

HOW ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP STYLE AFFECT THE WORK MOTIVATION AND COMMITMENT

Mohan S

Faculty of Management, SRM Institute of science and technology, Kattankulathur, Chennai-603203, Tamil Nadu, India.

Dr.V.Nithayananthan

Faculty of Management, SRM Institute of science and technology, Kattankulathur, Chennai-603203, Tamil Nadu, India, *corresponding author.

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to explore how organizational culture and leadership style affect organizational commitment and work motivation in the information technology sector in south India.

Design/methodology/approach: The study used a questionnaire for conducting the study, which included 226 workers in south India's information technology industry as the sample size. We evaluated the associations between the variables under this study by examining the data through factor analysis, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regression.

Findings: The cross-sectional data from 226 employees reveals some interesting results, highlighting the interrelationships between all the variables. The findings suggest that managers need to build on this concept by providing further training and development of employees' skills in addition to an organizational culture of acceptance, adaptation, and diversity.

Practical implications: This article will assist managers and policymakers in the information technology industry in developing a better knowledge of organizational culture and leadership styles, as well as their impact on commitment and motivation. Creating incentive programmes that appeal to all levels of employees independently of one another should be a managerial goal.

Originality/value: a comprehensive study that combines the variables of leadership styles, organizational commitment, work motivation, and organizational commitment into a complete model of study. The originality of this paper shows the effect of organizational commitment and leadership styles on work motivation and organizational commitment. This research conducted in south India, more specifically in Bengaluru, Chennai, and Hyderabad.

Keywords: Organizational culture, Organizational commitment, leadership style, work motivation, and information technology.

Paper type: Research paper

1.Introduction

Organizations are constantly striving to optimize their most valuable resource—their human capital—in today's dynamic and competitive business environment. As these factors are widely recognized as drivers of productivity, innovation, and overall organizational success, the pursuit

of higher levels of employee work motivation and organizational commitment is central to this endeavor. Achieving and maintaining high levels of motivation and commitment, however, is a multi-faceted challenge that depends to a large extent on the interplay between the style of leadership and the culture of the organization. Human capital is one of the resources that support an organization's mission (Holland et al., 2007) because it provides a competitive advantage through uniqueness. Various factors contribute to the value of human resources in organizational performance. This has direct and indirect links to organizational culture and leadership styles. The increased competition for resources and the scarcity of resources, among other factors, require a more strategic approach by the managers and leaders of the organization to the task of satisfying their employees and increasing their commitment and motivation to work.

Organizational culture is established in the early stages of an organization's life due to the importance of employee fit in their commitment to the organization (Behery and Paton, 2008). It is one of the most difficult factors to change at a later stage, as it develops over time to reach a level of pervasiveness and deployment. With the advent of the multi-fold increased influx of women into the workforce in the twentieth century (Igbaria and Baroudi, 1995), the importance of culture lies in its setting the framework for several variables in the organization. (efficacy and/or effectiveness) and behavioral norms.

This intensifies the need to ensure the maximum use of human resources. The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation in the education sector in the State of Qatar. This research provides a comprehensive analysis of organizational culture and various leadership styles to understand the factors influencing job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work motivation. Each of these factors determines the effectiveness and efficiency of the employees within the organization. This is essential for integrating the factors so as to offer a significant tool for use by various policymakers and managers of institutions in making leadership-based, effective decisions as well as laying the foundations for a healthy organizational culture.

2.Literature Review

2.1 Leadership style

Leadership is a multifaceted concept, impacted by situational factors, individual traits, interpersonal dynamics, and other workplace elements (DeCaro, 2005). As stated by Daft (2005), leadership entails a reciprocal relationship between leaders and followers, where both parties influence one another to achieve common goals and enact change. Bass (1998) describes leadership as an interplay among group members. According to Northouse (2007), leadership is fundamentally a process, not an inherent trait, and it involves interactions between leaders and their followers. This research will utilize the following definition of leadership: Yukl (2010) defines leadership as the process of influencing others to understand and agree on what needs to be done and how to do it, while also facilitating individual and collective efforts to achieve mutual objectives. Leadership style refers to the interaction patterns between leaders and their subordinates (Miller et al., 2002). This study adopts the path-goal leadership theory that identifies leader behaviors as directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented (House and

Mitchell, 1974; Indvik, 1987). The theory posits that each of these four leadership styles is effective under specific circumstances when leaders adapt their behaviors according to their subordinates and the task at hand (Satterlee, 2013).

The autocratic leader exercises control over team members and employs unilateral actions to accomplish a single objective. This leadership approach often leads to passive resistance from team members, necessitating persistent pressure and guidance from the leader to accomplish tasks. Autocratic leaders maintain a servant-master relationship with their subordinates (Adair, 1984). On the other hand, Starrat (2001) asserts that democratic leaders consult their team for every decision while acting as the central governing unit. Democratic leaders enable their teams to initiate tasks and grant them the liberty to accomplish those tasks at their own pace. An effective democratic leader consistently encourages participation and delegation, acknowledging they bear ultimate responsibility for any outcomes. Lastly, the laissez-faire leader exhibits minimal interference in their followers' affairs and exercises low control over the group. The leader's engagement in group activities is relatively low. Consequently, under a laissez-faire leadership style, groups usually struggle with insufficient direction or motivation (Bittel, 1989).

2.2 Organization culture

The examination of organizational culture encompasses a wide range of aspects, such as levels (observable, voiced values, and underlying assumptions), potency (strong or weak), and adaptability (adaptive or un adaptive). Researchers have developed various models and theories to evaluate organizational cultures along multiple dimensions, resulting in distinct yet similar theoretical frameworks. For instance, culture may be classified into adaptability/achievement/clan/bureaucratic categories (Daft, 2005), clan/adhocracy/hierarchy/market models (Cameron and Freeman, 1991; Quinn and Cameron, 1983; Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), and communal/fragmented/networked/mercenary groupings (Goffee and Jones, 1998). Wallach (1983) suggests that an organization's culture can comprise a mix of three classifications—bureaucratic, innovative, or supportive—in various proportions. For this study, we have adapted Wallach's (1983) framework. Wallach (1983) posits that the Organizational Culture Index (OCI) portrays culture across these three archetypal dimensions, allowing for the determination of an organization's unique blend based on the combination of these elements.

(1) Bureaucratic cultures typify an organized and methodical approach, featuring distinct responsibilities and authority. Organizations adopting this culture tend to be structured, cautious, orderly, rule-based, hierarchical, regulated, stable, and focused on power (Berson et al., 2008; Taormina, 2009).

(2) Innovative cultures: inventive, goal-oriented, high-pressure, invigorating, daring, demanding, entrepreneurial, and motivated (Koberg & Chusmir, 1987; Valencia et al., 2010). This culture emphasizes internal organizational systems and competitive advantage through fostering receptiveness to novel ideas (Rasool et al., 2012).

(3) Supportive cultures: characterized by trust, safety, fairness, sociability, and an orientation towards relationships, these cultures promote a cooperative environment (Berson et al., 2008;

Burke et al., 2007). Such a culture offers a welcoming work atmosphere with generally helpful and amicable employees (Wallach, 1983).

2.3 Work motivation.

The first person to realize the importance of motivation was Sigmund Freud (Hershey and Blanchard, 1988), who held the view that individuals could never attain their desires. Motives and subconscious needs shape human behavior, leading individuals to make choices based on the appeal they derive from varying actions and efforts.

Mitchell (1982) describes motivation as the extent to which a person desires and chooses to participate in particular behaviors. Higgins (1994) portrays motivation as an inner force for fulfilling unfulfilled needs. Other scholars relate motivation to the workplace setting. According to Lindner (1998), work motivation is "the internal force that prompts individuals to achieve personal and organizational objectives," while Nahavandi and Malekzadeh (1999) define work motivation as a "mental state, desire, energy, or interest that transforms into action." In this context, the action refers to work performance. This study will adopt the following definition for work motivation: "An array of dynamic forces originating from within and beyond an individual's existence, aimed at initiating work-related behavior and determining its shape, direction, intensity, and duration" (Latham and Pinder, 2005, p. 486).

2.4. Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment is the expression of an employee's belief in and dedication to their organization's goals and values, as well as their determination to stay with the organization and remain loyal (Mowday et al., 1982; Hackett et al., 2001). As organizations continually adapt and evolve, managers are constantly searching for methods to enhance employee commitment, which in turn leads to a competitive edge and improved work attitudes such as job satisfaction, performance, reduced absenteeism, and turnover intentions (Lok and Crawford, 2001; Yousef, 2000). Allen and Meyer (1990) devised a model of organizational commitment that incorporated three elements: affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional bond with, identification of, and engagement in the organization. Researchers have primarily focused on affective commitment when studying organizational commitment (Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2003). An employee's perceived costs associated with leaving the organization are related to their continued commitment. Normative commitment pertains to an employee's sense of obligation to remain with the organization. Researchers have given relatively less attention to normative involvement.

Loke (2001) posits that a leader's behavior has a direct impact on an employee's commitment to the organization. Acar (2012) asserts that leadership styles positively influence organizational commitment. Karrasch (2003) discovered that leadership behaviors have a positive correlation with employees' affective and normative commitment but a negative relationship with continuance commitment (Rivera and Tovar, 2007). Huang et al. (2006) found that the leader-follower relationship positively contributes to employee empowerment, ultimately leading to increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Some researchers argue that one frequently cited

reason for employees resigning from their jobs is poor treatment by their supervisors (Tepper, 2000).

3. Research methodology

3.1 Sample and data collection

This study examines the relationship between leadership style, organization culture, motivation, and organizational commitment. The description provided illustrates the research model depicted in Figure 1. This research is located in South India, and more specifically in Bengaluru, Chennai, and Hyderabad. The researchers conducted the study from April to July 2023. This study tested the effects of leadership style, organization culture, motivation, and organizational commitment on employees of information technology companies. The variables of the research were leadership style, organisation culture, organisational commitment, and work motivation. Factor analysis, Pearson correlation, and multiple linear regression. Researchers commonly use a calculation tool for analysis.

Figure 1.



3.1 Sample and data collection

Recent studies on organizational commitment indicate that researchers often utilize survey-based methodologies to examine various facets of these commitments. Shafazawana et al. (2016) assessed organizational commitment by leveraging a modified version of Allen and Meyer's (1996) three-revised component scale, which includes affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Yiing and Ahmad (2009) explored the moderating impact of organizational commitment on the connections between leadership style, organizational culture, and work motivation. Information technology employees completed self-administered questionnaires to gather data. Researchers commonly use surveys in this field because investigating organizational commitment and its connections limits their control or manipulation of independent variables (Jain, 2015). According to Kerlinger (1986, p. 348), survey research is a "systematic, empirical inquiry in which the scientist lacks direct control of independent variables due to their pre-existing manifestations or inherent non-manipulability." Therefore, we chose a questionnaire-based survey

method for our study to accommodate the large sample size instead of qualitative and experimental approaches. We facilitated data collection by using self-administered questionnaires accessed through online platforms like SurveyMonkey.com and Google Forms.

We developed each variable's questionnaire using previously established scales. Harris and Ogbonna (2001) developed a 13-item leadership behavior scale to measure leadership style, which assesses supportive (4 items), participative (5 items), and directive (4 items) leadership styles. Table 1 displays the reliability values (Cronbach's alpha) for this research questionnaire.

Table 1: Cronbach's α for leadership style

Leadership style	Cronbach's alpha
Supportive Leadership	0.91
participative leadership	0.81
Directive leadership	0.87

The organizational culture scale drew upon Wallach's (1983) 24-item measure, which categorizes organizational culture into innovative, supportive, and bureaucratic types with eight items each. The reliability values (Cronbach's α) used to gauge the internal consistency of this research's measurements are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: Cronbach's α for Organizational Culture

Organizational Culture	Cronbach's alpha
Supportive Culture	0.88
participative Culture	0.84
Bureaucratic Culture	0.80

We assessed work motivation using the 11-item scale from Robinson (2004), designed to gauge individual drive to excel in job performance. Table 3 provides the reliability values (Cronbach's α) for this research questionnaire.

Table 3: Cronbach's α for Work Motivation

Work motivation	Cronbach's alpha
Work motivation	0.83

Organizational commitment was gauged using the eight-point continuance commitment scale created by Meyer and Allen (1991). Their perception entails that employees remain within an organization due to necessity and the potential economic benefits they receive (Beck and Wilson, 2000). This results in employees fostering commitment to their organization because of rewarding factors. The reliability values (Cronbach's α) of this study questionnaire by Meyer and Allen (1993) can be observed in Table 4.

Table 4: Cronbach's α for Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment	Cronbach's alpha
Organizational commitment	0.80

4. Analysis and results

4.1 Regression analysis

We used regression analysis to estimate the relationships between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. This estimation is necessary to test the proposed hypotheses.

The result of the first regression for the organizational culture, leadership style (an independent variable), vs. the dependent variable, work motivation, is shown in Tables 6. Table 6 indicates that bureaucratic organizational culture, nationality, and job level have a significant influence on work motivation. From the model summary in Table 6, about 25.8 percent of the work motivation can be explained by a bureaucratic organizational culture, job satisfaction, education level, and job level.

Table 5: Regression coefficient organizational culture, leadership style, and work motivation

Model	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized coefficient		
	B	SE	β	T	sig
Constant	1.878	0.338		5.688	
Education level	0.126	0.077	0.099	2.014	0.031
Job level	-0.064	0.044	-0.103	-2.052	0.045
Years of service	-0.009	0.067	0.029	0.745	0.252
Supportive culture	-0.093	0.058	-0.003	-1.523	0.095
participative Culture	0.054	0.076	0.069	0.089	0.256
Bureaucratic culture	0.188	0.066	0.166	2.812	0.009
Directive leadership	0.041	0.059	0.051	0.621	0.045
Participative-supportive leadership	-0.025	0.063	-0.049	-0.652	0.256

Table 6. Work motivation regression model summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	0.489	0.286	0.252	0.526741

Note: Model summary organizational culture, leadership style and work motivation

The equation of the model is:

Work motivation = 1.878 + 0.188 bureaucratic culture + 0.126 educational level + 0.041 directive leadership + 0.064 job level

The second regression results for organizational culture and leadership style satisfaction with the control variables vs. organizational commitment are presented in Tables 7 and 8. Table 7 illustrates that supportive organizational culture, directive leadership, and participative-supportive leadership have a significant effect on organizational commitment. The model summary in Table 8 shows that about 67.5 percent of the organizational commitment can be created by a supportive culture, directive leadership, participative-supportive leadership, education level and years of service.

Table 7: Regression coefficient organizational culture, leadership style, and work motivation

Model	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized coefficient		
	B	SE	β	T	sig
Constant	1.698	0.238		7.268	
Education level	-0.112	0.048	-0.089	-2.212	0.031
Job level	-0.059	0.024	-0.053	-1.952	0.065
Years of service	0.052	0.029	0.079	2.125	0.032
Supportive culture	0.353	0.041	0.383	7.023	0.021
participative Culture	-0.024	0.054	-0.019	-1.289	0.156
Bureaucratic culture	-0.088	0.049	-0.065	-1.619	0.089
Directive leadership	0.142	0.038	0.198	3.521	0.025
Participative-supportive leadership	0.311	0.036	0.389	6.852	0.001

Table 8. Work motivation regression model summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	0.752	0.675	0.661	0.498525

Note: Model summary organizational culture, leadership style and work motivation

The equation of the model is:

Organizational commitment = 1.698 + 0.353 Supportive culture + 0.142 directive leadership + 0.311 participatory-supportive leadership + 0.112 education level + 0.052 years of service

From this regression analysis, it is evident that organizational commitment has more influence over organizational culture and leadership style followed by the organizations. A supportive culture in an organization means employees have more commitments to the organization and are working for a longer period.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings from our research will be advantageous for organization managers in South India, as they allow them to comprehend the factors influencing organizational commitment. This is especially crucial in industries with highly professional workforces, such as the IT sector, where commitment tends to be lower and less comprehended (Wang and Armstrong, 2004). Since many employees are expatriates, understanding the variables that impact work motivation and, subsequently, commitment will enable the development of effective strategies to enhance dedication. Anari (2012) supports this outcome, stating that the primary motive for conducting such a study is to boost work motivation and organizational commitment, subsequently reducing high turnover rates among software professionals.

In recent years, organizational commitment has emerged as one of the most significant research topics within organizational behavior due to its close connection with numerous individual and organizational aspects (Bahrami et al., 2016). Given that a substantial portion of school staff are non-nationals who will eventually leave, it is crucial to reinforce affective commitment involving loyalty and identification with the organization. This may involve incorporating employees in decision-making processes for matters like evaluations, annual leave,

and end-of-contract benefits. Furthermore, organizations should encourage and support employees to adopt innovative techniques that improve learning rather than simply following a top-down method. The current research also indicates a significant correlation between organizational commitment and culture. Therefore, managers can foster a positive and desirable work environment for employees to enhance their motivation and job satisfaction (Bahrami et al., 2016). Understanding leadership and commitment within information technology companies is crucial, as effective leadership and committed employees contribute to overall effectiveness (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016).

Based on the conclusions above, there are some recommendations for further studies, and the object of the study is as follows: Recommendation: For the top-level management to improve employee performance, there is a need to improve the transformational leadership capability and the organizational commitment and work motivation of the employees. Therefore, there is a need to conduct training and development regularly for human resources.

Future research could address the limitations of this study. Firstly, due to time restrictions, this study utilized a cross-sectional method, gathering data from a population at a single moment in time. Unfortunately, this approach does not effectively identify the underlying causes of relationships between variables. Conducting longitudinal studies would rectify this issue by allowing observations over an extended period. Secondly, despite conducting a pilot questionnaire to assess scale competency, some participants found the organizational culture scale items to be unclear. During the data collection stage, participants raised several questions about these items.

Reference

1. Acar, A. (2012), "Organizational culture, leadership styles, and organizational commitment in the Turkish logistics industry," *Social and Behavioral Sciences Journal*, Vol. 58, pp. 217–226.
2. Adair, J. (1984), *The Skills of Leadership*, Gower, Aldershot
3. Anari, N.N. (2012), "Teachers: emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 256-269.
4. Andrews, D. F. [1974], "A robust method for multiple linear regression," *Technometrics*, **16**, 523–531.
5. Bahrami, M.A., Barati, O., Ghoroghchian, M.S., Montazer-alfaraj, R., and Ezzatabadi, M.R. (2016), Role of organizational climate in organizational commitment: the case of teaching hospitals Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 96–100.
6. Bittel, L.R. (1989), *The McGraw-Hill 36-hour Management Course*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY
7. Beck, K., and Wilson, C. (2000), "Have we studied, should we study, and can we study the development of commitment? Methodological issues and the developmental study of work-related commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 257–278.

8. Behery, M.H., and Paton, R.A. (2008), "Performance appraisal: cultural fit and organizational outcomes within the UAE," *Education, Business, and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 166–176.
9. Berson, Y., Oreg, S., and Dvir, T. (2008), "CEO values, organizational culture, and firm outcomes," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 29 No. 5, pp. 615-633.
10. Burke, C.S., Sims, D.E., Lazzara, E.H., and Salas, E. (2007), "Trust in leadership: a multi-level review and integration," *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 606–632, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.006.
11. Cameron, K.S., and Freeman, S.J. (1991), "Cultural congruence, strength, and type: relationships to effectiveness," *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 5, pp. 23–58.
12. Champoux, J.E. (1991), "A multivariate test of the job characteristics theory of work motivation," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 12 No. 5, pp. 431-46.
13. Chiu, R.K., Luk, V.W.M., and Tang, T.L.P. (2002), "Retaining and motivating employees: compensation preferences in Hong Kong and China," *Personnel Review*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 402-31.
14. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.
15. Daft, R. (2005), *The Leadership Experience*, Thomson South-Western, Mason, OH.
16. Decaro, N.E. (2005), "An investigation of the relationship between initiating structure, consideration, and gender perception: an examination of the path-goal theory," UMI No. 3187623, doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Dissertations, and these database.
17. Deluga, R.J. (2006), "The politics of leadership: the relationship between task-people leadership and subordinate influence," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 359–66.
18. Goffee, R., and Jones, G. (1998), *The Character of a Corporation: How Your Company's Culture Can Make or Break Your Business*, Harper Business, London.
19. Harris, L.C., and Ogbonna, E. (2001), "Leadership style and market orientation: an empirical study," *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 35, No. 5/6, pp. 744–764.
20. Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. (1988), *Management of Organizational Behavior*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
21. J. (1994), *The Management Challenge*, 2nd ed., Macmillan, New York, NY.
22. Holland, P., Sheehan, C., and De Cieri, H. (2007), "Attracting and retaining talent: exploring human resources management trends in Australia," *Human Resource Development International*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 247–262.
23. Huang, X., Shi, K., Zhang, Z., and Cheung, Y.L. (2006), "The impact of participative leadership behavior on psychological empowerment and organizational commitment in Chinese state-owned enterprises: the moderating role of organizational enure," *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 345–367.

24. Igbaria, M., and Baroudi, J.J. (1995), "The impact of job performance evaluations on career advancement prospects: an examination of gender differences in the IS workplace," *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 107–123.
25. Indvik, J. (1987), "A meta-analysis of gender as a moderator of leader behavior-subordinate outcome relationships," in Nadler, L., Nadler, M., and Mancillas, W.T. (Eds), *Advances in Gender and Communication Research*, University Press of America, New York, NY.
26. Jain, A.K. (2015), "Volunteerism and organizational culture," *Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 116–144.
27. Karrasch, A.I. (2003), "Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment," *Military Psychology*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 225-236.
28. Kerlinger, F.N. (1986), *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd ed., American Problem Series, Holt, Reinhart, and Winston, New York, NY.
29. Latham, P., and Pinder, C. (2005), "Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century," *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 56, pp. 485–516,.
30. Lindner, J.R. (1998), "Understanding employee motivation," *Journal of Extension*, Vol. 36, No. 3, available at: joe.org/joe/1998june/rb3.
31. Lok, P., and Crawford, J. (2001), "Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 16 no. 7/8, pp. 594-613.
32. Lok, P., and Crawford, J. (2004), "The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a cross-national comparison," *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 321-38.
33. Loke, J.C.F. (2001), "Leadership behaviors: effects on job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment", *Journal of Nursing Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 191-204.
34. Meyer, J.P., and Allen, N.J. (1991), "A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment," *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 61–89.
35. Meyer, J.P., and Allen, N.J. (1993), "Commitment to the organization and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, No. 4, pp. 538–551.
36. Meyer, J.P., and Allen, N.J. (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace*, Sage, London.
37. Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D., and Jackson, D.N. (1989), "Organizational commitment and job performance: it's the nature of the commitment that counts," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74 No. 1, pp. 152–6.
38. Mitchell, T.R. (1982), "Motivation: new directions for theory, research, and practice," *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 80–88.
39. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.M., and Steers, R.M. (1982), *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*, Academic Press, New York, NY.

40. Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., and Porter, L.W. (1979), "The measurement of organizational commitment," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14, pp. 224–47.
41. Nahavandi, A., and Malekzadeh, A. (1999), *Organizational Behavior: The Person-Organization Fit*, Prentice Hall, NJ.
42. Northouse, P.G. (2007), *Leadership Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications, London.
43. Quinn, R.E., and Cameron, K. (1983), "Organizational life cycles and sifting criteria of effectiveness: some preliminary evidence," *Management Science*, Vol. 29, pp. 33–51.
44. Quinn, R.E., and Rohrbaugh, J. (1983), "A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis," *Management Science*, Vol. 29, pp. 363–77.
45. Rasool, S., Kiyani, A.A., Aslam, M.J., Akram, M.U., and Rajput, A.A. (2012), "Impact of organizational culture on employees' career salience: an empirical study of the banking sector in Islamabad, Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3, No. 7, pp. 299–306.
46. Rivera, B.R.G., and Tovar, L.A.R. (2007), "A turnover perception model of the general working population in the Mexican cross-border assembly (Maquiladora) industry," *Innovar*, Vol. 17 No. 29, pp. 93–106.
47. Robinson, K.L. (2004), "The impact of individual differences on the relationship between employee perceptions of organizational justice and organizational outcome variables", dissertation, Alliant International University, San Diego, CA, pp. 1-156.
48. Satterlee, A. (2013), *Organizational Management and Leadership: A Christian Perspective*, 2nd ed., Synergistic International Inc, Raleigh, NC.
49. Shafazawana, M.T., Ying, C.Y., Zuliawati, M.S., and Kavitha, S. (2016), "Managing job attitudes: the roles of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviors," *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 35, pp. 604-611.
50. Starrat, R.J. (2001), "Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: an oxymoron or ironic possibility," *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 333-522.
51. Tepper, B.J. (2000), "Consequences of abusive supervision," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 178–190.
52. Wallach, E.J. (1983), "Individuals and organizations: the cultural match," *Training and Development Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 29–36.
53. Wang, X., and Armstrong, A. (2004), "An empirical study of PM professionals' commitment to their profession and employing organizations," *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 377–386,
54. Yahaya, R., and Ebrahim, F. (2016), "Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review," *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 190–216.
55. Yiing, L. (2008), "The association between organizational culture and leadership behavior and organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and employee performance—A

Malaysian perspective, *Jabatan Dasar dan Strategi Perniagaan*, Fakulti Perniagaan dan Perakaunan, University Malaya.

56. Yiing, L.H., and Ahmad, K.Z.B. (2009), "The moderating effects of organizational culture on the relationships between leadership behavior and organizational commitment and between organizational commitment and job satisfaction and performance," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 53–86.
57. Yousef, D.A. (2001), "Islamic work ethic: a moderator between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in a cross-cultural context," *Personnel Review*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 152–69.
58. Yukl, G. (2010), *Leadership in Organizations*, 7th ed., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.