among other things (Klein et al., 2009). The construct of Continuance commitment returned a reliability score of .655, lower than the desired reliability score of .70 but consistent with other researcher’s results. According to Meyers et al., Continuance commitment is expected to be unrelated to Affective and Normative commitment (2002); yet all three constructs are measured using the same tool.

Two other researchers used the Organization Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). In retrospect, this may have been a more fitting tool for the direction this research took (Gunter, 1997; Argano, 2011). However, Gunter addresses the use the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey as a recommendation
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for future research. The authors of the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey have conducted research to determine if their tool continues to be valid. They have concluded that with the exception of the OCQ, there has been little “development and psychometric evaluation of commitment measures” (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 14).

Diversity of the two organizations researched, a manufacturing facility and a publishing company, was seen as a limitation by this researcher. The diversity produced quantifiable and reportable results, and this researcher did not consider that the diverse types of organizations and varied job responsibilities may hinder the congruence of results. The individual commitment scores can be seen in Table 2 following the appendix. What was seen as a limitation by this researcher was proposed as a recommendation for future research by Gunter. He proposed the use of diverse organizations, not just one (Gunter, 1997).

After further review of others’ research, the combination of quantitative and qualitative measures produced compelling results showing an extremely positive correlation between leadership practices and the other variable examined (Alexson, 2008). There were smaller populations. A higher percentage rate of participants and the quantitative aspect would provide more insight into some results than what was obtained from the qualitative research.

Theory Revisions

The original conceptual framework for this study was to determine the relationship of organizational commitment to the effective leadership practices of the leaders in the organization considering the job classification of the respondent and
general demographic identifiers (see Figure 1). The research data indicated a modification of the original framework would allow for a more detailed look at each commitment component and its singular relationship to each of the Five Exemplary Leadership Practices.

The researcher amended the original plans in order to examine the relationship of each of the leadership practices with each of the organizational commitment components individually, excluding personal characteristics. The relationship that each perceived leadership practice had with each organizational commitment component was examined. Authors have identified that the leader’s perceived actions have an impact on the loyalty and performance of the employee, potentially contributing to a competitive advantage in the marketplace (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Goleman et al., 2002).
Recommendations for Future Research

For the purposes of this study, only the relationship or correlation was used to accept or reject the hypothesis and answer the research questions. Causation of organizational commitment would be extremely beneficial to study. As stated previously, if an organization can determine what makes an employee committed, it will pay dividends, “Strong companies know the kinds of people they want and hire those who fit the mold” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 143). They have been known to risk a lot because they believed in someone and his capabilities.

In this study, the employees led by the Team Leaders, Department Heads, and the Assistant Publisher was the demographic control variable. Future studies might consider
measuring how organizational commitment might be affected by age, gender, tenure, and education. Three authors did a study in 1947 that considered demographics as a construct when measuring turnover. Their findings demonstrated that the turnover frequency was lower in workers who were over the age of 30, had completed 10 years of formal education, married and have at least one dependent (Tiffin et al., 1947). More recent research could result in similar findings.

This research looked at the employee’s level of organizational commitment and its relationship to leadership practices. While searching sources for the current research, it was found that perceived organizational support is a critical factor in the level of the employee’s organizational commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Schaubroeck et al., 1994; Armstrong-Stassen, 2004). Examining the effects that the perceived organizational support had on the employee’s organizational commitment may provide more insight into the current research. There were several such studies conducted on this subject matter. The results indicated this was a construct that exhibited a positive relationship to organizational commitment. Adding to that, a congruent study of the relationship perceived leadership practices and the level of perceived organizational commitment may add significantly to the limitation of determining the cause of the organizational commitment.

Conclusion

Leadership and organizational commitment are constructs that have evoked interest from researchers. There have been 65 different classifications developed to define the dimensions of leadership (Northouse, 2007). Researchers similarly conceptualize organizational commitment through varied paradigms. The five Leadership Practices
developed by Kouzes and Posner provide a contemporary and research based leadership model (2007). This study incorporated the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and the Meyer and Allen Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey as instruments to respond to three research questions.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between the leaders exhibited leadership practices and the level of organizational commitment among the employees of Midwest Manufacturing Facility and Publishing Company. Evidence supported a positive relationship between Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable other to Act, and Encourage the Heart when measured with Affective, Continuance, and Normative commitment. The study revealed a weak correlation between all five leadership practices and Continuance commitment but especially low for Challenge the Process. Continuance commitment has resulted in lower Leadership Practice correlation measurements in other studies (Nicholson, 2009; Rimes, 2011).

It is this researcher’s hope that this research can be used by organizations in the future to develop exemplary leaders so as to increase the level of commitment individuals feel toward an organization. In doing this, it will also be beneficial if an organization can begin to identify the motivations for commitment in its employees in order to further the commitment as well as identify which models are most effective and develop a means to foster that model in others.
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Appendices

Appendix A

January 30, 2013

Dear Participant,

As partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. degree completion through Tennessee Temple University, I am conducting research for the dissertation component of my degree program. You are being asked to participate.

The concept of organizational commitment has been identified as an important aspect in understanding the work behavior of the employees and how that behavior impacts the organization. This research will be examining the relationship between leadership and the level of organizational commitment an employee experiences.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and all responses will remain anonymous. The completed surveys will be stored securely.

If you choose to participate in this research, please complete the three questionnaires/surveys on the two following pages and deposit them in the blue plastic file box near the time clock. The survey period is from January 30-February 20, 2013.

Your decision whether to participate or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the organization, the educational institute, or this researcher.

Thank you for your time and I appreciate your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Connie Mitchell
Appendix B

February 12, 2013
Dear Participant,

As partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. degree completion through Tennessee Temple University, I am conducting research for the dissertation component of my degree program. You are being asked to participate.

The concept of organizational commitment has been identified as an important aspect in understanding the work behavior of the employees and how that behavior impacts the organization. This research will be examining the relationship between leadership and the level of organizational commitment an employee experiences.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and all responses will remain anonymous. Your decision whether to participate or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the organization, the educational institute, or this researcher. This survey will be open from February 12-February 22, 2013.

Thank you for your time, and I appreciate your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Connie Mitchell
March 4, 2013

Dear Participant,

As partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. degree completion through Tennessee Temple University, I am conducting research for the dissertation component of my degree program. You are being asked to participate.

The concept of organizational commitment has been identified as an important aspect in understanding the work behavior of the employees and how that behavior impacts the organization. This research will be examining the relationship between leadership and the level of organizational commitment an employee experiences.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and all responses will remain anonymous. If you choose to participate in this research, please complete the three questionnaires/surveys on the two following pages.

The survey period is March 4-6, 2013. Your decision whether to participate or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the organization, the educational institute, or this researcher.

Thank you for your time, and I appreciate your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Connie Mitchell
Appendix D

1st Electronic Survey Cover Letter

Dear Participant,

As partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. degree completion through Tennessee Temple University, I am conducting research for the dissertation component of my degree program. You are being asked to participate.

The concept of organizational commitment has been identified as an important aspect in understanding the work behavior of the employees and how that behavior impacts the organization. This research will be examining the relationship between leadership and the level of organizational commitment an employee experiences.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and all responses will remain anonymous. Your decision whether to participate or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the organization, the educational institute, or this researcher. This survey will be open from February 12-February 22, 2013.

Thank you for your time, and I appreciate your consideration. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Connie Mitchell
Appendix E

2nd Electronic Survey Cover Letter

Dear Participant,

As a partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. degree completion through Tennessee Temple University, I am conducting research for the dissertation component of my degree program. You are being asked to participate.

The concept of organizational commitment has been identified as an important aspect in understanding the work behavior of the employees and how that behavior impacts the organization. This research will be examining the relationship between leadership and the level of organizational commitment an employee experiences.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and all responses will remain anonymous. Your decision whether to participate or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the organization, the educational institute, or this researcher. This survey will be open from March 4-March 6, 2013.

Thank you for your time, if you have any questions, please contact me.

Connie Mitchell
Appendix F

General Demographic Survey

Please respond to the following demographic and job classification survey by checking one selection for each question.

1. Position classification in organization:
   _____ Non-Team Leader
   _____ Team Leader

2. Typical Shift:
   _____ Day Shift
   _____ Night Shift

3. Gender:
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

4. Age Group:
   _____ Under 20
   _____ 20-29
   _____ 20-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 or older

5. Years of Service:
   _____ One year or less
   _____ One to three years
   _____ Three to six years
   _____ Six to nine years
   _____ Nine to 12 years
   _____ Over 12 years

6. Highest Level of Education Completed:
   _____ Did not complete GED/ High School
   _____ GED/High School
   _____ Some College
   _____ College Degree
   _____ Graduate Degree
Appendix G

General Demographic Survey

Please respond to the following demographic and job classification survey by checking one selection for each question.

1. Position classification in organization:
   _____ Non-Department Head
   _____ Department Head

2. Typical Shift:
   _____ Day Shift
   _____ Night Shift

3. Current Status:
   _____ Full Time
   _____ Part Time

4. Gender:
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

5. Age Group:
   _____ Under 20
   _____ 20-29
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 or older

6. Time of Service:
   _____ One year or less
   _____ One to three years
   _____ Three to six years
   _____ Six to nine years
   _____ Nine to 12 years
   _____ Over 12 years

7. Highest Level of Education Completed:
   _____ Did not complete GED/ High School
   _____ GED/ High School
   _____ Some College
   _____ College Degree
   _____ Graduate Degree
Appendix H

Organizational Commitment Survey

Listed below is a series of statements that represent the feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement by placing a number from 1 to 7 using the scale below.

1=Strongly Disagree   4=Neither Disagree or Agree   6=Moderately Agree
2=Moderately Disagree  5=Slightly Agree
3=Slightly Disagree    7=Strongly Agree

1) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization. _____

2) I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own. ______

3) I feel a strong sense of ‘belonging’ to this organization._____

4) I feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization. ______

5) I feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization. ______

6) This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. ______

7) Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire. ______

8) It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to. ______

9) Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now. ______

10) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. ______

11) If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere. ______

12) One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives. ______

13) I feel an obligation to remain with my current employer. ______
14) Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now. ______

15) I would feel guilty if I left my organization now. ______

16) This organization deserves my loyalty. ______

17) I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it. ______

18) I owe a great deal to my organization. ______

The TCM Employee Commitment Survey does not require permission if used for one time academic research (Meyer & Allen, TCM Employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004, 2004).
January 9, 2013

Connie Mitchell
838 Cherry Hills Lane
Lebanon, MO 65536

Dear Ms. Mitchell:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to reproduce the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lishannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

1. That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
2. That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument:
   "Copyright 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission."
3. That one (1) electronic copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent promptly to our attention; and,
4. That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to me either via email or by post to; 1548 Camino Monde San Jose, CA 95125. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Epeterson4@gmail.com

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) Connie Mitchell  Date: 1/10/13

Expected Date of Completion is: 5/4/13
Appendix J

Leadership Survey

In this survey, you are being asked to assess your direct supervisor’s leadership behavior. Please read each statement carefully, and place a number from 1-10 using the rating scale below.

1= Almost Never  2=Rarely  3=Seldom  4=Once in a While
5=Occasionally  6=Sometimes  7=Fairly Often  8=Usually
9=Very Frequently 10=Almost Always

Ask yourself: He or She:

1) Sets a personal example of what he/she expects of others. ____________
2) Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
   ____________
3) Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his own skills and abilities. ____________
4) Develops cooperative relationships among the people he/she works with.
   ____________
5) Praises people for a job well done. ____________
6) Spends time and energy making certain that the people he/she works with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon. ____________
7) Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like. ____________
8) Challenges people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.
   ____________
9) Actively listens to diverse points of view. ____________
10) Makes it a point to let people know about his confidence in their abilities. ____________
11) Follows through on promises and commitments he/she makes. ____________
12) Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future. ____________
13) Searches outside the formal boundaries of his organization for innovative ways to improve what we do. ____________
14) Treats others with dignity and respect. ____________
15) Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects. ____________
16) Asks for feedback on how his actions affect other people’s performance. ____________
17) Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision. ____________
18) Asks “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected. __________
19) Supports the decisions that people make on their own. __________
20) Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values. __________
21) Builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization. __________
22) Paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish. __________
23) Makes certain that we set achievable goals, makes concrete plans, and establish measureable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on. __________
24) Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work. __________
25) Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments. __________
26) Is clear about his philosophy of leadership. __________
27) Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work. __________
28) Experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure. __________
29) Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves. __________
30) Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions. __________
Tables

Table 1

*Frequency Tables for all Responses to Kouzes & Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Model The Way</th>
<th>Inspire A Shared Vision</th>
<th>Challenge The Process</th>
<th>Enable Others to Act</th>
<th>Encourage the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a While</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Positively</td>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2**

*Pearson product moment correlation and r² segregated and combined.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>MW Manufacturing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Publishing Company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson product moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model The Way</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire A Shared Vision</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge The Process</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abridged Hypotheses Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Pearson R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R²%</th>
<th>Accepted/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a Model the Way</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a Challenge the Process</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a Model the Way</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a Challenge the Process</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10a Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11a Model the Way</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12a Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13a Challenge the Process</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14a Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15a Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>