

Employees' perception towards leadership style and organizational commitment in public organizations

Aschalew Mulugeta

Department of Management, Dire Dawa University
p.o.box 1362, Ethiopia
tel : +251910491241 e-mail-aschalewmulugeta@gmail.com

Eshetu Hailemariam

Department of Management, Dire Dawa University
p.o.box 1362, Ethiopia
tel:+251911743821 e-mail-esheyeb@gmail.com

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.8.6.2018.p7846

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.8.6.2018.p7846>

Abstract

A wide variety of managerial activities and organizational processes are affected by perception of employees. This research work is about assessing the perception of employees towards the leadership style and organizational commitment. Standard multifactor leadership and organizational commitment questionnaires were used to collect data from sample of 570 employees working in the public organization of Dire Dawa city administration. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and found that the employees perceive the leadership style to be more transformational and the commitment to be affective.

Key words: perception, leadership styles, employee commitment,

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Perception is the process through which people receive, organize, and interpret information about their environment. Perceiving involves becoming aware of the world around us and processing information about that world. Our social perceptions help us form opinions and judgments about others. Social perception is of interest because so many managerial activities are based on perceptions of employees.

Organizational commitment is a common phenomenon which has been extensively addressed by many researchers worldwide due to its importance to the organization (e.g. Angle & Perry, 1981; Kim, 2001; Lio & Nyhan, 1994; Lo, Ramayah, & Min, 2009). Organizational commitment has been linked to the performance of organizational constituents, their loyalty, organizational citizenship behavior, counterproductive behavior, employees' aggression, job satisfaction, and other individual and group constructs.

Committed employees are expected to perform at a greater level than their uncommitted counterparts (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989). They are willing to work extra hours when the job requires them to do so. They are also willing to promote the organization as a favorable place to work at. Due to its diverse accrued benefits to the organization, some researchers have devoted their effort to investigate the antecedents of organizational commitment (e.g. Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Lok & Crawford, 2004; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993).

Leadership style is the most prevalent factors that influence employees' attitudes and behaviors including organizational commitment. Leaders have adopted various styles when they lead others in the organization (Brown, 2003; Cheong, 2008; Chiang & Wang, 2012; Clark, Hartline, & Jones, 2009; Cox, 2001). Some are using democratic, people or relationship centered approach and others prefer autocratic, production centered method in order to achieve a similar goal, which is organizational effectiveness. The choice of a style is contingent on diverse factors such as personality traits of leaders, followers' acceptance of the leaders, their readiness, task complexity and the norms and values embraced by the organizational members.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Employees perception can affect organizational performance when they are willing and committed to organizational goals. A wide variety of managerial activities and organizational processes are affected by perception (Robet K. 2007).

James & Collins (2008) suggest that employees develop global beliefs of perceived organizational and perceived supervisor support. Due to the norm of mutual relationship, this support makes the employee feel obligated to exhibit beneficial organizational attitudes (commitment). Also Awan & Mahmood (2009) depict that employee commitment reflects the quality of the leadership in the organization.

In any given discipline, the success of a venture can nearly always be traced directly back to the vision and will of the leadership. Therefore, having effective leadership styles for the organization to retain competent employees is crucial to its survival. Brockner *et al.* (1992 as cited by **Temesgen, 2011**) recommended that the ability of an organization, to successfully implement business strategies, to gain a competitive advantage and optimize human capital, largely depends, among other factors, on the leadership styles that encourage employee commitment.

This study is to assess the perceptions of employees toward leadership styles of public organizations administrators (i.e. transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership) and organizational/employee commitment of public servants (i.e. affective, normative and continuance) in civil service organizations of in Dire Dawa city Administration (DDCA).

1.3. Objectives of the study

The overall aim of this study is to explore employees perception toward leadership style and employees' commitment of government/public organizations of DDCA.

2. Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The existing leadership and management research suggests that the leadership style of managers can lead to higher measures of organizational commitment in their direct reports.

The benefits of employee's organizational commitment have been well documented in the existing management literature. Committed employees are more likely to develop patterns of punctuality or to be chronically present at work (Brockner *et al.*, 1992; Hunt & Morgan, 1994).

2.2 The Concept of Leadership

Leaderships can be of many facets and they differ in effectiveness in terms of consequences of their actions towards internal and external stakeholders. Since organizations today are faced with many challenges, especially with the constant changes in technology, economic, social, political and legal conditions and internal processes, flexibility is required in resource utilization and in the

promotion of continuous learning (James & Collins, 2008; Leavy & Mckiernan, 2009). Therefore, there is a need for leaders in organizations to contribute not only in terms of knowledge or ideas but also in making right decisions and responding to the changes. Leadership can be defined as a complex social process, rooted in aspects of values, skills, knowledge as well as ways of thinking of both leaders and followers. Thus, it is all about the continuous process of establishing and maintaining a connection between who aspire to lead and those who are willing to follow (Hersey & Blanchard, 1984).

2.3 The Emergence of Leadership Theories

The earliest theories of leadership focused on the performance of great men. For instance, “without Moses, the Jews would have remained in Egypt and without Winston Churchill the British would have given up in 1940” (James & Burgoyne, 2001). Analysis of such heroic tributes gave rise to the Great Man Theory of Leadership, which contends that leaders are born, not made. This theory posits that certain individuals are endowed with leadership traits that cannot be learned (Perren & Burgoyne, 2001).

A review of the leadership literature reveals an evolving series of 'schools of thought' from “Great Man” and “Trait” theories to “Transformational” leadership. Whilst early theories tend to focus upon the characteristics and behaviors of successful leaders, later theories begin to consider the role of followers and the contextual nature of leadership.

2.4 Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM)

The FRLM describes a full range of influencing styles from ‘non-leadership’ to powerful transformational leadership behaviors. The model captures different kinds of behaviors which make a difference to outcomes for associates of the leader. In other words, the range of behaviors starts with transformational leader behaviors to transactional leader behaviors reaching to the lowest leader interaction of laissez-faire leader behaviors (MLQ, undated; Bass et al., 2003).

As we can describe an ideal or "pure" transactional leadership styles and a "pure" transformational one, it is clear that organizations are likely to have cultures that are characterized by both styles of leadership. A leader may employ both styles at different times or in differing amounts at the same time. Considerable recent research provides evidence that shows transformational leadership as eliciting extra effort and performance from followers, over and above that expected in an exchange relationship with a purely transactional leader. The authors' argument is that organizations should move in the direction of more transformational qualities in their cultures while also maintaining a base of effective transactional qualities (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass et al., 2003).

Trottier et al. (2008) suggest that Full Range Leadership theory of Bass is a strategic organization development intervention, designed to enhance the impact of leadership on employee commitment. Also the same authors emphasized that as Bass's full range leadership model is an important part of the leadership research as well as it presents researchers with a theory that can be empirically tested and provides insight into the duality that leaders face in current organizational settings.

Although multifactor theory is probably the most widely cited and comprehensive theory, leadership is often conceptualized within behavioral domains varying from non-leadership, or laissez-faire, to transactional leadership, which hinges on rewards and punishments, to transformational leadership, which is based upon attributed and behavioral charisma (Bass and Avolio, 1993 as cited in Bučiūnienė & Škudienė, 2008).

2.4.1 Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a process of influencing in which leaders change their associates' awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are

proactive: they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance "at expectations". They convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as higher levels of moral and ethical standards. Transformational leadership does not replace transactional leadership, but augments it in achieving the goals of the group (Bass, 1997; Hall et al., 2002).

In a transformational style, there is generally a sense of purpose and a feeling of family. Leaders and followers share mutual interests and a sense of shared fates and interdependence. They go beyond their self-interests or expected rewards for the good of the team and the good of the organization.

According to Bass et al. (2003), transformational leaders will focus on developing their followers by tapping them of their potentials, inspiring them, promoting collaboration, motivating them, and by reinforcing positive behaviors. The employees often develop a high level of trust and confidence in such a leader. The employees are proud to identify themselves with the leader and develop a strong sense of loyalty to them. Similarly, Bass (1997) argues that transformational leaders are pertinent especially during turbulent times when rapid changes and globalization takes place.

Transformational leadership fosters capacity development and brings higher levels of personal commitment amongst 'followers' to organizational objectives. According to Bass & Avolio (1993) transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group.

2.4.2 Transactional Leadership

A "pure" transactional style focuses on everything in terms of explicit and implicit contractual relationships. All job assignments are explicitly spelled out along with conditions of employment, disciplinary codes, and benefit structures. Self-interests are stressed. Employees work as independently as possible from their colleagues. Cooperation depends on negotiations not problem solving or a common mission. There is little identification of the employees with the organization, its mission or vision. Superiors primarily are negotiators and resource allocators (Bass and Avolio, 1993).

Transactional leadership is based more on "exchanges" between the leader and follower, in which followers are rewarded for meeting specific goals or performance criteria (Trottier et al., 2008; Bass et al., 2003). Rewards and positive reinforcement are provided or mediated by the leader. Thus transactional leadership is more practical in nature because of its emphasis on meeting specific targets or objectives (James & Collins, 2008; Sosik & Dinger, 2007). An effective transactional leader is able to recognize and reward followers' accomplishments in a timely way. However, subordinates of transactional leaders are not necessarily expected to think innovatively and may be monitored on the basis of predetermined criteria. Poor transactional leaders may be less likely to anticipate problems and to intervene before problems come to the fore, whereas more effective transactional leaders take appropriate action in a timely manner (Bass et al., 2003).

Transactional leaders display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled Contingent Reward and the corrective style is labeled Management-by-Exception (active and passive). Transactional leadership defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception are two core behaviors associated with 'management' functions in organizations. Full range leaders do this and more (MLQ, undated; Bass et al., 2003; Bolden et al., 2003).

2.4.3 Laissez-Faire leadership

Both the transformational and transactional leaders are described as leaders who actively intervene and try to prevent problems, although they use different approaches. When researching these two active forms of leadership, one finds that they are often contrasted with the third style of leadership, called laissez-faire leadership (Bass, 1990 as cited in Bučiūnienė & Škudienė, 2008). James & Collins (2008) describe the laissez-faire leader as an extreme passive leader who is reluctant to influence subordinates' considerable freedom, to the point of handing over his/her responsibilities. In a sense, this extremely passive type of leadership indicates the absence of leadership.

Laissez-faire leadership style has a negative impact on followers and associates- opposite to what is intended by the leader - manager. There are many behaviors that represent laissezfaire leadership as a “do nothing” or “hands-off” approach. Such behaviors include staying away from employees, shirking supervisory duties, and being “inactive, rather than reactive or proactive” (MLQ, undated).

2.5. The Concept of Employee Commitment

Multiple definitions of employee commitment are found in the literature. The way employee commitment is defined depends on the approach to commitment that one is adhering to. Hunt and Morgan (1994) state that organizational commitment has been operationally defined as “multidimensional in nature, involving an employee’s loyalty to the organization, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, degree of goal and value congruency with the organization, and desire to maintain membership.”

When looking at employee commitment within an organization, it is the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. In relation to this, Allen & Meyer (1990) define employee commitment as a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue employment with the organization. Similarly, Meyer & Becker (2004) define a committed employee as being one “stays with an organization, attends work regularly, puts in a full day and more, protects corporate assets, and believes in the organizational goals”.

2.5 The Dimensions of Employee Commitment

The most basic theory of employee commitment is Allen and Meyer’s conceptualization. This theory differs from others in the nature of the psychological state being described.

They identified three dimensions of employee commitment: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Normative commitment is a relatively new aspect of organizational commitment having been defined after the former ones (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

2.5.1 Affective Commitment

Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with the organization and its goals. Affective commitment involves three aspects such as the formation of an emotional attachment to an organization, identification with, and the desire to maintain organizational membership. In this context, affective commitment reflects the identification and commitment situation where the employees stay in the organization with their own will (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 2004).

Affective commitment is also attitudinal based and in this situation the employee sees him/herself as a part of the organization. Individuals with high levels of affective commitment continue employment because they want to. Therefore, it is very important for the organizations to have employees feeling affective commitment since strong affective commitment means employees willing to stay in the organization and accepting its objectives and values (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

2.5.2 Continuance commitment

Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Continuance commitment denotes the feeling that one has to stay with the organization because leaving would cost too much or because the employee perceives few employment alternatives elsewhere. It is a key predictor of desire to stay in or leave the organization (Wong, Hui, & Law, 1995).

There are two factors interpreted the development of continuance commitment. One is related to the volume of investments made and another is related to the scarce alternatives. Becker's (1960) theory has illustrates that employees keep committed to a particular organization because of their time and effort spent on mastering specific skills and gaining experiences or social relationships that cannot be replaced with ease elsewhere and would require huge investment to start over. In other words, sunk costs are taken into consideration to a great extent (Buciuniene & Skudiene, 2008). An employee is forced to remain in the organization by equally continuance commitment evolves under perceived lack of alternatives.

Continuance commitment is a commitment situation originating from the needs of employees to stay in the organization considering the costs of leaving. It refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization as well as the willingness to remain in an organization because of the investment that the employee has with "nontransferable" investments. Nontransferable investments include things such as retirement, relationships with other employees, or things that are special to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Brockner et al., 1992). Continuance commitment also includes factors such as years of employment or benefits that the employee may receive that are unique to the organization (Hunt and Morgan, 1994).

In continuance commitment, the employees consider the disadvantages of leaving the organization and avoid quitting. Moreover, continuance commitment is not a negative situation though it is considered to be a negative commitment type by the organizations.

2.5.3 Normative Commitment

Employees with a high level of normative commitment remain with the organization because they feel they ought to. Normative commitment explains an employee's tendency to stay with the organization with a sense of duty, loyalty, or obligation (Wiener, 1982). This is the component that has been argued to have significant similarities with affective commitment, especially when validating the scales presented by Meyer and Allen (1990, 1991, 1997). The antecedents of this dimension cover both prior and post-employment experiences.

As an obligation to show loyalty to one organization, normative commitment is capable of evolving much earlier than the actual employment takes place. Cultural socialization, historical traditions, family values and other external factors can affect the evolution of psychological state of obligation and incorporates a strong belief to be loyal to the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that this feeling would motivate individuals to behave properly and to do what is right for the organization. Thus, it was expected that normative commitment to the organization would be positively related to supportive work behaviors.

The three components of employee commitment are a psychological state that either characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization or has the implications to affect whether the employee will continue with the organization. An individual can have similar or different levels of all types of commitment. They are not mutually exclusive. Thus, regardless of the definition, "committed" employees are more likely to remain with the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research design

This study was carried out at government organizations found in Dire Dawa City Administration. The study was designed as the cross-sectional survey quantitative study which was used to gather the relevant and pertinent information with regard to leadership styles and employee commitment.

3.2 Population and Sampling Procedures

Since the purpose of this study is to explore employees perception toward leadership styles and employee commitment by surveying employees from public organizations of DDCA, the target population of this study included of public organizations of DDCA.

As per information obtained from Civil service bureau yearly magazine (2013) there are about 54 public organizations in DDCA including Bureaus. Since the activities performed by those public organizations diversified and different, representative sample had to be taken. In doing so the researcher set criteria like number of employees, amount of budget utilized, organizations facing huge public/customers complains. Consequently, the following 15 public organizations were purposively selected through aforementioned self sated criteria. The following table below presents the number of employees of sample selected public organizations of DDCA.

No.	Name of the Organization	Number of employees
1.	Education bureau	3096
2.	Health bureau	1079
3.	Agriculture, water and mining bureau	258
4	Dilchora Referral Hospital	396
5	Water and sewerage Authority	158
6	Road and construction Authority	106
7	Trade industry and investment Bureau	105
8	Construction and municipality bureau	103
9	Kebele 02 Administration	145
10	Finance and economic development bureau	98
11	Kebele 04 administration	77
12	Civil service bureau	76
13	Women and children bureau	64
14	Land development bureau	63
15	Water and sewerage Authority	158
Total		5982

Source: (Civil service Bureau yearly Magazine, 2014)

The aforementioned public organizations employees are 80.3% of the total public servants (7448) who are employed in the 54 public organizations of DDCA.

To select the sample from the total population of the study a single population proportion formula was used as presented below.

$$n = \frac{N.p.q.Z^2}{(N-1)e^2 + p.q.Z^2} \quad (\text{Kish and Leslie,1965})$$

N= Total population

Z= level of confidence, means the value of $Z_{0.05}=1.96$ using Z table.

e= error term or precision measurement/absolute size of the error in estimating P

p=proportion of a sample, when the proportion of the sample should be unknown then we can use

p=0.5.

n=sample size

$$n = \frac{5982 * 0.5 * 0.5 * 1.96^2}{(5982-1) * 0.04^2 + 0.5 * 0.5 * 1.96^2}$$

= 545 + 20% of n to offset the non response rate= 109+545=654

the sample was distributed to those 15 public organizations depending on their weight/proportion and the prerequisite for employee's participation as respondents in this study had to work for at least one year under the current leader

3.3 Data Sources and Type

As this study is basically empirical in nature, primary data was gathered from selected public/government organizations/bureaus employees. Hence, the more emphasize was inclined to the primary data source. The closed ended questionnaires which were designed on an *ordinal scale* of measurement basis was used to collect primary data, so that the variables could be ranked to measure the degree of their strength or the agreement or the disagreement of the respondents with the variables.

3.4 Data Gathering Instruments

For the purpose of this study a quantitative methodology involving a close-ended questionnaire was used as the measuring instrument. The close-ended questionnaires were administered to groups of people simultaneously, since they were less costly and less time consuming than other measuring instruments. Two separate instruments, namely multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) and organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ), was used in this research to obtain quantitative information on leadership styles and employees' organizational commitment respectively.

3.4.1 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Form 5X)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has been improved and tested since 1985 with the result that many versions of the questionnaire have been developed. It is formulated from the Full Range Leadership Model consisting of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership behaviors with five subscales. **Bass & Avolio** (1995) [as cited in Bass *et al.*, 2003], presented the MLQ Form 5X with five subscales of leadership styles.

Participants were asked to judge the extent to which their leader engaged in specific behaviors measured by the MLQ. The MLQ Form 5X is self-scoring and used 27 items excluding least relevant ones in our country's context to measure the nine subscales (3 items for each) in this study. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale labeled as 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = frequently, if not always. High score shows high effectiveness of leadership style perception while low score implies low effectiveness perception in the scale.

3.4.2 Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)

This Organizational Commitment Questionnaire consists of three dimensions as "Affective commitment", "Continuance commitment" and "Normative commitment". The selected OCQ is a self-scoring questionnaire and the responses to each of the 12

items (4 items for each dimension) are rated using a 5-point Likert scale labeled as 0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = neither agree nor disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. High score shows high employees' organizational commitment perception while low score implies low perception in the scale.

3.5. Data Analysis and Presentation Procedures

Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations of employees' answers to leadership styles and employee commitment scales was calculated in order to determine employees' perceptions of leadership styles and employees' organizational commitment.

4.Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

There were a total 570 employees, who participated in this study from various public organizations of Dire Dawa Administration, filled and returned the questionnaire. From the employee participants, the majority's age group was between 36 to 45 years (71.4%) followed by those 25 to 35 years old (25.8 %) and above 45 years old (2.8%) More than half of the total employee respondents have worked from 3 to 5 years (56.1%) followed by 1 to 3 years (28.8%) and above 5 years (15.1%).

4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Styles and Employee Commitment

It is needed to determine employees' perception to leadership style and organizational commitment. Table 4.1 below contains descriptive data (mean and standard deviations) for the five transformational leadership subscales, three transactional leadership subscales, one laissez-faire subscale, and three employee commitment scales as indicated by the respondents. In all cases, the distribution of scores for the sample contained reasonable variance and normality for use in subsequent analyses.

Table 4.1: Mean and Standard Deviations of Leadership Styles and Employee Commitment for employees' Responses

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation
Idealized Influence (attributed)	2.18	0.64
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.39	0.84
Inspirational Motivation	2.65	0.64
Intellectual Stimulation	2.17	0.85
Individualized Consideration	1.81	0.67
Transformational Leadership	2.25	0.65
Contingent Reward	2.43	0.81
Management-by-Exception (active)	2.21	0.76
Management-by-Exception (passive)	1.81	0.78
Transactional Leadership	2.15	0.56
Laissez-Faire	2.13	0.69
Affective Commitment	2.24	0.65
Continuance Commitment	2.16	0.66
Normative Commitment	2.18	0.56

Source: (own survey, 2016)

Note: N=570 each subscale of leadership styles and each scale of commitment has 3 items and 4 items, respectively.

4.2.1 Employees Perception to Leadership Styles

here the purpose is to determine employees' perception to current organization's leadership styles. The mean values for each of the transformational leadership subscales are calculated between 1.81 to 2.65 and having the standard deviation value of nearly 0.7; whereas for those of transactional leadership ranges from 1.81 to 2.43 and standard deviation of 0.78 and 0.81. The mean and standard deviation values for laissez-faire are 2.13 and 0.69, respectively.

The overall scores of data for the transformational and transactional subscales are, in some cases, slightly less than what Bass & Avolio (1997) [as cited in Bass et al., 2003] consider "ideal" levels for effective leadership. The suggested scores for the most effective leaders include a mean of 3.0 or higher for idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Mean scores for the subscales in this study ranged from 1.81 to 2.65.

On the other hand, the same authors suggested a mean score of 2.0 for contingent reward while this study's sample data mean score is 2.43, which is only slightly higher than the suggested one. The score for management-by-exception (active) in this study is 2.21; this is found above the suggested range of 1.0 and 2.0. In the same way, the suggested scores for management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire are between 1.0 and 0.0, but mean scores for this study have higher ranges of 1.81 and 2.13, respectively.

The aforementioned patterns of scores for this study suggest that some respondents perceived their leaders as one that has not exhibited the "ideal" levels of transformational leadership behaviors. These behaviors included instilling pride, inspiring a shared vision, talking optimistically, encouraging creativity, and placing much importance in coaching or training.

On the contrary, the mean score of contingent reward implies that some of the employees perceived their leaders as performing beyond expected average job of recognizing accomplishments and clarifying expectations. This is also similar for the management-by-exception (active) mean, which entails that some employees perceived their leaders as taking corrective action immediately when deviations occur. Furthermore, the mean scores of management-by-exception (passive) and laissez-faire proposes as some employees perceived that their immediate supervisors tended not to take corrective action or make decisions as soon as problems occur.

As the results of this study indicate, respondents perceived leadership style to be slightly more transformational (Mean=2.25) than to that of transactional (Mean = 2.15) and laissez-faire (M = 2.13). Therefore, this supports the finding by Trottier et al. (2008) that shows transformational leadership variables are slightly more important in terms of their overarching concept of leadership effectiveness in followers' perceptions of importance.

4.2.2 Employees Perception to their Organizational Commitment

In addition to the scores of leadership styles, the mean and standard deviations of the employees' commitment to their organization are presented in Table 4.3 as indicated by the respondents. The mean and standard deviation scores for each of the employee commitment scales are ranked by respondents as affective commitment has 2.24 and 0.65, normative commitment has 2.18 and .56, and continuance commitment has 2.16 and .66, respectively.

When we see from highest to lowest mean scores, respondents ranked their "Affective commitment" with highest mean of 2.24 whereas their "Continuance commitment" having lowest mean of 2.16 from total. In describing the application of their Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) scales, Allen & Meyer (1990) do not provide guidance about average, required, ideal, or expected means for affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Instead, Allen & Meyer (1990) and other researchers (Brockner et al., 1992; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Hunt & Morgan, 1994; Meyer et al., 2004) studied to identify what was a relationship between the

different types of organizational commitment and the outcomes that are being examined, as well as the pattern for those findings, and their level of influence.

Many of them proposed that the required pattern to be ranked starting from highest to lowest scores in the following manner such as affective commitment, normative commitment, and then continuance commitment.

The results of this study reflect that the pattern for mean scores is consistent with the above mentioned ones by presenting that affective commitment has highest score followed by normative commitment, and then continuance commitment has the least score. This indicates that some of the employees have strong affective commitment towards their organizations where they would consider themselves as belonging to these organizations. However, lowest mean of continuance commitment implies as the respondents felt that their leaders are not paying enough attention to the rewards in exchange of efforts they provide to the organizations compared to others.

5. Conclusion

In Dire Dawa city Administration, the employees of public organizations perceive the leadership style to be more transformational, followed by transactional and laissez-faire leadership style respectively. This indicates the leaders are more proactive striving for higher potential and standards, trust and higher level of commitment.

In the perception of employees of their commitment, they have affective commitment, followed by normative commitment and continuance commitment respectively. Employees in the public organization of the city administration have more attachment and involvement in the organization and prefer to stay in the organization.

6. References

- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990), The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization'. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. Retrieved March 28, 2015 from <http://workandbabies.com/wpcontent/uploads/2009/11/allen-myer-1990.pdf>
- Avolio, B., Zhu, W., Koh, W. & Bhatia, P. (2004), Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment: Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment and Moderating Role of Structural Distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 951–968. Retrieved March 18, 2015 from http://download.clib.psu.ac.th/datawebclib/e_resource/trial_database/WileyInterScienceCD/pdf/JOB/JOB_3.pdf
- Awan, M. R. & Mahmood, K. (2009), Relationship among leadership style, organizational culture and employee commitment in university libraries. *Library Management*, 31, 253-266. Retrieved January 11, 2011 from www.emeraldinsight.com/0143-5124.htm Bass, B.M.,
- Avolio, B. J., Jung, D.I., & Berson, Y. (2003), Predicting Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207–218. Retrieved March 14, 2011 from <http://forum.hrdiscussion.com/forum5/topic579.html>
- Bass, B.M. (1997), The ethics of transformational leadership. *KLSP: Transformational Leadership, Working Papers*. Retrieved September 28, 2015 from http://www.academy.umd.edu/publications/klspdocs/bbass_pl.htm
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993), Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 12, 113-121.

Bernson, M., Levine, D., & Krehbiel, T. (2002), *Basic Business Statistics: Concepts and Applications* (8th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Biggam, J. (2008), *Succeeding with your Master's Dissertation: A step-by-step handbook*. London: McGraw Hill.

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A. and Dennison, P. (2003), A review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks, Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter, United Kingdom. Retrieved March 28, 2011 from http://centres.exeter.ac.uk/cls/documents/mgmt_standards.pdf

Brockner, J., Tyler, T., & Scheneider (1992), The Influence of Prior Commitment to An Institution on Reactions to Perceived Unfairness: The higher they are, the harder they fall. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 241-2615. Bučiūnienė, I. & Škudienė, V. (2008), Impact of Leadership Styles on Employees' Organizational Commitment in Lithuanian Manufacturing Companies. *SEE Journal*, 33, 57-65