

Influence of Transformational Leadership Style on Employees' Job Commitment: A Study on Private Sector in Bangladesh

Dr. Ireen Akhter ¹
Fariha Murtaza²

Abstract : This study explored the influence of transformational leadership style on employees' job commitment in the private sector of Bangladesh.

Methods-Data were collected from 102 first-line managers working in different organizations in the private sector of Bangladesh through on-line survey by using a structured questionnaire. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to carry out the research analysis.

Findings-Transformational leadership has found a positive influence on employees' job commitment in both manufacturing and service-oriented organizations in the private sector of Bangladesh. As demography, two important factors, gender and years of professional experience were considered. However, except employees' level of job experience, no substantial differences have found in case of gender.

Practical implication- The study suggests that managers may utilize a transformational leadership style more to motivate and influence their subordinates for increasing their commitment towards organization.

Future implication- This study has conducted only on first-line managers, thus, to see the influence of transformational leadership style on mid-level of management and by top-level management can be topic for future research work.

Keywords: leadership, transformational leadership, job commitment, organization

1.0 Introduction

Leadership is considered as one of the most important and necessary tools for progress, excellence and success in any organization. It is one of the most vital management functions of an organization which directs different types of resources to achieve the organizational goals efficiently. Efficient leadership is able to provide clarity of the purpose, motivate and guide the organization to realize and envision its mission.

Transformational leadership (TL), as one of the leadership styles has been considered as a leader's efforts to influence and transform the culture of the organization through the development of a common goal of the organization (Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010: 163-183). Transformational leaders set examples to their employees through a strong sense of corporate culture, employee recognition and individual consideration. TL becomes visible when the leaders promote their employees' interests, when they prioritize their team goals

¹ Professor, Institute of Business Administration (IBA-JU), Jahangirnagar University, Email: ireen@juniv.edu

² Teacher, Sunnydale School, Email: farihamurtazaba@gmail.com

and objectives before individual gain and when they generate awareness among employees for the betterment of the group cohesion and to consider their group interest beyond their self-interest (Bass 1990:19-31).

On the other hand, employees' job commitment (EJC) is emotional attachment of employees with the organization which instigate the decision of employees to continue their membership in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997:309-312). Employees become committed towards any organization if they feel to continue their relationship with the organization and if they are willing to devote considerable effort to achieve organizational goals.

Because of the global competition, it is becoming necessary for organizations to implement proper leadership styles to influence the commitment of their people towards the organization. Many studies have previously linked TL to individual and organizational factors in different countries. Therefore, this study has been focused on whether transformational leaders may influence employees towards EJC in the private sector of Bangladesh.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Leadership

Leadership is an art of leading employees through motivation to perform according to the strategy and stated goals of an organization (Puni et al., 2016:1-7). In a professional setting, the purpose of business leadership is to find out an ideal leadership model that will perfectly match a firm's specific function and its people. An unhappy or dissatisfied employee is less likely to feel dedicated for her/his work. Effective leaders create and implement strategic goals (Shi & Ye, 2016:877) and consider what is right for their organization and people (Acuna & Male, 2022:1-17). An effective leader is always on the lookout for new ideas and inventive solutions. The willingness to attempt new things can motivate and urge others to think beyond the box as well (Al- Zuned, 2017:10-12). Therefore, people in all levels of management always coach and motivate their subordinates and peers in the organizations (Bigio, 2015:1830-1927).

Leadership research has been undertaken using a variety of frames of reference over time and in different eras. Organizational culture, economic and social structure, the level of unionization, and other factors may necessitate different types of leadership styles in different situations (Iqbal et al., 2015:1-6) considering the contingency of the situation.

2.2 Transformational Leadership (TL)

Transformational Leadership (TL) as one of the leadership styles, is increasingly becoming a critical topic of discussion in academia and industry. Transformational leaders try to change the organization's culture by coming up with a common goal that emphasizes autonomy and respect (Zembylas & Iasonos, 2010:63-183). In a TL, the sense of personal investment in the company's success is strengthened by encouraging employee participation in decision-making (Minett et al., 2009:486-493). As the transformational leaders focuses on the need of the followers, it is perceived that they are better able to initiate better organizational commitment among the followers (Scott-Halsell et al.,

2008:99-113).

According to Avolio et al., (1991:9-16), transformational leaders have been characterized by four separate components. They are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leaders increase motivation, efficiency and job satisfaction, improve policy and innovative idea, and develop empowerment among their people (Bass & Avolio, 1993: 49-80; Usman, 2020: 95-107), instead of leaving the followers to make their own decisions like Laissez-faire leaders or involve any kind of basic-level exchange between leaders and followers like transactional leaders (Burns, 1978). Though, according to Bass & Avolio (1993: 49-80), Laissez-faire leadership, transactional leadership, and transformational leadership styles together made a new concept of Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM).

TL is gaining popularity in business because it increases employee engagement and reduces turnover by providing a supportive company culture, work contentment, and individual recognition. Transformational leadership approaches have been successful in promoting change (Herold, et al., & Lui, 2008: 346-357) within a variety of organizations. It can produce strategic organizational change (Waldman, et al., 2004: 355-380), increase staff satisfaction (Judge & Piccolo, 2004: 755-780), reduce stress and burnout (Seltzer, et al., 1989: 174-185), and reduce turnover intentions (Bycio, et al., 1995: 468-474; Martin & Epitropaki, 2001:247-262).

Leaders following the TL style are, in general, passionate towards encouraging the workforce towards empowerment. They are able to generate awareness with the charisma they possess. Implementing TL in firms can ensure an appropriate work atmosphere that leads to EJC.

2.3 Employees' Job Commitment (EJC)

Employees' job commitment (EJC) is also an important aspect for a company to look into. It supports the organization in achieving its goals, which is connected with the performance of employees. Dissatisfied employees are more inclined to quit from the organization. An employee's preference can be directly influenced by the leadership style, which can then lead to EJC, and EJC again leads to higher productivity, profitability, worker retention, and an overall better work environment.

Meyer and Allen (1997:309-312; 1991:61-89) developed the three-component (affective, continuance and normative) model of organizational commitment. Where, affective commitment is referred to as the individual's emotional attachment with the organization, continuance commitment referred to intent of employees to stay with the organization for a long period of time, and normative commitment is the obligation of employees towards the organization.

Thus, TL and EJC are necessary for improving organizational learning that helps organizations to adapt with environmental changes (Mirkamali, et al., 2011: 139-148). The aim of this study is to explore the influence of TL on EJC in the private sector of

Bangladesh.

3.0 Research Question, Research Objectives and Research Hypotheses

3.1 Research Questions

The main research question is: Does TL style has any influence/impact on EJC?

3.2 Research Objectives

The primary objective has been set to explore the influence of TL style on EJC. To understand the relationship between TL and EJC, following specific objectives have been identified:

- To see the nature of TL practices in the private organizations in Bangladesh,
- To see the level of EJC in the private organizations in Bangladesh,
- To see whether TL practices have any influence on EJC in the private organizations in Bangladesh, and
- To see whether extraneous variables, gender, and years of work experiences have any influence on TL and thus on EJC in the private organizations in Bangladesh.

3.3 Research Hypothesis

Following main and working hypotheses have been developed:

Main Hypothesis: H_0 : TL does not have any influence on EJC.

Working Hypothesis: Demography is considered as one of the important issues in any social and business research. Therefore, two important variables, gender and years of work experiences with types of organizations have been considered to see their influence on leadership styles and thus on EJC. The three working hypotheses are:

H_{0A} : Gender does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.

H_{0B} : Work experience does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.

H_{0C} : Types of organizations (Manufacturing or Services) do not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.

4.0 Significance of the Study

Committed employees are a valuable asset to any organization. They can add best value to their organizations. Therefore, this study examines and compares the role of TL style and its influence on EJC in both service and manufacturing organizations in the private organizations of Bangladesh. The result of this study may assist the relevant business leaders to make more informed decisions regarding adoption of the TL style to their organizations which may enhance EJC.

5.0 Research Methodology

5.1 Sources of Data

Secondary data has been collected from different literature review, and primary data from

first line managers of different organizations in Bangladesh.

5.2 Target Population and Sample Size

The first-line managers working for different private organizations in Bangladesh are the target population of this study. Students who are studying Executive MBA (EMBA) at different public and private universities were the targeted group. Therefore, they are supplied the questionnaire online. Although a total of 111 responses were received for the survey but due to the partial completion and inconsistency, 9 responses were screened out. Therefore, 102 questionnaires were administered for survey. Among 102 respondents, 28 (27%) were from manufacturing organizations and 74 (73%) were from service-oriented organizations. Among all the respondents, 60 (59%) were male and 42 (41%) were female (Table 1).

Table I: Demography of the Respondents

Types	Organizations		Gender	
	Manufacturing	Service	Female	Male
Number (%)	28 (27%)	74 (27%)	42 (41%)	60 (59%)
Total (%)	102 (100%)		102 (100%)	

Source: Primary

5.3 Data Collection Instrument and Method

Data was acquired through online surveys where students of Executive MBA program who are working at different private organizations. They were requested to fill up the questionnaire by their peers. Thus, the convenience, as well as snowball approach were used for collecting data. The questionnaire had two parts. Part-A is about the employees' demography, Part-B is about EJC in the organization, as well as about TL style.

Regarding employees' demography two important factors gender and years of experiences have been considered, considering their wide use in the behavioral research. Though, age is also one of the very important factors of demographic, has been excluded as all the respondents are from first line managers, and their age is between 25 to 35.

Currently there are a number of instruments available that measure TL (Bass & Avolio, 1995). However, the most commonly used and most comprehensive measures of TL is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995). A total of 22 statements (questionnaire) have been taken from different literature, as well as multifactor leadership questionnaire considering the culture of our country.

To measure EJC, a total of nine questions from 15 question of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Schappe, 1998; Shore, et al., 1995) were administered, collected from different literature review. A five-point Likert scale has been utilized with each statement in part B from Strongly Disagree (SD = 1) to Strongly Agree (SA = 5).

5.4 Data Analysis Method

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data by using SPSS version 25. The mean, frequencies, and standard deviations were used as descriptive

statistical tools, whereas, simple linear regressions and correlation were used as inferential statistical tools.

5.5 Reliability Test:

Cronbach's alpha has found 0.975 for the reliability test. According to Nunnally (1978:279-280), more than 0.7 alpha value is considered as reliable.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.975	31

6.0 Findings and Analysis

6.1 Descriptive Analysis

The average of the mean values of all statements of TL (Mean is 3.7675 and standard deviation is 0.85097), shows that majority of the managers in these organizations agreed that they follow TL style in their organization (the lowest mean value is 3.7675 with 1.303 standard deviation and (the highest mean value is 4.0 with 1.16 standard deviation) (Table-I in Appendix). The study also shows that on average employees in these organizations are committed as the average of the mean values of all statements of EJC (Mean is 3.7734 and standard deviation is 0.75423), shows that majority of the managers in these organizations agreed that they are committed towards their organization (the lowest mean value is 2.97 with 1.27 standard deviation and (the highest mean value is 3.97 with 1.009 standard deviation) (Table-II in Appendix).

6.2 Inferential Statistics

6.2.1 Correlation Analysis

In general, correlation values exist between +1 (positive) to -1 (negative), where '0' indicates that there is no association. Here, TL has found significantly and positively correlated with the dependent variable, EJC ($r = 0.803$, $p < 0.01$). TL also has been found significantly and positively correlated with the EJC in both the manufacturing organizations ($r = 0.776$, $p < 0.01$) and service-oriented organizations ($r = 0.821$ and $p < 0.01$) (Table-3).

Table 3: Correlation between TL and EC in Manufacturing and Service Organizations

Correlations		EJC		
		Manufacturing	Service	Total
TL	Pearson Correlation	.776**	.821**	.803**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	28	74	102
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Source: Survey data

Influence of Gender and Years of Work Experience

The relation between TL and EJC is influenced by gender ($r = 0.112$), and years of experience ($r = 0.208$) positively. However, this influence is not statistically significant for gender ($p=0.263$), as the p-value is larger than the significance level ($p > .05$), but significant for years of experience ($p=0.036 < .05$) (Table-4).

Table 4: Correlation Matrix

		Gender	Years of Experience	TL
Gender	Pearson Correlation	1	-.185	0.112
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.063	0.263
Yrs. of Experience	Pearson Correlation		1	0.208*
	Sig. (2-tailed)			0.036

Source: Survey data

6.2.2 Regression Analysis

6.2.2.1 Influence of TL on EJC

To see the influence of TL on EJC, a multiple regression analysis was done, where the value of R^2 is 0.645 (Table-III in Appendix), which signifies that 64.5% of the variations in the dependent variable EJC can be explained by the variations in the independent variable TL.

From ANOVA table (Table-IV in Appendix), it has been found that the p-value (Sig= 0.000) is less than 0.05 which shows that the study result is significant and valid. The Coefficient table (Table-V in Appendix) also prove that, TL ($t=13.487$, $p < .05$) has a significant effect on EJC. Thus, the null hypothesis, H_0 : TL does not have any influence on EJC is rejected, means, TL has positive and significant influence on EJC.

6.2.2.2 Influence of Gender, and Years of Work Experience

In case of gender, and years of work experiences, the value of the adjusted R^2 is 0.076 (Table-VI in Appendix), which indicates that only 7.6% of the variance in TL style can be predicted from the variables gender and years of work experience.

Here, the p-value (sig= 0.051) is greater than 0.05 (Table-VII in Appendix), which shows that the study result is not significant, though the result is close to 0.05. According to the Table-VII (in Appendix), it can be concluded that, Gender ($t=1.654$, $p > .05$) has no significant effect on TL, but Years of Experience ($t=2.175$, $p < .05$) has significant effect on TL.

Thus, the null hypothesis,

H_{0A} : Gender does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC cannot be rejected.

H_{0B}: Work experience does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC is rejected.

6.2.2.3 Influence of Manufacturing vs. Service-oriented organizations

In case of manufacturing and service-oriented organizations, the values of R^2 are 0.603 and 0.674 respectively. It signifies that 60.3% of the variations in the commitment of the employees in manufacturing organizations and 67.4% of the variations in the commitment of the employees in service-oriented organization can be explained by the variations in TL (Table-IX in Appendix).

The ANOVA table (Table-X in Appendix), indicates that the p-value (sig= 0.000) is less than 0.05 in both the cases of manufacturing and service-oriented organizations, which shows that the study result is significant and valid. From the co-efficient table (Table-XI in Appendix), it is seen that the TL has a significant effect on employee commitment in both manufacturing organizations ($t=6.280$, $p<0.05$) and service-oriented organizations ($t=12.189$, $p<0.05$).

Thus, the null hypothesis, H_{0C}: Types of organizations (Manufacturing or Services) do not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC is rejected, means, TL has positive and significant influence on EJC in both manufacturing and service-oriented organizations.

7.0 Results and Discussion

The research analysis has been conducted with the aim to elucidating the influence of TL style on EJC in the private organizations of Bangladesh.

A two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to evaluate the association followed by a linear regression model. The correlation results showed that the correlation between TL and EJC is statistically significant ($p< 0.01$) and positively correlated ($r = 0.803$). The regression analysis revealed that EJC can reliably predicted TL by 64% ($R^2 = .645$). Also, there is a substantial and positive association between TL and EJC, with a coefficient of 0.311 ($p=0.000$, $N=102$). The regression analysis supports the alternative hypotheses as the P value is smaller than 0.05, which confirms that TL style has influences on EJC.

In case of gender, and years of professional experience, the result of the correlation matrix shows that there is no positive association of the covariates with TL, except years of experience. The years of experience ($p=0.036$, $p<.05$) is statistically significant with TL, whereas, gender ($p= 2.63$, $p>.05$) is not statistically significant with TL. The regression model states that only 4.8% ($R^2=0.076$) of the variance in the influence of TL can be predicted from the variables of gender, and years of professional experience. The p-values of gender ($p=0.101$) is larger than the significance level 0.05. Thus, the analysis fails to reject the null hypothesis for gender. But the test shows that years of experience is a

significant predictor ($p=0.032$, $p>.05$) for TL suggesting to reject the null hypothesis. This is an important contribution to the influence of TL analysis.

Preliminary correlation analysis and regression analysis were also conducted separately on the service and manufacturing organizations. The correlations results revealed that there is a significant and positive link between TL and EJC of the employees in both manufacturing organizations ($r=0.776$, $p< 0.01$) and service-oriented organizations ($r=0.821$, $p< 0.01$). The significance level in regression analysis is less than 0.05 for both manufacturing and service organizations which rejects the null hypothesis. Thus, it can be stated that TL has a significant influence on EJC in both manufacturing and service-oriented organizations (Table 5).

Table 4: Summary of Hypotheses

	Hypotheses	R	R ²	Sig.	Co-efficient, β	Accepted/Rejected
1	H _o : TL does not have any influence on EJC	0.803	0.645	0.000	0.311	Rejected
2	H _{oA} : Gender does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.	0.276	0.076	0.319	1.382	Accepted
3	H _{oB} : Work experience does not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.	0.276	0.076	0.032	1.908	Rejected
4	H _{oC} : Types of organizations (Manufacturing or Services) do not have any influence in the relationship between TL and EJC.	0.776 and 0.821	0.603 and 0.674	0.000 and 0.000	0.335 and 0.294	Rejected

8.0 Recommendation

From the ancient time, we have seen different types of leadership styles. In corporate world, leaders apply different types of leadership styles considering internal (people and policies) and external situation (demography, economic, and social). Among all styles, this study emphasis on transformational leadership (TL) style as it is considered as one the important styles of leadership. It has shown positive influence on the organizational performance and job commitment of the people in the organization theoretically.

After analyzing the collected data, it has also proved that it has influence on Employee Job Commitment. Thus, this study suggests that managers may utilize a TL style more in their organizations to motivate and influence employees as when firms use more TL styles, EJC increases. However, it is also recommended that managers must assess work environment before applying this TL style, as this study has conducted only on the first-line managers. Thus, to see the influence of TL on mid-level management can be the topic for future research work.

Reference:

- Acuna, B. K., & Male, T. (2022). Toxic leadership and academics' work engagement in higher education: A cross-sectional study from Chile. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, pp1-17.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1741143222104474>
- Al Zuned, A. M. (2017). Effective business leadership styles: A case study of Harriet Green. *Middle East Journal of Business*, 12(2), pp10-19.
- Avolio, B. J., David A. W. and Francis J. Y. (1991). The Four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), pp 9-16.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18 (3), pp19-31.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*, pp 49–80
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1995). Does the transactional transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?'. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp130-139.
- Bigio, S. (2015). Endogenous liquidity and the business cycle. *American Economic Review*, 105(6), pp 1883-1927.
- Bycio P, Hackett R, Allen J. Further assessments of Bass's (1985). Conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1995;80(4). Pp 468–478.
- Herold D, Fedor D, Caldwell S, Liu Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Mar, pp 346–357. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.346.
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S., & Haider, N. (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), pp 1-6.
- Judge TA, and Piccolo RF. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 89, pp 755–768. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755.
- Martin R, Epitropaki O. (2001). Role of organizational identification on implicit leadership theories, transformational leadership and work attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 4, pp 247–262.
- Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9, pp 309-312.
- Meyer, P. J., and Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, Volume 1, Issue 1, Spring 1991, pp 61-89

- Minett, D., Yaman, H. R., & Denizci, B. (2009). Leadership styles and ethical decision-making in hospitality management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), pp 486-493.
- Mirkamali, S. M., Thani, F. N., & Alami, F. (2011). Examining the role of transformational leadership and job satisfaction in the organizational learning of an automotive manufacturing company. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, pp 139-148.
- Nunnally (1978). *Applied Psychological Measurement*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 3(2), pp 279-280.
- Puni, A., Agyemang, C. B., & Asamoah, E. S. (2016). Leadership styles, employee turnover intentions and counterproductive work behaviors. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 5(1), pp 1-7.
- Schappe, Dtephen P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 132. p227.
- Scott-Halsell, S., Shumate, S. R., & Blum, S. (2008). Using a model of emotional intelligence domains to indicate transformational leaders in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), pp 99-113.
- Seltzer J, Numerof RE, Bass BM. (1989). Transformational leadership: Is it a source of more or less burnout and stress? *Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration*. 12, pp 174–185.
- Shi, Y., & Ye, M. (2016). Responsible leadership: Review and prospects. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 6(08), p877.
- Shore, Lynn McFarlane, Barksdale, Kevin, Shore, Ted H. (1995). Managerial perceptions of employee commitment to the organization. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 38, p1593.
- Usman, M. (2020). Transformational leadership and organizational change: In the context of today's leader. *International Business Education Journal*, 13(1), pp 95-107. <https://doi.org/10.37134/ibej.vol13.1.8.2020>
- Waldman D, Javidan M, Varella P. (2004). Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory. *Leadership Quarterly*. 15(3), pp 355–380.
- Zembylas, M., & Iasonos, S. (2010). Leadership styles and multicultural education approaches: An exploration of their relationship. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(2), pp 163-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120903386969>

APPENDIX

Table I: Descriptive Statistics-Transformational Leadership (TL)

My manager -		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	always seeks new opportunities.	4.00	1.160
2	creates future career path for us.	3.47	1.256
3	has a clear understanding of us.	3.63	1.304
4	inspires others for the future career.	3.55	1.240
5	Makes others committed to his/her future career.	3.54	1.224
6	leads by doing other than telling.	3.46	1.340
7	plays the role model for us.	3.46	1.391
8	Provides best example.	3.36	1.303
9	fosters teamwork among all work groups.	3.61	1.204
10	encourages to be team players.	3.68	1.153
11	leads all the group to work for the same goal.	3.62	1.227
12	develops a team attitude.	3.57	1.190
13	shows us his expectation from us.	3.77	1.151
14	insists us for the best performance.	3.66	1.294
15	always settle for the best.	3.44	1.165
16	acts considering my feelings.	3.61	1.179
17	admires personal feelings of all.	3.71	1.182
18	behaves in a supportive manner.	3.63	1.143
19	treats me with consideration.	3.75	1.158
20	has showed me the simple ways to look anything.	3.46	1.183
21	motivate me to create my own ideas.	3.52	1.158
22	motivate me to see any problems in new ways.	3.51	1.167
	Average	3.7675	0.8510

Table II: Descriptive Statistics – Employee Job Commitment (EJC)

Statements-		Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I am ready to give my best effort in order to support this organization.	3.69	1.117
2	I find this organization as a great organization to work for.	3.97	1.009
3	I would accept almost any type of job assignment for this organization.	2.97	1.270
4	I find that my values are consistent with the organization's values.	3.54	1.114
5	I am proud to be the part of this organization.	3.79	1.111
6	This organization inspires me to give my best job performance	3.40	1.180
7	It was my right decision to join this organization.	3.62	1.072
8	I really care about the future of this organization.	3.75	.949
9	This organization is best for me to work.	3.25	1.132
Average		3.7734	0.75423

Table III: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	0.803 ^a	0.645	0.642	0.96561	2.169

a. Predictors: (Constant), TL; b. Dependent Variable: EJC

Table IV: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	169.600	1	169.600	181.897	.000^b
	Residual	93.240	100	.932		
	Total	262.840	101			

a. Dependent Variable: EJC; b. Predictors: (Constant), TL

Table V: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.485	.377		3.943	.000
	TL	0.311	.023	.803	13.487	.000

a. Dependent Variable: EJC

Table VI: Model Summary of the Covariant

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.276 ^a	.076	.048	4.06645	1.745

a. Predictors: (Constant), Years of Professional Experience, Gender, Age Group; b. Dependent Variable: TL

Table VII: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	133.112	3	44.371	2.683	.051
	Residual	1620.528	98	16.536		
	Total	1753.640	101			

a. Dependent Variable: TL; b. Predictors: (Constant), years of professional experience, gender, and age group

Table VIII: Coefficients of the Covariant

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	8.250	3.453		2.389	.019	1.397	15.102
	Gender	1.382	.836	.164	1.654	.101	-.276	3.040
	Yrs. of Exp.	1.908	.877	.218	2.175	.032	.167	3.648

a. Dependent Variable: TL

Table IX: Model Summary (Manufacturing and Service Organizations)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
MO	.776 ^a	.603	.587	1.23731	2.494
SO	.821 ^a	.674	.669	.83526	2.023
a. Predictors: (Constant), TL; b. Dependent Variable: EJC					

Table X: ANOVA (Manufacturing and Service Organizations)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
MO	Regression	60.383	1	60.383	39.441	.000^b
	Residual	39.805	26	1.531		
	Total	100.187	27			
SO	Regression	103.653	1	103.653	148.572	.000^b
	Residual	50.232	72	.698		
	Total	153.885	73			
a. Dependent Variable: EJC; b. Predictors: (Constant), TL						

Table XI: Coefficients (Manufacturing and Service-oriented Organizations)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
MO	(Constant)	.863	.839		1.029	.313	-.861	2.587
	TL	.335	.053	.776	6.280	.000	.225	.445
SO	(Constant)	1.851	.400		4.629	.000	1.054	2.648
	TL	.294	.024	.821	12.189	.000	.246	.342
Dependent Variable: EJC in Manufacturing (MO), and EJC in Service-oriented Organizations (SO),								