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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in non-governmental organizations. The study was guided by the following key research questions focusing on the four styles of leadership as derived from the theoretical framework: What is the effect of directive leadership style on employee commitment in NGOs? How does supportive leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? In what ways does participative leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? Lastly, does achievement oriented leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?

The study employed descriptive research design with emphasis on the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in NGOs. The target population of interest in this study was made up of employees of CA in Kenya, Malawi and Nigeria who were 100 in total. The sample frame consisted of a list of all official employees that worked in CA in those countries and was obtained from the HR Department. The sample size was 80 employees of CA who were selected using a stratified sampling technique and were divided into managers and non-managers. Data was collected using questionnaires and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings were presented using tables and charts. Correlational analysis was also be employed to test the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

The study showed that managers at CA told employees what needed to be done and how it needed to be done and that they did expect employees to question them. The study also showed that managers at CA expected staff to report back after completing each step of the work and they explained the level of performance that was expected of employees. The study showed that CA managers asked employees to follow standard rules and regulations and ensured that employees were aware of, and understood the organization’s policies and procedures, and they took actions when rules and regulations were not followed.

The study showed that managers at CA maintained a friendly working relationship with subordinates and they behaved in a manner that was thoughtful to employee’s needs. The study also showed that managers at CA gave feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner and they were approachable and friendly. The study showed that all team
members at CA were given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences and employee teams in the organization enjoyed a friendly working environment.

The study showed that managers at CA listened receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions and they consulted with employee teams when they were facing a problem, and before making key decisions. The study showed that employees at CA were assigned into task groups, to action policies or objectives affecting them, and that, managers scheduled work for employees by involving them. The study showed that CA managers held regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication, and that, they maintained an open door policy which made them easily accessible to employees.

The study showed that employees at CA find that their values and the organizations values are very similar, and they were very happy to be members of the organization. Employees enjoyed talking about their organization to people outside the organization, and they understood how their work contributed to the organizations goals and objectives. The study also showed that it would be very hard for employees at CA to leave their organization immediately, even if they wanted to. The study showed that CA employees were happy to stay in with the organization because of the support they received from their managers and their current position was inspiring for them. The study showed that CA employees felt that they owe the organization quite a bit because of what it had done for them and that they were willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the organization become successful.

Directive leadership hiders the creation of a culture for shared values and employees are less likely to adopt organizational or managerial values when they are excluded from decision-making processes. This study therefore recommends CA to apply directive leadership on programmes/ situations that is needed cautiously, so as to receive feedback from employees for better commitment. Achievement oriented style of leadership expects continuous improvement in how employees apply skills for better results in each performance cycle. The study recommends CA to apply this leadership style since the study has revealed it to be the most effective in achieving employee commitment, since it encourages the employee’s willingness to stay with the organization.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

The changing funding context in International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) has led to excessive competition between different agencies for scarce resources and a demand for clear demonstration of value for money, leading to a non-negotiable requirement for a competent workforce. These challenges necessitate actions directed at eliciting commitment from the employees with the aim to retain the best talent at the optimum level of engagement. It should be noted that most NGOs employ local talent, as part of ensuring local commitment and increasing the probability of success (Murdie & Kakietek, 2012). The sustainability of such commitment amidst stiff competition, and a higher demand for accountability, will largely depend on how organizations build their capability to influence employees to commit their best skills and energies to achieve organizational goals and to deliver donor requirements (Daft, 2008). In clear sight at Christian Aid (CA) and other NGOs is the unavoidable approach to employment on fixed term contract basis, owing to the nature of NGO project funding as determined by donors. Employees are therefore always having at the forefront of their mind how to secure their employment either with the current employer or a different employer, whichever seems more promising.

Leadership is regarded as a key factor in the initiation of transformative change in organizations, with leaders having the capability to espouse and entrench behaviours and attitudes that result in a positive effect on individuals, teams, and organizations (Raja & Palanichamy, 2011). Achua and Lussier (2013), define leadership as the influencing process of leaders and followers to achieve organizational objectives through change. They continue to define influence, as the process of a leader communicating ideas, gaining acceptance of them, and motivating followers to support and implement the ideas through change. The essence of leadership is anchored on the ability of a leader to influence how employees respond in an organization (Gunavathy & Indumathi, 2010). According to Daft (2008) leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes and outcomes that reflect their shared purposes. This provokes the intent of this study then to investigate how this leadership influences executed in the aforementioned context of NGOs can have an effect on employee commitment.
Leadership is a key factor in the management and control of employees and the organization and, can be viewed as a series of managerial attitudes, behaviours, characteristics and skills, based on individual and organizational values, leadership interests and, reliability of employees in different situations (Alkhatani, 2016). Leadership is executed in different styles depending on the leader’s personality and the situation at hand. Irwin (2014) suggests that style is the outward face of a leader because it is the most readily observable way we interact with others. There are various evolutionary models of leadership styles that have been developed, a majority of them lying along a continuum of job centeredness and employee centeredness (Achua & Lussier, 2013). Daft (2008) while making reference to Fielder’s Contingency Model, refers to relationship orientation or task orientation leadership styles. Job entered leadership style is said to be the degree to which a leader takes charge to get the job done, while the employee centered leadership style is where the leader endeavours to meet the personal needs while developing relationships (Achua & Lussier, 2013). Studies conducted by the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Centre and the Ohio State University, offer models which focus on two main dimensions of leadership styles including, initiating structure style behaviours and consideration style behaviours (Achua & Lussier, 2013).

Commitment can be defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with an organization and involvement in the organization. Organizational Commitment refers to the acceptance of organizational values and willingness to stay in that organization (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Commitment to the organization is linked to key work related factors such as; employee absenteeism, employee turnover, employee performance and, employee citizenship behaviour (Alkhatani, 2016). Organizational commitment can be categorized into three components namely: affective commitment, continuance commitment and, normative commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Affective commitment is linked to the employees’ emotional attachment to their identification and their involvement in the organization and is best illustrated by an employee’s identification with the organization and its goals. Continuance commitment refers to the employee’s assessment of whether the value cost of leaving the organization is greater than the cost of staying. Normative commitment refers to the employees feelings of responsibility to the organization.
Avolio et al. (2004) associate commitment with three characteristics; value commitment, where one has a connection to the organizational values and goals; effort commitment, where one is willing to put in the necessary effort to achieve organizational goals; retention commitment, where one has a strong intention and willingness to continue being part of the organization. When employees are less committed, they look for other opportunities, and if those opportunities are not available, they may emotionally or mentally “withdraw” from the organisation (Lok & Crawford, 2004). Organizational Commitment is associated with the desire to remain in the organization based on rational cost-benefit considerations and a sense of moral obligation (Franke & Felfe, 2011). With a recent survey in CA indicating a desire to leave the organization by as high as 50% of the respondents it is imperative to investigate all possible reasons that could be influencing this attitude and how leaders could intervene to change this result and elicit greater continuance or retention commitment.

The subject of leadership styles and organizational commitment has attracted global interest leading to a lot of research in this area with confirmatory results that leadership style affects different types of employee commitment (Clinebell et al., 2013; Buciuniene & Skudiene, 2008), studies conducted in Luthania and India respectively. This relationship would behove organizations such as CA to take a keen interest in the quality of their leadership, if it has a notable effect on such a key employee attitude.

In the Hong Kong construction industry, Famakin and Abisuga (2016) established that leadership styles significantly influence two of the three forms of employee commitment, recommending that priority should therefore be given to styles that enhanced the commitment of employees during the execution of construction projects. This proposes an interesting insight for NGOs which work on project basis as per donor time lines, with further investigations needed due to the differences in the type of industry. The goal of this study is therefore to establish whether similar influences exist between leadership styles and employee commitment in NGOs such as CA, which over the past six years has increased its donor funded projects, a departure from the past when funding was solicited from CA supporters in the United Kingdom (UK) and hence neither restricted nor time bound.
A study conducted by Wiza and Hanganipai (2014), in South Africa among university academics at a selected South African institution, revealed that transformational leadership style had a significant positive relationship with affective and continuance employee commitment while transactional leadership style had a significant and positive relationship with only normative commitment. In Kenya, Wekesa, Namusonge and Iravo (2013) conducted an exploratory study on the role of servant leadership on organizational commitment in state corporations where they found the need for further research on leadership styles and organizational commitment.

These previous studies empirically explain that leadership style will have some significant effects on employee commitment, equally placing the responsibility of employee commitment on the leader as opposed to regarding it simply as a moral obligation on the part of the employee. A leader can therefore intentionally apply a particular management style, with the expectation to invoke commitment for retention, productivity and organizational citizen behaviours. By using appropriate leadership styles, managers can affect employee job satisfaction, commitment and productivity (Alkhatani, 2016). If this holds true, in our study on NGOs it would then follow that CA leaders should be intentional about their style behaviour application, and observant on the effects of that application on the employees.

A counter argument to the importance of leadership style for employee commitment has been made proposing that, employees who have an intrinsic desire to perform at a high level, are more welcoming of the leader’s guidance, the leadership style notwithstanding, the outcome being commitment to the organization (Dale & Fox, 2008). While this may be true, we have established that various studies have evaluated leadership styles as antecedents of organizational commitment (Erben & Guneser, 2008). Whether the leadership style directly invokes commitment or, simply has an effect on different work situations leading to a less stressful experience, numerous studies in this area suggest that it can only be ignored to the detriment of overall organizational performance. Undoubtedly, the input of the leader contributes to the psychological contract that the employee holds with the organization. Avey, Wernsing and Palanski (2012) established that the psychological contract could be one that is characterized by a sense of ownership, a sense of effectiveness, accountability, a sense of duty, and a greater sense of belongingness.
NGOs are engaged in the business of social development or humanitarian response which calls on the goodwill of different stakeholders, be it donors, sponsors, volunteers, governments, beneficiaries and NGO workers. NGO work is often carried out in difficult and volatile contexts for periodic durations and is characterised by uncertainty of funding, shifting political climate and insecurity which leads to high mobility of employees greatly affecting organizational commitment. The sustainability and impact of NGOs in the critical aspects of social development and humanitarian response requires highly committed employees who share in the vision for a better life for all (Murdie & Kakietek, 2012). The role of leadership is integral to the stability of NGOs, as well as the commitment of the employees working for them. As we have shown leadership styles may have an effect on organizational employee commitment which needs to be considered by the NGO sector.

CA is one of the leading NGOs in the UK with operations spanning across 25 countries in four continents. The essential purpose of CA is to expose the scandal of poverty, challenge the systems and structures that favour the rich over the poor and marginalized and, help in practical ways to end poverty. The organization has a diverse workforce and views employee commitment as being integral to attaining optimal performance (Christian Aid, 2016). The study focused on CA to determine the effect of leadership styles on employee commitment in CA while focused on three countries in Africa: Nigeria, Kenya and Malawi. The study was underpinned by the four styles of leadership that were proposed by the path-goal leadership theory.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
While employee commitment is core to the realisation of organizational goals, past studies have focused on transformational and transactional leadership (Clinebell et al., 2013; Buciumiene & Skudiene, 2008; Raja & Palanichamy, 2011) failing to address the incremental process of leader follower engagement which is more representative of how leaders grow, and influence subordinates on an on-going basis. The path-goal theory as first proposed by Martin Evans offers four leadership style approaches that a leader can apply contingent upon the requirements of the situation and the follower competence and attitude (Daft, 2008), as compared to the transformational and transactional styles which
suggest a huge discrepancy in the type of leadership offered by transformational and transactional leaders and their effects on employee behaviours and attitudes.

Additionally, and perhaps even more critical, a lot of research has been conducted globally on the effects of leadership behaviour on employee commitment but, it has mainly focused on the public and private sectors with little evidence of any research on the same subject in the NGO sector (Raja & Palanichamy, 2011; Buciuniene & Skudiene, 2008; Wekesa, Namusonge & Iravo, 2013; Wiza & Hanganipai, 2014).

Dramatic changes in the global economy over the past 25 years have had significant implications for commitment and reciprocity between employers and employees. For example, increasing global competition, scarce resources and employee engagement and commitment costly resources, high labour costs, consumer demands for ever-higher quality and investor pressures for greater returns on equity have prompted organizations to restructure themselves. At some companies, restructuring has meant reductions in staff and in layers of management.

The shift in NGO funding in the 21st Century, where they have less of their own unrestricted funds and are largely dependent on restricted institutional donor and private sector funding, has created a competitive business environment, where donors are requiring NGOs to demonstrate value for money within tight timelines (McDoy, Chand, & Sridhar, 2009). NGOs have to retain competent and highly committed staff in order to not only meet this requirement but, equally to secure their likelihood for future funding (McDoy, Chand, & Sridhar, 2009). The challenge posed to NGO leadership in this context is one where they must elicit commitment from employees who are constantly in transition on a fixed term contract to implement projects or even where organizational restructures have become the order of the day due to the restrictive and constrained operational environment. Employee attraction and retention is linked to employee commitment which as some studies have posited is also linked to the leadership styles in the organization (Clinebell et al., 2013), though as we have established this has not sufficiently covered the NGO sector.

In a recent staff engagement survey in Christian Aid, 51% of respondents indicated that they were considering leaving the organization within the next 12 months (Kyndt, 2015).
The result was similar across the board in the different continents with slight variations to the results with ranged from 49-53%. It is urgent then that the leadership pays attention to organizational commitment and moves quickly to intervene appropriately. Organizational Commitment has been termed as the strength of an individual’s involvement, willingness to exert effort and, to remain in the organization (Raja & Palanichamy, 2011). This rate of intention to leave the organization may suggest that all or some of these three elements may not be in place. It may also be indicative that a good number of employees could already have moved on psychologically or, may be focusing their best efforts on looking for new opportunities hence the need to urgently examine possible factors that could turn this around.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment at Christian Aid, an international NGO, based on the path-goal leadership theory.

1.4 Research Questions
1.4.1 What is the effect of directive leadership style on employee commitment in NGOs?
1.4.2 How does supportive leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?
1.4.3 In what ways does participative leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?
1.4.4 Does achievement oriented leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?

1.5 Significance of the Study
1.5.1 The Management Team at Christian Aid
The findings of this study was intended to equip the senior management team and the Human Resources (HR) Department of Christian Aid to come up with effective interventions to develop the capability of managers in the organization to apply the leadership styles that were most likely to elicit employee commitment.
1.5.2 International Non-Governmental Organizations

NGOs share similarities in their operational models which may benefit from the findings of this study. The study may also assist other NGOs in workforce planning and leadership development interventions. This would be grateful in ensuring that leaders elicit employee commitment within their organizations.

1.5.3 Future Research / Scholars

The study has added to the existing body of knowledge on the impact of leadership styles on employee organizational commitment and has availed data for further research and practical reference.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was carried out in the Africa Division of Christian Aid covering three countries; Kenya, Malawi and Nigeria. The study focused on leadership styles and organizational commitment for the CA employees. The population comprised a total of 100 employees from the three countries. The sample of the study comprised of 80 employees that were derived from various functions of the organization which included management, programme and support functions such as HR, Finance, and Administration. The formula for getting 80 employees from the 100 was as discussed in Chapter Three. Online structured questionnaires were used for data collection using the survey network known as “Survey Monkey”. The researcher took six weeks to collect data.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1.7.1 Leadership

Leadership is inspiring others to give themselves unreservedly, to a mission (Irwin, 2014). Leadership can be observed as an action focused is less on personal needs, and more focused on the needs of the people, and those of the organization that one is leading (Northouse, 2015).

1.7.2 Leadership Style

Leadership style is the approach of providing direction, implementing plans and motivating people (Northouse, 2015). From the employees’ perspective, it is seen as it includes the total pattern of explicit and implicit actions performed by their leader (Irwin, 2014).
1.7.3 Employee Commitment
Employee commitment is an individual’s relative ability and involvement in a certain organization (Nayak & Sahoo, 2015).

1.7.4 Non-Governmental Organization
Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are legally constituted corporations created by natural or legal people that operate independently from any form of government (Stankowska, 2014).

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter primarily dwelt on introducing the research topic and providing the context for the study; background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, importance of the study, scope of the study and definition of terms. In Chapter two, the study will provide literature review related to the study, Chapter three, will describe the research methodology.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is a review of the literature that introduces different perspectives related to the impact of leadership styles on employee commitment in NGOs and specific to the research questions which are: - What is the effect of directive leadership style on employee commitment in NGOs? How does supportive leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? In what ways does participative leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? And, Does achievement oriented leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?

It has been observed that commitment manifests itself in distinct behaviour (Bell & Mjoli, 2014) such as the willingness for people to devote time and energy to fulfil their job, expressions of positive feelings toward an entity or individual, and the conscious decision to make commitments, and then thoughtfully carry out the actions required to fulfil them (Alkhatani, 2016). Because commitment requires an investment of time as well as mental and emotional energy, most people make them with the expectation of reciprocation with something of value. Our study seeks to establish how leadership style is a component of value and whether the different styles hold similar or dissimilar value in eliciting commitment (Lok & Crawford, 2004) from employees in the NGO sector (Bakuwa, Chasimpha, & Masamba, 2013). Does the reciprocal value, if any, of different leadership style have a positive or negative effect on employee commitment?

In this literature review the reference point for the leadership styles or behaviour is the path goal theory which offers a set of defined approached on how leadership styles are exhibited. This theory which was first proposed by Martin (1970) deriving from Vroom’s expectancy theory, and then further developed by House (1971), tends to go beyond the contemporary definitions of transformational and transactional styles to offer specific behavioural style options that are exhibited in the process of leadership. This theory proposes four leadership styles that a leader can adopt in their engagement with followers including; supportive leadership which shows concern for followers wellbeing and personal needs; directive leadership style which involves telling followers exactly what they are meant to do with little room for negotiation; participative leadership styles which allows consultation with followers about their decisions; and, achievement oriented
leadership styles which involves setting clear and challenging goals for subordinates (Daft, 2008). Leaders should therefore have the ability to critically diagnose the organizational environment, determine contingent situational factors and subsequently make sound decisions in leading the organization towards success (Clinebell et al., 2013).

The focus of this study was on the impact of leadership styles on employee commitment in NGOs. The investigation on what leadership styles manifest in NGOs and the effects they have on employee commitment was based on the four styles proposed by path-goal leadership theory.

The complex nature of projects in NGOs requires the adoption of flexible leadership styles that will enhance the commitment of the employees in, often, stressful environments (Famakin & Abisuga, 2016). Path-goal leadership was built on goal setting and expectancy theory (Polston-Murdoch, 2013) and attempts to reconcile the relationship and discrepancies that exist between the task and person orientation of the leader vis-à-vis the satisfaction and performance of the employee (Northouse, 2015). It has therefore been considered as the most comprehensive contingency theory (Robbins, 2005). Unlike other forms of leadership approach, path-goal theory seeks to specify the leadership behaviour that fits the employee and work environment through enhancing employee commitment to productivity in the organization (Northouse, 2015).

In this literature review, the study sought to highlight previous research that has linked leadership style to employee commitment in varied sectors by reviewing studies that interrogate several outcome variables or measures of commitment such as employee turnover, goal achievement, adherence to rules and regulations and innovation among others.

2.2 Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

Directive leadership style offers employees guidance on what to do such that they have a higher degree of certainty on what the leader expects of them. The leader uses the directive style by offering clarity on rule and procedures and expectations for situations which require explicit guidance, while stating clear timelines for when tasks need to be completed (Nevarez, Wood, & Penrose, 2013). The directive leadership style is best suited to situations where goals are ambiguous, the employee is inexperienced in the particular task area or where the employee is exhibiting demotivation and negligence of
duty. This approach should then elicit commitment to specific goals on the one hand but may also lead to a high dependency and low creativity on the other hand (Clark, Hartline, & Jones, 2009). This approach may work best in a context where there are set deliverables and targets but much less need for innovation. An interesting finding was established in a study by Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) that directive leadership has no effect on employee commitment to service quality in the hotel industry. On the contrary, the study by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) on construction projects established that affective commitment is fairly related to a directive leadership style.

In a review of related literature Ebrahim (2016) examined different studies to have established that employees are highly committed and highly involved in their organization when their leaders adopt directive, participative, and supportive leadership behaviours as a combination, suggesting that directive leadership cannot independently have an effect on the different components of employee commitment. These discrepancy of outcomes gives us the more reason to investigate how the instructive and task oriented approach of the direct leadership style impacts organization commitment in NGOs.

2.2.1 Planning and Scheduling
A directive leader gives specific instructions on how employees should accomplish their assignments in terms of the sequence and order of activities, closely monitoring the milestones and the outcomes. The directive leader therefore keeps a firm hand on delivery of tasks fully owning the turnaround times for not only final outcomes but also the periodic outcomes and phases of execution of the entire set of activities (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987). Planning and scheduling of assignment is therefore fully owned by the leader with little delegation of sequencing assigned to the subordinates. While scholars have suggested that this style has its place in organizations, and could in fact elicit the commitment of individuals who need this step by step guidance because they are new to the task, or who need to be followed up closely due to some lapses in their commitment to task achievement, the absence of total delegation and close monitoring can also lead to a sense of resentment and lack of trust from the leader failing to win affective commitment and loyalty (Clinebell, Skudiene, Trijonyte, & Reardon, 2013). Employees may simply accomplish tasks because they are being monitored and less so because they are committed to doing so.
Agarwal, De Carlo, and Vyas (1999), in their comparative study of American and Indian salespersons, established that in cultures which were more promotive of order taking, high power distance and low individualism such as Asian cultures, subordinates expected managers to give directives of what needs to be done. Hence, a high level of structure and planning behaviour resulted in having no impact on organizational commitment and a simple confirmation that the generally expected outcome of negative impact on attitude on employees was not present. While one would have expected the contrary, an interesting outcome was that in cultures which encouraged low power distance and high individualism such as the American one, salespersons find difficulty in structuring their jobs and it would therefore be preferable that leaders adapt a directive style in order to elicit positive attitudes from employees which are supportive to commitment (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999).

In a study of Nigerian workers investigating the hypothesis that employees who view their leader to be low on directive behaviour would be more involved and engaged in their jobs than workers who viewed their leaders to be high on directive behaviour, results indicated that this was not the case and that in actual fact, directive leadership behaviour contributed at a high percentage to employee involvement which demonstrates normative commitment, however it would have the inverse effect on affective commitment which hinges on emotional attachment (Akinbode & Fagbohungbe, 2012). Such studies prompt the need to establish whether the highly structured approach to planning and monitoring of tasks would have a similar impact on employee commitment in NGOs.

2.2.2 Setting Performance Goals
The directive leadership style offers a set performance goals that employees can work towards providing a strong sense of inner purpose and direction, which in turn motivates members to take actions that support the leader’s vision. This avoids the ambiguity that that is characterized (Clark, Hartline, & Jones, 2009) by disillusionment of employees leading to the retention of high achievers and encourages normative commitment where employees feel responsible for the delivery of their set goals. However, though the directive leadership can prove to be quite effective in communicating goals and organizational intentions in a clear and succinct manner it has been suggested that directive leadership is effective only by coercion or compulsion rather than choice or commitment to the goals (Dolatabadi & Safa, 2011). Ekaterini (2010) made an observation
that a number of combined factors interacted to present a positive and statistically significant relationship to directive leadership to impact among other factors, commitment. These factors include age and, organizational design or business model. The results of the study suggested that higher education level was consistent with the use of less directive leadership while age had a positive impact on the use of directive leadership owing to the fact that older leaders can rely on their years of experience due to the confidence derived from experiences which enables to make decisions with much more ease as opposed or compared to younger managers (Ekaterini, 2010).

In our study of Christian Aid, we bear in mind that the greater majority of employees have significant experience due to the nature of work that the organization carries out that requires a significant amount of capacity building of implementing partners. We therefore interrogate all leadership styles against a well experienced demographic of employees.

Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) conducted a study in the Iranian banking industry on employee commitment to service quality where they established that the directive leadership style has a negative effect on shared values and positive influence on role clarity. While role clarity enhances normative commitment which is exhibited by a keen interest in achieving outcomes for the organization the study by Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) summarises that the autocratic nature of directive leadership, may reduce the employees’ commitment to service quality and shared values between the bank as the employer and the employees. The results of this study showed that the overall effect of the directive leadership style was negative and diminished employees commitment in sharp contrast to the earlier finding in the study on American and Indian sales persons which indicated a positive impact of this style of leadership due to the need for structure for salespersons regardless of culture (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999). These studies were however conducted in for profit sectors in Asia and America with the aim to assess commitment to quality service and task commitment. This study will focus on NGO sector across different countries and examine whether the task clarity offered by directly style has an effect on commitment to the organization as opposed to simply being limited to delivery of those tasks.

A study conducted on plantation companies in Malaysia suggested a significant relationship between directive leadership with all forms of commitment, when practiced
alongside supportive leadership style, further suggesting that employees who stay with an organization because they feel obligated or having no choice do not exhibit the same eagerness and involvement as employees who have developed affection, identity and responsibility towards the organization (Mahdi, Mohd, & Almsafir, 2014). The stark difference in the context between plantation companies which have a specificity of tasks and hence more likely to be a highly directed, as opposed to NGOs which demand a high level of creativity in developing responsive social interventions, prompts the need for further study in this area.

2.2.3 Enforcement of Rules and Regulations

A directive leadership style stresses on adherence to rules and regulations in engagement with subordinates (Lok & Crawford, 2004). Achieving goals by following rules, or compliance, as stated in the organizational policies is then perceived as being a sign of commitment (Asgari, 2014). This style tends to reinforce normative commitment as employees take responsibility for their actions bearing in mind the likely consequences of not doing so. Furthermore, they solidify the behaviours of adherence to rules and procedure, which promotes job performance (Lok & Crawford, 2004).

Polston-Murdoch (2013) found that the directive style is appropriate for newly hired or inexperienced subordinates and in situations which call for immediate actions. However their study only interrogated the gender perspective and supervisor related commitment where they found that gender would only predict subordinates commitment to their superiors for achievement oriented and directive styles. A study on the relationship between leadership style and entry level employees’ commitment to organizations by Tanchaisak (2009) revealed an interesting finding, which contradicted a general belief, especially in the western context, that commitment should be higher when leaders use more participative style (Lok & Crawford, 2004). In this study Thai followers reported that their commitment was higher with leaders who were directive but not with leaders who use more autonomous approaches such as the supportive, participative and achievement-oriented styles. In the Thai context then, leaders who use increased levels of rules and regulations which are eminent of the directive style would elicit commitment due to the tendencies towards high power distance and uncertainty avoidance nature of the Thai people (Hofstede, 2001). Arguable though is how this would be relevant in the same contexts in situations that need creativity and equally, whether this same finding
would apply to well experienced employees. This study focused on the broader perspective of employee organizational commitment as affected by leadership style regardless of tenure and experience in the NGO sector.

A study by Asgari (2014) in the banking sector, in Iran, showed the lack of significant relationship between using directive leadership style and normative commitment which would lead to shared customer-oriented values. A study by Bell and Mjoli (2014) found a positive and significant relationship between directive leadership and consistent behaviour in employees which was supportive to promotion of integration and the development of uniformity which is supportive to uniform observance of rules and regulations. This consistency enables control, differential between responsibility and authority, and high degree of system mind-set and which enforces compliance from employees, leading to high job performance. While several studies have proved it one way or the other with regard to whether that relationship leans towards a positive or negative relationship (Clark et al., 2009; Famakin & Abisuga, 2016; Dolatabadi & Safa, 2011; Tanchaisak, 2009), it remains to be seen how employee commitment in the NGO sector in Africa relates to this subject and in particular the international NGO sector where leadership styles are influenced both by the company headquarter values and policies, as well as the local or host country culture and practice, and whether if that relationship exists is of notable significance.

2.3 Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The supportive leadership style shows concern for employees’ wellbeing and personal needs exhibiting consideration behaviours. The supportive style is viewed as a people-oriented leadership behaviour style that involves a two way communication and focuses mainly on emotional and social support (Nwokocha & Iheriohanma, 2015). A relational approach which is a strong aspect of supportive leadership allows for the approachability needed to build trust with employees, which in turn gives them the confidence to approach the leader with their personal concerns and equally for the leader to intuitively identify those needs. The supportive leadership style has been said to be characterized by showing an understanding of employee personal and professional needs, creating a supportive atmosphere, both of which result in high trust and confidence building in employees (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bhatia, 2004). Williams (2016) surmises the elements of supportive leadership as that in which the leader is friendly, approachable, shows
concern for employees and their welfare, not only treats them as equals but also creates a friendly atmosphere for them to work in.

In a study on Columbia Records, Vandegrift and Matusitz (2011) suggested that a supportive leadership style is in general terms effective because it serves the workers’ need to feel well regarded and appreciated. Their study established that Columbia Music executives and producers made their artists feel supported by treating them like valuable assets on the premise that if the artists did not feel emotionally connected to the record company they would transfer their talent to a competitor, suggesting they related supportive management to continuous commitment or the willingness to stay (Vandegrift & Matusitz, 2011). Notably they applied behaviour that boosted a positive sense of self with constant positive feedback on their performance, demonstrating a key behavioural outcome of a supportive style. In support of this, a study by Mahdi et al (2014) found that supportive and directive leadership behaviours were strongly related to all forms of commitment, affective, continuance and normative, concluding that leaders who gave advice to their subordinates, supported and paid keen attention to individual needs of followers would enhance the level of organizational commitment.

2.3.1 Consideration and Approachability
Famakin and Abisuga (2016) investigated construction workers commitment and found that supportive leadership style influenced affective commitment of the employees, meaning that construction workers were more likely to develop an emotional attachment and identification in a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment which may also result in greater citizenship and identification with organizational goals. An interesting perspective of this study however was that this emotional attachment derives out of employees being poorly remunerated in the Nigerian construction industry which affects their commitment to project success. Such conditions therefore predicate the employees to have a preference for their leaders to be consideration and show deliberate concern (Polston-Murdoch, 2013) for their personal needs. The context and conditions of the construction industry differs significantly from the NGO sector which we want to investigate. It has been identified that individualized consideration is characteristic of leaders who foster a supportive by listening with intention to the individual needs of their followers (Khasawneh, Omari, & Abu-Tineh, 2012). In turn, consideration can only be experienced through interaction hence the leader has to be perceived as approachable.
Williams (2016) in his definition of supportive leadership says that supportive leadership is a style in which the leader is friendly and approachable.

In a study conducted by Agarwal, DeCarlo, and Vyas (1999), it was expected that the relationship between consideration behaviours and organizational commitment would be greater for Indian sales persons, compared to their American counterparts. However the results indicated that consideration was significantly related to organizational commitment in both sample groups. A supportive considerate approach resulted in managing the role stress factors leading to greater commitment of sales persons in both cultures (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999).

In contrast, a recent study by Hwang et al. (2015), found that the use of a supportive leadership style influenced employees’ affective or emotional commitment in the United States (US), China, Japan and South Korea but did not significantly affect Singaporean employees. This is of significance interest to our study which will cover Africa. An outcome that indicates that, American workers would be more needful of a considerate approach as opposed to their Singaporean counterparts poses an interesting perspective and a variance that cannot lead us to assume that the same would be said for NGOs in Africa. In the study by Khasawneh, Omari, and Abu-Tineh (2012), vocational teachers in Jordan felt their leaders showed an interest in employee well being, assigned projects individually and paid attention to those who seemed not to be fully involved, terming this as individualised consideration resulting in a positive relationship between a supportive leadership style to employee commitment. Whether this is unique to the Jordanian context, prompts our question, and noted that these behaviours elicited affective commitment in those employees because it stirred their trust, respect and appealed to their hopes (Khasawneh, Omari, & Abu-Tineh, 2012), presents a fascinating scenario for further study.

2.3.2 Emotional Attachment
Retention is a specific challenge in the NGO Sector with varied studies demonstrating that the high turnover of qualified employees in non-profit organizations has increasingly negative impact on recruitment, engagement and effectiveness due to the fixed term nature of projects (Bakuwa, Chasimpha & Masamba, 2013; Batti, 2014). The results of a study by Kim and Hancer (2011) suggested that leaders exhibiting sympathy and
consideration for employees’ needs will keep them emotionally attached, and motivate them to spend the rest of their career with the organization (Kim & Hancer, 2011). This implies that the continuance commitment necessary for reduced turn over can be elicited by a supportive and considerate style (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999). This outcome prompts us to question whether supportive behaviour tendencies would have an impact on aid workers who do not always have the option for a long term career with a single NGO employer, and, who are traditionally expected to be intrinsically committed to the cause of attaining equal rights for the disadvantaged, notwithstanding the terms of service (Bakuwa, Chasimpha, & Masamba, 2013). Additionally, the unanswered question remains whether the same finding would hold true for NGO workers in African countries.

Long and Kowang (2015) concluded from their research that emotionally intelligent leaders have a statisitically significant relationships with all the dimensions of employee commitment and that HR Pracitioners should focus on developing attributes in their leaders that were demonstratable of emotional intelligence such as understanding, the ability to assess emotional needs and to act in alignment to emotional connection. In another study on the path goal leadership styles and commitment, Famakin and Abisuga (2016) found that that the supportive leadership style will influence the commitment of employees in the construction industry, which however could be reduced by the stressful environment of the construction. They recommend that to reduce the effect of that stressful environment, leaders of construction projects can create a friendly and psychologically supportive environment for the employees in order to make the working environment more appealing to them (Agarwal, DeCarlo, & Vyas, 1999).

It was the intention in this study to review how the same applied in NGOs, and in particular in Christian Aid, where the sources of stress differ, to establish whether supportive leadership has the same impact on the willingness to stay in the organization. Akinbode and Fagbohungbe (2012) confirmed that workers who perceived their bosses to apply a high level of interpersonal relations and unrestrained leadership style would identify more with their organizations than leaders who demonstrated the opposite in the Nigerian context. The results of their study returned a significant positive correlation with employee commitment (Akinbode & Fagbohungbe, 2012). Interpersonal relations which lead to a greater emotional commitment were therefore seen to contribute to affective commitment. The study includes the Nigerian context but as situated specifically
in the NGO sector. These results create a keen interest for our study to see whether the same result would present to support the recruitment, training and performance requirements of leaders in the NGO sector in Africa hence the need to make a direct observation and further interrogation.

2.3.3 Equal Opportunities for Team Members
When employees are provided with equal opportunities at the work place, they feel equally acknowledged for their contribution which in turn leads to a sense of shared purpose among team members. This encourages employees to offer their best effort to the organization. In their study of leadership styles and employee commitment in two subsidiaries of a multinational enterprise operating in the Information and Technology (IT) industry in Lithuania and in the capital of a country in central Europe; Clinebell et al. (2013) offer that the sense of fair treatment offered by a positive style approach has an effect on normative commitment where employees feel a greater sense of shared responsibility when they sense that favouritism is not present. A shared sense of community in which participation in a whole offers an equal opportunity to contribute and to benefit are enablers commitment that results in joint effort and a perceived sense that tasks were are also being performed for equal rewards (Dessler, 1999).

Alkhatani (2016) posits that when a leader pays close attention to individual differences, then a sense of fairness is experienced leading to greater commitment. Both of these studies however are focused on the transformational and transaction leadership styles while this study will focus on the path goal theory. A supportive leadership style seeks to ensure that every member feels equally acknowledged, having access to similar opportunities, which could lead to a greater sense of responsibility for what the organization seeks to achieve. The study sought to establish whether a supportive style of leadership had any effect on the sense of responsibility of NGO workers in Africa through the study of the three countries in the East, South and West of Africa.

2.4 Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The participative leadership style balances the involvement of managers and their subordinates in information sharing, decision making, and even problem solving (Kim S., 2002). This is achieved because participation is a process in which influence is shared among individuals who may not be at the same level and are therefore not equal in the
hierarchy (Locke & Schweiger, 1979). This shared influence results in a consultative culture between managers and their subordinates an early outcome of which could be employee commitment (Dolatabadi & Safa, 2011). Ng’ethe, Namusonge and Iravo (2012) proposed in their study on academic staff retention in universities in Kenya, that universities needed to pay attention to the involvement of staff in decision making and regular communication. Ng’ethe et al. (2012) further suggested that failing to do so could leave pertinent issues unattended and lead to those same issues influencing staff to leave, hence having a negative impact on continuance commitment. Our study aimed to check whether the employee strata that was studied would exhibit similar patterns considering that the majority of employees in Christian Aid are highly trained and work independently.

2.4.1 Consultative and Participatory Decision Making

According to Dolatabadi and Safa (2011), participative leadership involves a consultative culture between supervisors and subordinates. Their findings indicate that employees who perceive their managers as adopting consultative and participative behaviour tend to be more committed to their organizations in the banking sector in Iran. The consultative approach enhances dissemination of organizational values to employees which leads to affective commitment where employees have a sense of emotional attachment, identification and involvement. This suggests that employees who are allowed to participate in decision making are likely to be more committed to those decisions, hence the organization. In a study of the Nigerian Manufacturing Industry, Kuyea and Sulaimonb (2011) results indicated a significant relationship between employee involvement in decision making and organizational performance. In a context where employee involvement was established to be rather low, firms with high employee involvement in decision making were found to outperform firms with low employee involvement in decision making. This was therefore a clarion call for involvement of employees in decision making if organizational performance was to be sustained for competitive advantage in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria.

In South Africa study on the effect of the participative leadership style on banks clerks (Bell & Mjoli, 2014), found that the presence of participative leadership was not necessary for employee loyalty which is a critical measure of commitment. This result contradicted previous studies. Further, the attempt in the study to analyse the impact of
participative leadership through the lens of leadership came up with pretty much the same outcome that this style was not an antecedent for employee commitment (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). This inconsistency in results has been explained by some scholars as being the challenge that participation receives from direction, and the need to appreciate participation as being important for decision making but not always for execution (Muczyk & Reimann, 1987). The suggestion here is that participation could be taken too far, to the detriment of execution which requires a leader to take on the directive style in order to get desired outcomes, which may impact the sense of shared results and hence commitment. It remained to be seen whether the context, as in this case the banking and manufacturing sectors being in different contexts resulting in discrepant outcomes, can be supported one way or the other by conducting the study in a different industry and context. The study applied the same approach in NGOs to determine whether the participative approach would earn the employee loyalty that was precedent to commitment.

2.4.2 Ownership and responsibility
The participative leadership style integrates the input of employees into group or organizational decisions even which creates greater ownership of those decision and the activities that are required to implement those decisions (Hwang et al., 2015). Famakin and Abisuga (2016) posit that this style of leadership is effective when subordinates are highly trained and involved in their work, the success of which would lead to both emotional attachment and shared ownership of outcomes.

In a study covering Confucius countries it was determined that the commitment of China, Singapore and South Korean workers was not influenced by this style perhaps because of the preference for high power distance which may be more suitable to a directive style (Hwang et al., 2015). However the contrary was the case in Japan, where though they share some similar cultural characteristics with the Confucian Asia cluster, Japanese people tend to value participative leadership more than do people in other Confucian countries. It then implies that Japanese workers may feel a greater sense of obligation towards the organization and hence normative commitment. A different study in Chinese state owned enterprise offered a different set of results where results showed that the impact of participative leadership style on employees of Chinese state-owned enterprise was far more complex than the above stated studies (Cheung, Shi, Zhang, & Lee, 2006).
While the results supported participative leadership as an antecedent to commitment that is elicited from a general sense of empowerment and ownership, the analyses revealed that participative leadership style behaviour was positively related for employees who joined the corporations after 1997, as opposed to those who had joined before that time.

Steyer, Schifflingera, and Lang (2008) established in their study that participative leadership can be surmised to be supportive to the essential human relations assumptions according to which a team orientation and considerate, participative leadership foster goal identification. This goal identification, in turn fosters the positive relationship to, and ownership to the goals reducing the resistance and withdrawal that ensues from employees feeling excluded from the development of goals, and then being mandated or coerced to deliver the very same goals.

2.4.3 Direct Interaction

The participative leader creates time to meet with subordinates for purposes of consultation removing the barriers that can be easily created by the power relationship. This creates the familiarity that eliminates power relationship barriers, enabling employees to express their views without inhibition. Cheung et al. (2006) conducted a study in Chinese state owned corporations where they found that while participative leadership behaviour tended to make short-tenure employees feel competent leading to greater commitment to the an organization, such leadership behaviour did not have a significant impact on competence and organizational commitment for long tenure employees. This is a fascinating outcome that may imply that long serving employees may derive their commitment from other factors other than participation in State owned corporations.

This study focused on how this element of commitment is affected by the participative style of leadership regardless of tenure in the NGO sector as there had been limited study on this area. Does the participative style of the leader commitment that is exhibited by voluntary participation and contribution of employees? The significance established by Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) on employee commitment to service quality in banks suggests strongly that participative leadership style has a key effect on employees’ interest in excellent outcomes for the organization showing that employees who work in a participative bank environment would buy into the organizational culture and values and
are influenced by the firm’s culture and values. Whether participative leadership would lead to the same outcome in NGOs where outcomes are not about an increase in profit margins but rather social change remains to be determined and forms part of the essence of our study.

Studies have proposed that, continuance commitment which entails willingness to stay is high when the prospect of leaving the organization results in perceived sacrifice, and the availability of viable alternative employment options is low, such that the perceived sacrifice would be worth the move (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). The disruption of working relationships has been identified in varied studies as such a sacrificial cost of leaving an organization (Clinebell et al., 2013) as subordinates working under a participative leader may have fewer opportunities to participate in decision making in their new job, and therefore lose the ability to demonstrate their talents. Employees may therefore choose to remain in an organization for fear of losing the data that could result in their career progression having been given chances to show case their best talent by a participative leader in their previous job (Ebrahim, 2016). These varied studies therefore strongly suggest that the opportunities for competence development and career growth that are created by the participative leader would make it more difficult for an employee to leave resulting in continuance commitment.

Although a number of studies in different sectors have established a positive relationship between participative leadership and organizational commitment (Huang et al., 2006), there has been limited examination of such relationships in the context of the NGO Sector in Africa. While we would expect that a positive relationship would exist, we recognize that current funding challenges in the NGO sector mean that tenure is not assured on any basis, without organizational sustainability taking priority. With such uncertainty, this study therefore was keen to establish whether the participative leadership would have an effect that prompts employee continuance commitment.

2.5 Effect of Achievement Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
Leaders who have a relatively high desire for achievement exhibiting a desire for the successful completion of tasks, attaining excellent quality standards, and developing new and better ways of doing things (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). This kind of leader not only seeks to gain technical expertise but also has adheres to strict follow through with tasks
and duties assigned to subordinates. According to House (1975), the achievement-oriented leader,

“sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, continuously seeks improvement in Performance and shows a high degree of confidence that the subordinates will assume responsibility, put forth effort and accomplish challenging goals. This kind of leader constantly emphasizes excellence in performance and simultaneously displays confidence that subordinates will meet high standards of excellence” (p.3).

The demonstration of confidence distinguishes an achievement orientation from a directive one, as the directive leader leans more towards a lack of trust (Clinebell, Skudiene, Trijonyte, & Reardon, 2013), that subordinates may not have the level of self-leadership required for execution. Excellent quality standards and excellence of execution can be evidence of commitment to the organization (Clinebell, Skudiene, Trijonyte, & Reardon, 2013). In such a case, employee who are keen to commit to quality standards also prefer to have leaders who pay attention to the achievement of tasks, matching their own work value style, enhancing their sense of duty and high interest in results (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008).

2.5.1 High Quality Performance

Achievement oriented leaders put stress on quality outputs from their subordinates and hence set challenging goals for them. High quality outputs and excellence of execution can be evidence of commitment to the organization. Limsila and Ogunlana (2008) conducted a study in Thailand in which they found that Thai workers desired to have leaders who pay attention to subordinates’ needs for achievement. This encourages normative commitment where employees feel that their own need for achievement and responsibility is enhanced by the leadership style. The study by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) found that employees in the construction industry want to continue to work with a leader whose performance attributes coincide with their personal goals. Lumbasi, K’Aol and Ouma (2016) established in their study on senior managers of the Company of the Year Award (COYA) winning companies in Kenya that the effect of achievement-oriented leadership style on the attainment of outcomes, was vastly influenced by a combination of the achievement-oriented style of leadership where there’s also a reward system for those who attain the given goals, and where employees design their own
strategies for attaining those goals. COYA is a mark of high quality performance outcomes which we wish to examine as a measure of commitment in the NGO sector where, donor funds do not lend themselves to rewarding high performance and where donor requirements and delivery timetables can be quite restrictive. This study investigated whether in the absence of reward related to performance and restrictive delivery parameters, that achievement-oriented leadership elicited the commitment of employees to apply their best efforts to the organization in the NGO sector.

In their journal publication in the Harvard publication bearing the rather alarmist title of “Leadership Run Amok: The Destructive Potential of Overachievers” by Spreier, Fontaine, and Malloy (2006), suggest that there is a dark side to the achievement oriented style in the long run. They suggest that an intense focus in on acheiveinent can demolish trust, undermine morale, reduce workplace productivity and erode confidence in management. The detriment of all these elements that are supportive to affective commitment where trust fosters a sense of identity may indeed be a cause for concern with the achievement oriented style but with studies having shown discrepant outcomes, further studies are necessary to probe this assertion further. A study of Nigerian workers also established that productive, our case achievement oriented leadership style did not directly predict employees’ commitment to the organization, but rather as relates to the path goal theory employee commitment only relates to leadership style when employees have perceived that the style lends to their job satisfaction and motivation (Akinbode & Fagbohungbe, 2012). In other words there are antecedents that preclude commitment as relates to the achievement oriented leadership styles, as well as other styles in the Nigerian context.

2.5.2 Continuous Improvement

Employees can commit to continuously develop their capabilities in order to offer the best service to the organization, including investing their own resources. The achievement oriented style of leadership actually expects continuous improvement in how employees apply skills for better results in each performance cycle (Lam, O'Donnell & Robertson, 2015). There’s little evidence of study around the relationship between an achievement-oriented styles of leadership with employees commitment to continuous improvement. Whether employees can commit their continuous development for the employer benefit remains to be determined. What has been established is that employees expect leaders to
support their growth by being a coach or mentor and in that respect to consider subordinates’ needs over own needs in effect preferring leaders to share risks and be able to encourage them to envision attractive future states (Alkhatani, 2016).

In alignment to this proposition, the study by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) established that continuance commitment is positively associated with the achievement-oriented style in the construction industry while the notable outcome was that the supportive leadership style was negatively associated with the continuance commitment. While that study posits that the achievement-oriented style is a good predictor of retention in the construction industry while the supportive style is not, this study sought to establish whether the achievement orientation leadership style led to retention and continuance improvement commitment in the NGO sector with particular reference to Christian Aid.

Lam, O’Donnell and Robertson (2015) posit that positive relationships with employees, correlates closely to the leaders effectiveness in implementing continuous improvement initiatives. In other words employees are more likely to exhibit normative commitment behaviours where good workplace relationships exist. This highlights leader subordinate relationship as a possible mediating factor for an achievement oriented leader to elicit the necessary commitment to continuous improvement that is characteristic to the achievement of continuous improvement by the subordinates.

A further study to establish the existence of a direct relationship is therefore necessary considering the outcomes of the earlier study by Limsila and Ogunlana (2008) which found that Thai workers have a preference for leaders who pay attention to the employee’s own need for achievement. Santo and Cardoso (2017) in their study found that employee commitment to continuous improvement has as antecedents, their well-being and the work life balance. This study then suggests yet more mediating variables to a productive outcome when the achievement oriented leadership style.

A study done on the public university in the northern state of Malaysia established the relationship between an achievement oriented leadership style and employee commitment was less significant than that of leaders with a people oriented supportive style (Soha, Osman, Manaf, & Abdullah, 2016). For the employees’ commitment to match the achievement oriented leaders need for continuous improvement and to increase general
levels of employee commitment, the leader would have to be deliberate about having in place mechanisms to address the wellbeing of employees.

The NGO sector attempts to create environments that support wellbeing of employees under the banner of “duty of care” (Cripe, 2016), however the very nature of NGO work can be heavily detrimental to employee wellbeing owing to the direct contact with extremes of human suffering. The question for our study then is to establish whether the achievement oriented leader can in such conditions elicit the necessary commitment to goals and the creativity and innovation necessary to support it.

2.6 Chapter Summary
In Chapter Two, pertinent theory and literature relating to the research questions has been reviewed. The literature demonstrated that there is a link between leadership styles and employee organizational commitment. The next chapter describes the methods and procedures which were used to conduct the study, especially the research design, population, sampling design as well as the collection and analysis of data.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This section describes the general methodology used in carrying out the research study. It discusses the research design, the population and sample design, the research procedure, the data collection and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive research design. A descriptive study collects data in order to answer questions about current status of the subject or topic of study. The classification of the particular research design for this study was the purpose of the study. There are precise steps involved in a descriptive study, and they include: selection of research questions, selection of an appropriate methodology to collect information, selection of appropriate sampling methods, analysis and reporting of findings (Kothari, 2004).

The researcher believes that a descriptive research design was appropriate for the study because the study was concerned with finding out the effects of different leadership styles on employee commitment at three levels of the desire to stay in the organization, the sense of responsibility and identity with the organization names as continuance, normative and affective commitment.

3.3 Population and Sampling Design
3.3.1 Population
Population has been defined as any complete group of entities that share some common set of characteristics (Zikmund et al., 2010). In this study, the target population was all 100 employees of Christian Aid from three countries namely Kenya, Nigeria and Malawi in their different positions. All the employee records were obtained from Christian Aid HR department using the Human Resource Information System (HRIS) known as the Abantu. The population distribution was as shown in Table 3.1. Though the population cut across the African continent, it was homogeneous in nature. According to Cooper and Schindler (2011), if the populations are the same for the purposes of the study, they are collectively called homogeneous, meaning of one kind, and different random samples from homogeneous populations may be called homogeneous as well.
Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population Characteristics</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Christian Aid, 2016)

3.3.2 Sampling Design

Sampling refers to the process by which part of the population is selected and conclusions are drawn about the entire population (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). The sampling design describes in detail the sampling frame, sampling techniques and the sample size.

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Sampling frame refers to the list of elements from which the sample is drawn, and is closely related to the population (Cooper & Schindler, 2011; Zikmund et al., 2010). According to Cooper and Schindler (2011) it is a complete and correct list of population members only. The sampling framework for this study consisted of 100 employees from various departments within CA. The list from which the sample was drawn was obtained from the organization’s HR department. This number formed the sampling frame. The sampling frame according to current statistics was presented in Table 3.1.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

Sampling is defined as any procedure that draws conclusions based on measurements of a portion of the population (Zikmund et al., 2010). Stratified random sampling was used to classify the sample into different strata. The respondents from each strata were identified using simple random sampling so that every respondent had an equal chance of being selected to participate in the study. The strata in this study was divided into two and it contained the management and non-management staff within CA’s Country Programmes.
Stratified random sampling was selected for the study since it had three main benefits: it increased the sample’s statistical efficiency, provided adequate data for analysing the various subpopulations, and enabled different research methods and procedures to be used in different strata (Cooper & Schindler, 2011).

3.3.2.3 Sample Size

Sample size refers to the number of elements selected from a given population (Zikmund et al., 2010). A sample size is a section of a study population that is selected from the total population in a manner that ensures that every different possible sample of the desired size has the same chance of being selected (Peck, Olsen, & Devore, 2009). For the purpose of this study, the Yamane (1967) formula was used to select the sample size for the study which brought the sample size to 80 respondents, and it was calculated using the following formula, and was distributed as shown in Table 3.2.

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}
\]

Where \( n \) was the sample size, \( N \) was the population size, \( 1 \) was the constant and \( e^2 \) was the margin of error, which was 5\% for 95\% confidence level.

\[
n = \frac{100}{1+100(0.05^2)} = 80
\]

Table 3.2 Sample Size Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population Characteristics</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Managers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Christian Aid, 2016)
3.4 Data Collection Methods
Cooper and Schindler (2011) state that data collection methods refer to the process of gathering data after the researcher has identified the types of information needed. This study focused on the use of primary data which was collected from the target sample. A structured online questionnaire was used to collect the data. The data collection instrument for the study had been developed based on literature from various scholars on the subject of leadership styles on employee commitments.

The questionnaire was divided into six sections: The first part was designed to analyse demographic data, which focused on collecting the respondent’s personality characteristics. The second part looked at supportive leadership styles and employee commitment at Christian Aid. This section consisted of questions that were based on the identified supportive leadership styles and employee commitment studied in the literature review with five levels of preference. The third part of the questionnaire looked at the directive leadership styles and employee commitments. The fourth part of the questionnaire assessed the participative leadership styles and employee commitments. The fifth part focused on achievement-oriented leadership styles and employee commitment, and the last part had questions related to employee commitment.

The questionnaire had a likert scale of five multiple choice options for each question and were adopted to represent the five levels of preference that included: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The likert scale questions were used because they use a universal method of collecting data, which makes them easy to understand. The likert scale was also used because it meant the data would be quantitative in nature which made it easy for the researcher to draw conclusions, draw results, and create graphical figures from the responses. Furthermore, the use of the likert scale ensured that the respondents were not forced to express an either-or opinion, rather it allowed them to be neutral while responding to the questions.

Reliability analysis for the purpose of this study was done through a pilot test which was done to check for the consistency of the research instrument. The Cronbach Alpha which is a more scientific method was used to test whether the variables under investigation met the threshold. The variables that had a Cronbach alpha of 0.7 and above was considered for subsequent further analysis. Validity analysis of factor analysis was used to test for
validity whereby the variables that had a co-efficient of less than 0.4 were not considered for subsequent analysis. This was a reduction measure to ensure that the study utilized only those variables that met the threshold.

3.5 Research Procedures
A structured questionnaire was developed by the researcher, specifically for this study. The data collection method that was used was a structured questionnaire and more specifically, a self-administered online structured questionnaire. The data collection instrument (online structured questionnaire) was pilot tested with 10 respondents of the total target respondents representing various functions in Christian Aid, who were not included in the final selection of the population. The problems anticipated to be encountered during pilot testing of the data collection instrument were addressed by making necessary adjustments to the online questionnaire before administering it to the study sample. After revision of the data collection instrument, the whole study sample was subjected to the data collection instrument. A number of methods were used to improve the response rate such as notification e-mails and phone call reminders.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods
Data editing and coding was done by the researcher to reduce error during the data entry stage and ensure that clean data was used for analysis. Descriptive analysis was done to check for the meaning of the data provided using percentages and summaries. Reliability as well as validity analyses were conducted to check for consistency of the responses and variables that best described the given responses respectively.

Correlation analysis is the process of studying the strength of that relationship with available statistical data (Peck, Olsen, & Devore, 2009). Correlational analysis was used to test for the association among the dependent variables and independent variables for the study. Thereafter, regression analysis was used to test for the effect of the independent variable of the leadership styles on the dependent variable (employee commitment). The results were presented in form of tables and figures with brief descriptions. The regression model took the form of:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon \]
Where $Y =$ Organizational commitment

$X_1 =$ Supportive leadership style

$X_2 =$ Directive leadership style

$X_3 =$ Participative leadership style

$X_4 =$ Achievement oriented leadership style

$\beta_i =$ Coefficients of the independent variables, where $i = 1,2,3,4$

$\varepsilon =$ Error term

### 3.7 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the general research design used and defined the population and sampling plan. The data collection methods and research procedures applied were described, along with the data analysis methods applied in order to use the collected data to answer the research questions. The next chapter presents the results and findings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study results and findings. The analysed data has been presented using figures and tables. The section has been divided as guided by the questionnaire. The chapter also gives brief explanations of the figures and tables that have been presented.

4.2 Response Rate and Demographic Response

4.2.1 Response Rate

The researcher sent out 80 questionnaires to the respondents using the online tool known as the “Survey Monkey”. Using phone calls and emails to prompt a high response rate, the researcher managed to receive 71 responses from the target population and this were downloaded from the Survey Monkey platform in the form of SPSS. These results gave the study a response rate of 88.8% which was above the required threshold as shown in Figure 4.1. Cooper and Schindler (2011) state that a resulting study rate of 60% is sufficient to render a study successful.

![Response Rate Pie Chart]

Figure 4.1 Study Response Rate

4.2.2 Reliability and Validity Test Results

The Cronbach Alpha test was also carried out to test the various study variables. Table 4.1 shows that if the directive leadership variable was removed from the questionnaire, the instrument would improve since it would have a coefficient of 0.828, but if participative leadership variable was removed, then the questionnaire would be weakened since the Cronbach Alpha would be 0.726, if supportive leadership variable was removed,
then the questionnaire would be weakened since the Cronbach Alpha would be 0.742, if achievement oriented leadership variable was removed, then the questionnaire would be weakened since the Cronbach Alpha would be 0.702, and if the employee commitment variable was removed, then the questionnaire would be weakened since the Cronbach Alpha would be 0.786.

Table 4.1 Cronbach Reliability Test for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Item</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive Leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Oriented Leadership</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Position in the Organization

The respondents were asked to indicate the position they held in the organization and their response was as shown in Figure 4.2. The results showed that 57.7% were non-management staff while 42.3% were management staff. These results show that both groups of employees were considered in the study and were significantly represented. This result indicates that the organization was evenly distributed between management and non-management staff because of the equal chances offered to all employees by the organization.

![Figure 4.2 Position in the Organization](image-url)
4.2.4 Department Worked
The respondents were asked to indicate the department they worked for in the organization and their response was as shown in Figure 4.3. The results showed that 53.5% worked in Programme department, 15.5% were in the divisional/ country leadership department, 14.1% were in finance, 9.9% were in administration and support, and 7% were in regional support. There results show that all departments within the organization were considered in the study and were significantly represented. The results had more respondents in the programme department because the core business of the organization was running programmes.

![Department Worked](image)

**Figure 4.3 Department Worked**

4.2.5 Respondents Gender
The respondents were asked to indicate their gender and their response was as shown in Figure 4.4. The results showed that 53.5% were female while 46.5% were male. The results show that all genders within the organization were considered in the study and were significantly represented, and it also shows that female respondents were more in the organization. The female respondents were more, and this could be explained by the nature of the organizational business and the organizational policies that are family friendly and supportive.
4.2.6 Age of Respondents
The respondents were asked to indicate their age and their response was as shown in Figure 4.5. The results showed that 50.7% were aged between 31-39 years, 25.4% were aged between 40-49 years, 14.1% were above the age of 50 years, and 9.9% were below the age of 30 years. There results show that all age groups within the organization were considered in the study and were significantly represented. Majority of the respondents were aged between 31-39 years, and this could be explained by the fact that the organization is focused on bringing on board employees who have experience, due to the need to have employees who can build the capacity of their partners.

4.2.7 Duration in Organization
The respondents were asked to indicate the duration they had been with the organization and their response was as shown in Figure 4.6. The results showed that 28.2% had been
with the organization for 2-3 years, 26.8% had been with the organization for 4-5 years, 22.5% had been with the organization for less than a year, 18.3% had been with the organization for 6-10 years, and 4.2% had been with the organization for 11 years and above. There results show that all employees regardless of the number of years with the organization were considered in the study and were significantly represented. The results also show that majority of the respondents had been with the organization for more than three years which shows that they were best placed to respond to the questions.

![Figure 4.6 Duration with the Organization](image)

**4.3 Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment**

**4.3.1 Rating of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment**

The respondents were asked to rate several directive leadership style factors and their impact on employee commitment using the scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree 3. Moderately Agree, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly Agree and their results were as shown in Table 4.2. The resulting standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the differences in the responses received was insignificant.

Table 4.2 shows that managers ensured that employees were aware of, and understood organization policies and procedures as agreed to by 86.3% of the respondents; the resulting mean of 4.12 shows that managers ensuring employees understand organization policies was very significant. Managers asked employees to follow standard rules and
regulations as indicated by 78.5% of the respondents who agreed; the resulting mean of 3.95 shows that managers asking employees to follow the rules was significant.

Table 4.2 Rating of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive Leadership Style</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells me what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells employees what to do without expecting employees to question him/her.</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager expects staff to report back after completing each step of the work.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager explains the level of performance that is expected of employees.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager checks work on a regular basis to assess progress and learning</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager shows that he/she has doubts about my/my colleague ability to carry out their tasks.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager asks me to follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager ensures that employees are aware of, and understand, organization policies and procedures.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager takes actions when rules and regulations are not followed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 also shows that managers took actions when rules and regulations were not followed as agreed to by 73.4% of the respondents; the resulting mean of 3.86 shows that managers taking actions when rules and regulations were not followed was very significant. Manager checked work on a regular basis to assess progress and learning as agreed to by 75.3% of the respondents; the resulting mean of 3.84 shows that managers checking on work progress regularly was significant. Managers explained the level of performance that is expected of employees as agreed to by 78.8% of the respondents; the resulting mean of 3.82 shows that managers explaining expected employee performance was significant. Managers expected staff to report back after completing each step of the work as shown by 49.2% of the respondents who agreed while a significant percentage of 41.5% disagreed; the resulting mean of 3.04 shows that managers expecting feedback after every step of the work was significant. Managers told employees what needs to be done and how it needs to be done as agreed to by 45.4% of the respondents, a significant percentage of 43.9% disagreed; the resulting mean of 2.98 shows that managers telling employees what and how needs to be done was significant. Manager not showing their doubts about employees’ ability to carry out their tasks as shown by 60% of the respondents that disagreed; the resulting mean of 2.45 shows that managers not showing their doubts in employees was significant. Managers did not tell employees what to do without expecting employees to question them as shown by 80% of the respondents that disagreed; the resulting mean of 1.89 shows that managers not expecting questions from employees was insignificant.

4.3.2 Correlations for Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

A Pearson correlation test was carried out to determine the significance of the several directive leadership style factors and their influence on employee commitment, and the p value of <0.05 was used as the threshold for determining significant factors. The results were as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 shows that planning and scheduling was an insignificant factor in employee commitment (r=0.070, p>0.05). Setting performance goals was an insignificant factor in employee commitment (r=0.146, p>0.05). Enforcement of rules and regulations was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.308, p<0.05).
### Table 4.3 Correlations for Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Scheduling</th>
<th>Setting Performance Goals</th>
<th>Rules &amp; Regulation Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Scheduling</td>
<td>.070 .590</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Performance Goals</td>
<td>.146 .256</td>
<td>.301* .014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Regulation Enforcement</td>
<td>.308* .015</td>
<td>.129 .300</td>
<td>.353** .004</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

### 4.3.3 Regression Analysis for Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The researcher transformed variables for directive leadership by computing means of the study variable into three main categories listed as: planning and scheduling, setting performance goals, and enforcement of rules and regulations. These variables were used to run the regression analysis, and the results were as follows:

### Table 4.4 Model Summary of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.81084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant): Planning and Scheduling, Setting Performance Goals, and Enforcement of Rules and Regulations

Table 4.4 shows the results of the regression model summary for planning and scheduling, setting performance goals, and enforcement of rules and regulations (independent variables), and the dependent variable which was employee commitment. The adjusted R square value for the model showed that 34.5% of the variance in the
model (employee commitment) can be explained by planning and scheduling, setting performance goals, and enforcement of rules and regulations.

Table 4.5 shows the regression coefficients for the model and it predicts the relationship between the variables (planning and scheduling, setting performance goals, and enforcement of rules and regulations) and employee commitment. The regression coefficient indicates that planning and scheduling had a positive significant influence on employee commitment since its precision level was less than the threshold of <0.05. The table shows that performance goals and enforcing rules and regulation had a positive, but insignificant influence on employee commitment since their precision levels were more than the threshold of <0.05. The three variables had coefficients of planning and scheduling (0.000), setting performance goals (0.060), and enforcement of rules and regulations (0.152). This therefore concludes that the variables have a positive influence on employee commitment. Planning and scheduling had a significant influence, while setting performance goals, and enforcement of rules and regulations were insignificant to employee commitment.

**Table 4.5 Regression Coefficients for Directive Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.393</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Scheduling</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>5.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Goals</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>-1.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Regulation Enforcement</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-1.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment

**4.4 Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment**

**4.4.1 Rating of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment**

The respondents were asked to rate several supportive leadership style factors and their impact on employee commitment using the scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Moderately Agree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree and their results were as shown in Table
4.6. The resulting standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the differences in the responses received was insignificant.

Table 4.6 Rating of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Leadership Style</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>N %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager behaves in a manner that is thoughtful to employee’s needs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager gives feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is approachable and friendly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is mindful of my personal needs and takes action to support me.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager does little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All team members are given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team enjoys a friendly work environment.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager schedules regular individual meetings with me to discuss my work.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that managers are approachable and friendly as shown by 89.4% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.26 shows that managers being approachable and friendly was significant. Managers maintained a friendly working relationship with subordinates as shown by 86.4% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.24 shows that managers maintaining a friendly working relationship was significant. Managers behaves in a manner that is thoughtful to employee’s needs as shown by 81.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.17 shows that managers being thoughtful of employees was significant. Employee teams enjoyed a friendly work environment as shown by 76.9% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.02 shows that employees’ teams enjoying a friendly work environment was significant.
environment was significant. Managers give feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner as shown by 81.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.00 shows that managers giving prompt feedback to employees’ requests was significant. All team members were given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences as shown by 80% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.00 shows that members being given opportunities to attend relevant training was significant. Managers are mindful of employees’ personal needs and takes action to support them as shown by 72.7% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.94 shows that managers being mindful of employees’ personal needs was significant. Managers did little things that made it pleasant to be members of the group as shown by 68.2% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.83 shows that managers doing the little things that were pleasant to employees was significant. Managers scheduled regular individual meetings with employees to discuss their work as shown by 69.2% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.75 shows that managers scheduling regular meetings with employees to discuss their work was significant.

4.4.2 Correlations for Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

A Pearson correlation test was carried out to determine the significance of the several supportive leadership style factors and their influence on employee commitment, and the p value of <0.05 was used as the threshold for determining significant factors. The results were as shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 shows that consideration and approachability was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.490, p<0.01). Emotional attachment was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.330, p<0.01). Equal opportunities for team members was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.492, p<0.01).
Table 4.7 Correlations for Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>Consideration and Approachability</th>
<th>Emotional Attachment</th>
<th>Equal Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration and Approachability</td>
<td>.490**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Attachment</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.780**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.825**</td>
<td>.693**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.4.3 Regression Analysis for Supportive Leadership Style

The researcher transformed variables for supportive leadership by computing means of the study variable into three main categories listed as: consideration and approachability, emotional attachment, and equal opportunities for team members. These variables were used to run the regression analysis, and the results were as follows:

Table 4.8 shows the results of the regression model summary for consideration and approachability, emotional attachment, and equal opportunities for team members (independent variables), and the dependent variable which was employee commitment. The adjusted R square value for the model showed that 67.7% of the variance in the model (employee commitment) can be explained by consideration and approachability, emotional attachment, and equal opportunities for team members.

Table 4.8 Model Summary for Supportive Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.43811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant): Consideration and Approachability, Emotional Attachment, and Equal Opportunities for Team Members
Table 4.9 shows the regression coefficients for the model and it predicts the relationship between the variables (consideration and approachability, emotional attachment, and equal opportunities for team members) and employee commitment. The regression coefficient indicates that consideration and approachability, and emotional attachment have a positive significant influence on employee commitment since their precision levels are less than the threshold of <0.05. The table shows that equal opportunities for team members had a positive, but insignificant influence on employee commitment since its precision level was more than the threshold of <0.05. The three variables had coefficients of consideration and approachability (0.002), emotional attachment (0.003), and equal opportunities for team members (0.689). This therefore concludes that the variables have a positive influence on employee commitment. Consideration and approachability, and emotional attachment had a significant influence, while equal opportunities for team members was insignificant to employee commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration and Approachability</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>3.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Attachment</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>3.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities for Team Members</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment

4.5 Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

4.5.1 Rating of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The respondents were asked to rate several participative leadership style factors and their impact on employee commitment using the scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree 3. Moderately Agree, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly Agree and their results were as shown in Table 4.10. The resulting standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the differences in the responses received was insignificant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Leadership Style</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager listens receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager consults with the team when he/she is facing a problem.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager consults with employees before making key decisions.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All decisions made by organization leadership are shared in a timely manner with the employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers explain to the employees the importance of their input in decision making</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are assigned into task groups to action policies or objectives affecting them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager schedules work for employees by involving them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager holds regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager maintains an open door policy and is easily accessible by employees.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager attends social events organized for employees.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows that managers maintained an open door policy and were easily accessible by employees as shown by 85.5% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.23 shows that managers maintaining an open door policy and being easily
accessible was significant. Managers listened receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions as shown by 83.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.05 shows that managers listening respectively to subordinates was significant. Managers attended social events organized for employees as shown by 67.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.81 shows that managers attending social events organized for employees was significant. Managers scheduled work for employees by involving them as shown by 75.4% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.80 shows that managers scheduling work by involving employees was significant. Managers explained to the employees the importance of their input in decision making as shown by 74.6% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.79 shows that managers explaining the importance of employees in decision making was significant. Managers consulted with the team when they faced a problem as shown by 66.1% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.77 shows that managers consulting with the team was significant. Managers consulted with employees before making key decisions as shown by 67.2% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.69 shows that managers consulting with employees before making key decisions was significant. All decisions made by organization leadership were shared in a timely manner with the employees as shown by 66.7% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.65 shows that leadership decisions being shared in a timely manner was significant. Employees were assigned into task groups to action policies or objectives affecting them as shown by 54.9% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.50 shows that employees being assigned to task groups to action plan decisions that affected them was significant. Managers held regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication as shown by 54.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.48 shows that managers holding regular meetings with employees as opposed to sending emails was significant.

4.5.2 Correlations for Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
A Pearson correlation test was carried out to determine the significance of the several participative leadership style factors and their influence on employee commitment, and the p value of <0.05 was used as the threshold for determining significant factors. The results were as shown in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11 Correlations for Participative Leadership Style Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>Consultative Decision Making</th>
<th>Shared Ownership</th>
<th>Direct Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Decision Making</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ownership</td>
<td>.285*</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Interaction</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4.11 shows that consultative and participatory decision making was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.370, p<0.01). Shared ownership and responsibility was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.285, p<0.05). Direct interaction was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.295, p<0.05).

4.5.3 Regression Analysis for Participative Leadership Style

The researcher transformed variables for participative leadership style by computing means of the study variable into three main categories listed as: consultative and participatory decision making, shared ownership and responsibility, and direct interaction. These variables were used to run the regression analysis, and the results were as follows:

Table 4.12 shows the results of the regression model summary for consultative and participatory decision making, shared ownership and responsibility, and direct interaction (independent variables), and the dependent variable which was employee commitment. The adjusted R square value for the model showed that 67.5% of the variance in the model (employee commitment) can be explained by consultative and participatory decision making, shared ownership and responsibility, and direct interaction.
Table 4.12 Model Summary for Participative Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.44615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant): Consultative and Participatory Decision Making, Shared Ownership and Responsibility, and Direct Interactions

Table 4.13 shows the regression coefficients for the model and it predicts the relationship between the variables (consultative and participatory decision making, shared ownership and responsibility, and direct interactions) and employee commitment. The regression coefficient indicates that consultative and participatory decision making, and direct interactions have a positive significant influence on employee commitment since their precision levels are less than the threshold of <0.05. The table shows that shared ownership and responsibility had a positive, but insignificant influence on employee commitment since its precision level was more than the threshold of <0.05. The three variables had coefficients of: consultative and participatory decision making (0.050), shared ownership and responsibility (0.199), and direct interactions (0.000). This therefore concludes that the variables have a positive influence on employee commitment. Consultative and participatory decision making, and direct interactions had a significant influence, while shared ownership and responsibility was insignificant to employee commitment.

Table 4.13 Regression Coefficients for Participative Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>2.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative and Participatory Decision Making</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ownership and Responsibility</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Interactions</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>8.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment
4.6 Effect of Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

4.6.1 Rating of Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The respondents were asked to rate several achievement oriented leadership style factors and their impact on employee commitment using the scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree 3. Moderately Agree, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly Agree and their results were as shown in Table 4.14. The resulting standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the differences in the responses received was insignificant.

Table 4.14 Rating of Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My manager consistently sets goals for performance that are quite challenging.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager sets goals that are specific and clear.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager ensures that allocated goals are always accomplished within specific timelines.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager expects staff to design their own strategies for accomplishing given goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are given constant feedback on their goal performance.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a recognition system in place for those who attain the given goals.</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals assigned to the employees are in line with the organization strategic plan.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are asked to think ahead and develop longer term plans for their functions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager expects that each employee has a clear work plan for achieving their goals.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that goals assigned to the employees are in line with the organization strategic plan as shown by 91.9% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.19 shows that assigned goals being in line with the organization’s strategic plan was significant. Managers expect that each employee has a clear work plan for achieving their
goals as shown by 91.9% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.15 shows that managers expecting employees to have clear work plans for goal achievement was significant. Employees are asked to think ahead and develop longer term plans for their functions as shown by 79.1% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.05 shows that employees being asked to have long term plans for their functions was significant. Managers expect staff to design their own strategies for accomplishing given goals as shown by 80.7% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.00 shows that managers expecting staff to design their own strategies for goal accomplishment was significant. Managers set goals that are specific and clear as shown by 78.7% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.93 shows that managers setting clear goals was significant. Managers ensure that allocated goals are always accomplished within specific timelines as shown by 78.7% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.87 shows that managers ensuring that set goals are accomplished within specific timelines was significant. Employees are given constant feedback on their goal performance as shown by 71% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.77 shows that employees receiving constant feedback on their goal performance was significant. Managers consistently set goals for performance that are quite challenging as shown by 50.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.39 shows that managers setting challenging goals performance was significant. There isn’t a recognition system in place for those who attain the given goals as shown by 42.6% of the respondents that disagreed while a significant percentage of 34.4% were neutral; the resulting mean of 2.72 shows that the absence of a recognition system for employees that attain given goals was slightly significant.

4.6.2 Correlations for Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style

A Pearson correlation test was carried out to determine the significance of the several achievement-oriented leadership style factors and their influence on employee commitment, and the p value of <0.05 was used as the threshold for determining significant factors. The results were as shown in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15 shows that high quality performance was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.381, p<0.01). Achievement and recognition was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.477, p<0.01).
Table 4.15 Correlations for Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>High Quality Performance</th>
<th>Achievement and Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Performance</td>
<td>.381** .002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement and Recognition</td>
<td>.477** .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.6.3 Regression Analysis for Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style

The researcher transformed variables for achievement-oriented leadership style by computing means of the study variable into two main categories listed as: high quality performance, and achievement and recognition. These variables were used to run the regression analysis, and the results were as follows:

Table 4.16 shows the results of the regression model summary for high quality performance, and achievement and recognition (independent variables), and the dependent variable which was employee commitment. The adjusted R square value for the model showed that 21.2% of the variance in the model (employee commitment) can be explained by high quality performance, and achievement and recognition.

Table 4.16 Model Summary for Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.40071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant): High Quality Performance, and Achievement and Recognition

Table 4.17 shows the regression coefficients for the model and it predicts the relationship between the variables (high quality performance, and achievement and recognition) and employee commitment. The regression coefficient indicates that high quality performance had a positive, but insignificant influence on employee commitment since its precision...
level was higher than the threshold of <0.05. The table also shows that achievement and recognition had a positive and significant influence on employee commitment since its precision level was less than the threshold of <0.05. The two variables had coefficients of: high quality performance (0.380), and achievement and recognition (0.010). This therefore concludes that the variables had positive influence on employee commitment. High quality performance had an insignificant influence on employee commitment, while achievement and recognition had a significant influence on employee commitment.

**Table 4.17 Regression Coefficients for Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>2.350</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Performance</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement and Recognition</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>2.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment

**4.7 Employee Commitment**

**4.7.1 Rating of Employee Commitment Factors**

The respondents were asked to rate several employee commitment factors using the scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2. Disagree 3. Moderately Agree, 4. Agree, 5. Strongly Agree and their results were as shown in Table 4.18. The resulting standard deviation of <1.5 shows that the differences in the responses received was insignificant.

Table 4.18 shows that employees were willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the organization be successful as shown by 93.3% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.37 shows that employees willing to put more effort than it is expected of them for the organization’s success was significant. Employees feel inspired to provide the best service to their partners and/or their colleagues as shown by 93.5% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 4.33 shows that employees being inspired to provide the best service to all stakeholders was significant. Employees understand how their work contributes to the organizations goals and objectives as shown by 98.4% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of
3.98 shows that employees understanding how their work contributes to the organizations goals and objectives was significant.

Table 4.18 Rating of Employee Commitment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organizations values are very similar.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very happy being a member of this organization.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking about my organization to people outside the organization.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my work contributes to the organizations goals and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to stay in this organization because of the support I have from my manager.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current position is inspiring for me.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I worry about what might happen if something was to happen to this organization and I was no longer a member.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel inspired to provide the best service to our partners and/or my colleagues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I owe this organization quite a bit because of what it has done for me.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 also shows that employees find that their values and the organizations values are very similar as shown by 90.2% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.90 shows that employees finding similarities between their values and those of the
organization was significant. Employees enjoyed talking about their organization to people outside the organization as shown by 88.5% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.88 shows that employees talking about their organization to outsiders was significant. Employees were very happy being members of the organization as shown by 85.2% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.85 shows that employees being happy as members of the organization was significant. The employees’ current positions were inspiring for them as shown by 68.8% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.85 shows that employees being inspired by their current positions was significant. Employees were happy to stay in this organization because of the support they have from their managers as shown by 59.6% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.69 shows that employees being happy by support from managers was significant. Sometimes employees worry about what might happen if something was to happen to the organization and they were no longer members as shown by 53.4% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.60 shows that employees worrying about the future of the organization and their fate was significant. Employees feel that they owe the organization quite a bit because of what it has done for them as shown by 55% of the respondents that agreed; the resulting mean of 3.48 shows that employees feeling that they owe the organization was significant. It would be very hard for employees to leave their organization right now, even if they wanted to as shown by 50% of the respondents that agreed, while a significant percentage of 30.6% were neutral; the resulting mean of 3.45 shows that employees finding it hard to leave the organization was significant.

4.7.2 Correlations for Employee Commitment Factors
A Pearson correlation test was carried out to determine the significance of the several employee commitment factors, and the p value of <0.05 was used as the threshold for determining significant factors. The results were as shown in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19 shows that identifying with the organization was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.467, p<0.01). Willingness to stay was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.932, p<0.01). Organizational loyalty was a significant factor in employee commitment (r=0.760, p<0.01).
Table 4.19 Correlations for Employee Commitment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>Identify with Organization</th>
<th>Willingness to Stay</th>
<th>Organizational Loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify with Organization</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Stay</td>
<td>.932**</td>
<td>.286*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Loyalty</td>
<td>.760**</td>
<td>.297*</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.7.3 Regression Analysis for Employee Commitment Factors

The researcher transformed variables for employee commitment factors by computing means of the study variable into three main categories listed as: identity with the organization, willingness to stay, and organizational loyalty. These variables were used to carry out the regression analysis, and the results were as follows:

Table 4.20 shows the results of the regression model summary for identity with the organization, willingness to stay, and organizational loyalty (independent variables), and the dependent variable which was employee commitment. The adjusted R square value for the model showed that 55.2% of the variance in the model (employee commitment) can be explained by identity with the organization, willingness to stay, and organizational loyalty.

Table 4.20 Model Summary of Employee Commitment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.22944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors (Constant): Identity with the Organization, Willingness to Stay, and Organizational Loyalty
Table 4.21 shows the regression coefficients for the model and it predicts the relationship between the variables (identity with the organization, willingness to stay, and organizational loyalty) and employee commitment. The regression coefficient indicates that identity with the organization and organizational loyalty had a positive significant influence on employee commitment since their precision levels were less than the threshold of <0.05. The table also shows that willingness to stay with the organization had a positive, but insignificant influence on employee commitment since its precision level was higher than the threshold of <0.05. The three variables had coefficients of: identity with the organization (0.000), willingness to stay (0.311), and organizational loyalty (0.008). This therefore concludes that the variables had positive influence on employee commitment. Willingness to stay had an insignificant influence on employee commitment, while identity with the organization and organizational loyalty had significant influence on employee commitment.

Table 4.21 Regression Coefficients of Employee Commitment Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-.771</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>-1.314</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity with the Organization</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Stay</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Loyalty</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Commitment

4.8 Chapter Summary

The chapter has offered explanations for the response rate, reliability and validity tests, as well as the demographic information. The chapter has presented results for directive leadership style factors, supportive leadership style factors, participative leadership style factors, and achievement oriented leadership style factors and their level of influence on employee commitment. Statistical measures have been used for presentations and the Pearson correlation and inferential statistics have been used to present the existing relationships between the various study variables. The next chapter offers the study discussion, conclusion and recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided in various sections that include: section 5.1 introduction, section 5.2 summary of findings, section 5.3 discussions, section 5.4 conclusions, and section 5.5 recommendations for improvement, and for further studies.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in non-governmental organizations. The study was guided by the following key research questions focusing on the four styles of leadership as derived from the theoretical framework: What is the effect of directive leadership style on employee commitment in NGOs? How does supportive leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? In what ways does participative leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs? Lastly, does achievement oriented leadership style affect employee commitment in NGOs?

The study employed descriptive research design with emphasis on the effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in NGOs. The target population of interest in this study was made up of employees of CA in Kenya, Malawi and Nigeria who were 100 in total. The sample frame consisted of a list of all official employees that worked in CA in those countries and was obtained from the HR Department. The sample size was 80 employees of CA who were selected using a stratified sampling technique and were divided into managers and non-managers. Data was collected using questionnaires and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings were presented using tables and charts. Correlational analysis was also be employed to test the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

The study showed that managers at CA told employees what needed to be done and how it needed to be done and that they did expect employees to question them. The study also showed that managers at CA expected staff to report back after completing each step of the work and they explained the level of performance that was expected of employees. The study showed that CA managers checked work on a regular basis to assess progress and learning and they never showed that they had doubts about their employees’ ability to
carry out tasks. The study showed that CA managers asked employees to follow standard rules and regulations and ensured that employees were aware of, and understood the organization’s policies and procedures, and they took actions when rules and regulations were not followed.

The study showed that managers at CA maintained a friendly working relationship with subordinates and they behaved in a manner that was thoughtful to employee’s needs. The study also showed that managers at CA gave feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner and they were approachable and friendly. The study showed that CA managers were mindful of employees’ personal needs and took action to support them, as well as doing little things that made it pleasant for employees to be members of the organization. The study showed that all team members at CA were given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences and employee teams in the organization enjoyed a friendly working environment. The study finally showed that managers at CA scheduled regular individual meetings with employees to discuss their work.

The study showed that managers at CA listened receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions and they consulted with employee teams when they were facing a problem, and before making key decisions. The study showed that all decisions made by the organization’s leadership were shared in a timely manner with the employees, and managers explained to the employees the importance of their input in decision making. The study showed that employees at CA were assigned into task groups, to action policies or objectives affecting them, and that, managers scheduled work for employees by involving them. The study showed that CA managers held regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication, and that, they maintained an open door policy which made them easily accessible to employees. The managers at CA also attended social events organized for employees.

The study showed that employees at CA find that their values and the organizations values are very similar, and they were very happy to be members of the organization. Employees enjoyed talking about their organization to people outside the organization, and they understood how their work contributed to the organizations goals and objectives. The study also showed that it would be very hard for employees at CA to leave their organization immediately, even if they wanted to. The study showed that CA employees
were happy to stay in with the organization because of the support they received from their managers and their current position was inspiring for them. The study revealed that sometimes employees worried about what might happen if something was to happen to this organization and they were no longer members, and they were inspired to provide the best service to their partners and/or their colleagues. The study showed that CA employees felt that they owe the organization quite a bit because of what it had done for them and that they were willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the organization become successful.

5.3 Discussions
5.3.1 Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study shows that managers at CA told employees what needed to be done and how it needed to be done. These results are in tandem with Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) state that, when employees are guided on what to do, they have a higher degree of certainty on what the leader expects of them. This elicits commitment to specific goals on the one hand but may also lead to a high dependency and low creativity on the other hand. The study shows that managers at CA told employees what to do, and expected employees to question them. These results are in tandem with Ebrahim (2016) who examined different studies and established that, employees are highly committed and highly involved in their organization when their leaders adopt directive, participative, and supportive leadership behaviours as a combination, suggesting that directive leadership cannot independently have an effect on the different components of employee commitment.

The study also shows that managers at CA expect staff to report back after completing each step of the work. These results are similar to Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) who states that, directive leadership style offers set performance goals that employees can work towards and it avoids the ambiguity that that is characterized by disillusionment of employees leading to the retention of high achievers and encourages normative commitment where employees feel responsible for the delivery of their set goals.

The study shows that managers at CA explained the level of performance that was expected of employees. These results are similar to Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) who states that, directive leadership style offers set performance goals that employees can
work towards and it avoids the ambiguity that is characterized by disillusionment of employees leading to the retention of high achievers and encourages normative commitment where employees feel responsible for the delivery of their set goals.

The study shows that managers at CA checked work on a regular basis to assess progress and learning. According to a study by Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) in the Iranian banking industry on employee commitment to service quality, they established that, directive leadership style has a negative effect on shared values and positive influence on role clarity.

The study shows managers at CA did not show that they had doubts about their employees’ ability to carry out their tasks. The study by Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) shows that the autocratic nature of directive leadership may reduce the employees’ commitment to service quality and shared values between the bank as the employer and the employees.

The study showed that managers at CA asked employees to follow standard rules and regulations. These results are in tandem with Polston-Murdoch (2013) who states that, directive leadership style stresses on adherence to rules and regulations in engagement with subordinates.

The study revealed that managers at CA ensured that employees were aware of, and understood organization policies and procedures. These results are also in tandem with Polston-Murdoch (2013) who states that, achieving goals by following rules, or compliance, as stated in the organizational policies is perceived as being a sign of commitment.

The study shows that managers at CA took actions when rules and regulations were not followed. These results are also in tandem with Polston-Murdoch (2013) who states that, directive leadership style tends to reinforce normative commitment as employees take responsibility for their actions bearing in mind the likely consequences of not doing so.
5.3.2 Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The study shows that managers at CA maintained a friendly working relationship with subordinates. These results are supported by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who found that supportive leadership style influenced affective commitment of the employees, meaning that employees were more likely to develop an emotional attachment and identification in a friendly and psychologically supportive work environment which may also result in greater citizenship and identification with organizational goals.

The study shows that managers at CA behaved in a manner that was thoughtful to employee’s needs. These results are in tandem with Nwokocha and Iheriohanma (2015) study that states, supportive style is viewed as a people-oriented leadership behaviour style that involves a two way communication and focuses mainly on emotional and social support.

The study shows that managers at CA gave feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner. These results are supported by Polston-Murdoch (2013) who found that supportive leadership style predicates the employees to have a preference for their leaders to be considerate and show deliberate concern.

The study shows that managers at CA were approachable and friendly. The study by Nwokocha and Iheriohanma (2015) showed that, a relational approach which is a strong aspect of supportive leadership allows for the approachability needed to build trust with employees, which in turn gives them the confidence to approach the leader with their personal concerns.

The study shows that managers at CA were mindful of employees’ personal needs and took action to support them. These results are in tandem with the study by Kim and Hancer (2011) who suggested that leaders exhibiting sympathy and consideration for employees’ needs will keep them emotionally attached, and motivate them to spend the rest of their career with the organization.

The study shows that managers at CA did little things that made it pleasant to be a member of the group. These results are in agreement with Agarwal, DeCarlo, and Vyas
(1999) who states that the continuance commitment necessary for reduced turn over can be elicited by a supportive and considerate style.

The study shows that all team members at CA were given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences. A study by Clinebell et al. (2013), the sense of fair treatment offered by a positive style approach has an effect on normative commitment where employees feel a greater sense of shared responsibility when they sense that favouritism is not present.

The study shows that employees’ teams at CA enjoyed a friendly work environment. These results are in tandem with Agarwal, DeCarlo, and Vyas (1999) who stated that, to reduce the effect of that stressful environment, leaders of construction projects can create a friendly and psychologically supportive environment for the employees in order to make the working environment more appealing to them.

The study shows that managers at CA scheduled regular individual meetings with employees to discuss their work. These results are similar to Alkhatani (2016) who posits that, when a leader pays close attention to individual differences, then a sense of fairness is experienced leading to greater commitment. Supportive leadership style seeks to ensure that every member feels equally acknowledged, having access to similar opportunities, which could lead to a greater sense of responsibility for what the organization seeks to achieve.

5.3.3 Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

The study shows that managers at CA listened receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions. These results are in agreement with Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) who state that, participative leadership involves a consultative culture between supervisors and subordinates and that, employees who perceive their managers as adopting consultative and participative behaviour tend to be more committed to their organizations.

The study shows that managers at CA consulted with the team when they were facing a problem. According to Dolatabadi and Safa (2011), consultative approach enhances dissemination of organizational values to employees which leads to affective commitment where employees have a sense of emotional attachment, identification and involvement.
The study shows that managers at CA consulted with employees before making key decisions. Dolatabadi and Safa (2011), suggest that employees who are allowed to participate in decision making are likely to be more committed to those decisions, hence the organization.

The study shows that all decisions made by the organization’s leadership were shared in a timely manner with the employees. These results are in tandem with Hwang et al. (2015) who states that, participative leadership style integrates the input of employees into group or organizational decisions even which creates greater ownership of those decision and the activities that are required to implement those decisions.

The study shows that managers at CA explained to the employees the importance of their input in decision making. These results are in agreement with Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who posit that, participative style of leadership is effective when subordinates are highly trained and involved in their work, the success of which would lead to both emotional attachment and shared ownership of outcomes.

The study shows employees at CA were assigned into task groups, to action policies or objectives affecting them. These results are in agreement with Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who posit that, participative style of leadership is effective when subordinates are highly trained and involved in their work, the success of which would lead to both emotional attachment and shared ownership of outcomes. Dolatabadi and Safa (2011), suggest that employees who are allowed to participate in decision making are likely to be more committed to those decisions, hence the organization.

The study shows that managers at CA scheduled work for employees by involving them. According to Dolatabadi and Safa (2011), suggest that employees who are allowed to participate in decision making are likely to be more committed to those decisions, hence the organization.

The study shows that managers at CA held regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication. These results are in agreement with Dolatabadi and Safa (2011) who suggest that, employees who are allowed to participate
in decision making are likely to be more committed to those decisions, hence the organization.

The study shows that managers at CA maintained an open door policy and were easily accessible by employees. These results are in tandem with Cheung et al. (2006) who states that, participative leaders create time to meet with subordinates for purposes of consultation removing the barriers that can be easily created by the power relationship. This creates the familiarity that eliminates power relationship barriers, enabling employees to express their views without inhibition.

The study shows that managers at CA attended social events organized for employees. These results are in agreement with Cheung et al. (2006) who found that while participative leadership behaviour tended to make short-tenure employees feel competent leading to greater commitment to the organization, such leadership behaviour did not have a significant impact on competence and organizational commitment for long tenure employees.

5.3.4 Effect of Achievement Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study shows that employees at CA found that their values and those of the organization were very similar. These results were similar to the study by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who found that, employees in the construction industry want to continue to work with a leader whose performance attributes coincide with their personal goals.

The study shows that employees at CA were very happy being members of the organization. These results are similar to a study by Limsila and Ogunlana (2008) who found that, Thai workers desired to have leaders who pay attention to subordinates’ needs for achievement. This encourages normative commitment where employees feel that their own need for achievement and responsibility is enhanced by the leadership style.

The study shows that employees at CA enjoyed talking about their organization to people outside the organization and that CA employees understood how their work contributed to the organizations goals and objectives. These results are similar to the study by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who found that, achievement oriented leaders put stress on quality outputs from their subordinates and hence set challenging goals for them, and that, high
quality outputs and excellence of execution can be evidence of commitment to the organization.

The study shows that it would be very hard for CA employees to leave the organization right now, even if they wanted to. These results are similar to a study by Limsila and Ogunlana (2008) who found that, Thai workers desired to have leaders who pay attention to subordinates’ needs for achievement. This encourages normative commitment where employees feel that their own need for achievement and responsibility is enhanced by the leadership style.

The study shows that employees at CA were happy to stay in the organization because of the support they had from their managers. These results were supported by Alkhatani (2016) who states that, employees expect leaders to support their growth by being a coach or mentor and in that respect to consider subordinates’ needs over own needs in effect preferring leaders to share risks and be able to encourage them to envision attractive future states.

The study shows that employees’ current position was inspiring for them. These results are supported by Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who established that, continuance commitment is positively associated with the achievement-oriented style in the construction industry while the notable outcome was that the supportive leadership style was negatively associated with the continuance commitment.

The study shows that employees at CA sometimes worry about what might happen if something was to happen to this organization and they were no longer members. These results are similar to Ebrahim (2016) study that shows, employees may choose to remain in an organization for fear of losing the data that could result in their career progression having been given chances to show case their best talent by a participative leader in their previous job.

The study shows that employees at CA felt inspired to provide the best service to their partners and/or their colleagues. This results are in tandem with Famakin and Abisuga (2016) who established that, employees can commit to continuously develop their
capabilities in order to offer the best service to the organization, including investing their own resources.

The study shows that employees at CA felt that they owed the organization quite a bit because of what it had done for them. These results are similar to Bell and Mjoli (2014) study which proposed that, the achievement oriented style of leadership actually expects continuous improvement in how employees apply skills for better results in each performance cycle.

The study shows that employees at CA were willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help the organization become successful. These results are similar to Bell and Mjoli (2014) study which proposed that, continuance commitment which entails willingness to stay is high when the prospect of leaving the organization results in perceived sacrifice, and the availability of viable alternative employment options is low, such that the perceived sacrifice would be worth the move.

5.4 Conclusions
5.4.1 Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study concludes that CA as an organization employs direct leadership effectively and efficiently since its managers guide employees on what needs to be done and how it needs done while expect their employees to question them. Managers in the organization are also interested in progress feedback from their employees and they carry out regular assessment of the progress. It can be concluded that the ability of CA managers asking employees to follow standard rules and regulations, ensuring that employees are aware of the organization’s policies and procedures, and finally taking actions when rules and regulations are not followed is an effective and efficient way by which the organization utilizes directive leadership style.

5.4.2 Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study concludes that CA as an organization employs supportive leadership effectively and efficiently since its managers maintain a friendly working relationship with subordinates and they are thoughtful to employees’ needs. The ability of CA managers giving prompt feedback to employees’ requests as well as their approachability is indicative of the effective implementation of supportive leadership within the
organization. From the study, it can be concluded that employees at CA are given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences, and that they enjoy a friendly working environment.

5.4.3 Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study concludes that CA as an organization employs participative leadership effectively through listening receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions and consulting with them when facing problems, and before making key decisions. The organization also employs participative leadership through timely sharing of leadership decisions within the organization and managers explaining to employees the importance of their input in decision making. It can therefore be concluded that employees at CA are assigned into task groups, to action policies or objectives affecting them, and their work is scheduled from direct involvement. Managers holding regular meetings to communicate with employees and their application of an open-door policy, is another factor that attributes of the conclusion of their efficient application of participative leadership.

5.4.4 Effect of Achievement Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study can conclude that employees at CA find that their values and those of the organization to be very similar, and they are very happy to be members of the organization. From the study, it can be concluded that employees enjoy talking about their organization to people outside the organization, and they understand how their work contributes to the organizations goals and objectives. Employees being inspired to provide the best service to their stakeholders, and their feelings of owing the organization and their willingness to put in a great deal of effort beyond what was expected of them; are conclusive factors that indicate that CA had effectively implemented achievement-oriented leadership in its organization.

5.5 Recommendations
5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement
5.5.1.1 Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
Directive leadership hinders the creation of a culture for shared values and employees are less likely to adopt organizational or managerial values when they are excluded from decision-making processes. This study therefore recommends CA to apply directive
leadership on programmes/ situations that is needed cautiously, so as to receive feedback from employees for better commitment.

5.5.1.2 Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study recommends CA managers to apply supportive leadership style since employees that are provided with equal opportunities at the work place, feel acknowledged for their contribution, which in turn leads to a sense of shared purpose among them. This encourages them to offer their best effort to the organization.

5.5.1.3 Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
The study recommends CA to apply participative leadership more since it has revealed that employees who perceive their managers as adopting consultative or participative leadership behaviour are more committed to their organizations, more satisfied with their jobs and higher in their performance. These would yield better results for the organization in its goal of attaining employee commitment.

5.5.1.4 Effect of Achievement Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment
Achievement oriented style of leadership expects continuous improvement in how employees apply skills for better results in each performance cycle. The study recommends CA to apply this leadership style since the study has revealed it to be the most effective in achieving employee commitment, since it encourages the employee’s willingness to stay with the organization.

5.5.2 Recommendations for Further Studies
This study focused on effects of leadership styles on employee commitment in Christian Aid. The results are limited to the organization, and thus further research needs to be carried out in other local and international NGOs to determine the overall effect of leadership. Other similar studies also need to be carried out on private and public institutions to determine whether the influence is the same, or there are other moderating factors.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: COVER LETTER

10th February 2017

Dear Respondent,

I’m a Master of Science in Organizational development program at United States International University (USIU). As part of my Master’s Degree requirement I’m expected to successfully conduct Applied Research on a relevant topic in my area of concentration (Leadership).

This study will look at **The Effect of Leadership Styles on Employee Commitment in International Non-Governmental Organization: A Case of Christian Aid.**

I would like to request that you to spend some of your valuable time (10-15 minutes) to complete this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge. Thank you in advance for accepting to be a contributor. Your responses will be treated with the confidentiality it deserves.

To maintain anonymity, we have not included names on the questionnaire.

A brief of the introduction letter from the Dean, Chandaria School of Business at United States International University- Africa which certifies that I’m a student in the mentioned program, is included.

Yours Sincerely,

Lilian Githuka (Masters Student)

For more information please contact on:
Tel. +254 721361319
Email- lilian.githuka@gmail.com
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART ONE: Demographics

Read all the questions first and choose the appropriate answer box by ticking only one number for each question. All information will remain confidential and to maintain anonymity, no names are required.

1. What position do you hold in your organization (tick as appropriate)?
   Management: ………………… Non-Management: …………………

2. Please indicate your department (tick as appropriate):
   Programme: …… Finance: …… Administration: …… Regional Support: ……

3. What is your gender?
   Male 1  Female 2

4. What is your age category?
   50 years and above 1  40-49 years 2  30-39 years 3  Below 30 years 4

5. How long (years) have you been working for Christian Aid?
   Less than 1 year 1  1-3 years 2  3-5 years 3  5-10 years 4  Above 10 years 5
PART TWO: Effect of Directive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

6. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements describing the directive leadership styles by using the scale of 1-5 where 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral (N), 4 Agree (A) and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive Leadership Style</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (A)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Scheduling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells me what needs to be done and how it needs to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager tells employees what to do without expecting employees to question him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager expects staff to report back after completing each step of the work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting Performance Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager explains the level of performance that is expected of employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager checks work on a regular basis to assess progress and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager shows that he/she has doubts about my/my colleague ability to carry out their tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement of Rules and Regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager asks me to follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager ensures that employees are aware of, and understand, organization policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager takes actions when rules and regulations are not followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please add any additional factors besides the ones mentioned that you think would describe how directive leadership style is carried out in the organization?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART THREE: Effect of Supportive Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements describing the supportive leadership styles by using the scale of 1-5 where 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral (N), 4 Agree (A) and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Leadership Style</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (A)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration and Approachability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager maintains a friendly working relationship with subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager behaves in a manner that is thoughtful to employee’s needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership gives feedback to employee’s requests in a prompt manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is approachable and friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is mindful of my personal needs and takes action to support me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager does little things that make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities for Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All team members are given opportunities to attend relevant trainings and conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My team enjoys a friendly work environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are equitably compensated for their work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager schedules regular individual meetings with me to discuss my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What other factors besides the ones mentioned do you think would describe how supportive leadership style would affect organizational employee commitment?  
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART FOUR: Effect of Participative Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

10. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements describing the participative leadership styles by using the scale of 1-5 where 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral (N), 4 Agree (A) and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative Leadership Style</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (A)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultative and Participatory Decision Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager listens receptively to subordinates ideas and suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager consults with the team when he/she is facing a problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager consults with employees before making key decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Ownership and Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All decisions made by organization leadership are shared in a timely manner with the employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers explain to the employees the importance of their input in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are assigned into task groups to action policies or objectives affecting them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager schedules work for employees by involving them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager/s shares the role of leading meetings and projects with team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager holds regular meetings to communicate with employees as opposed to e-mail communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager maintains an open door policy and is easily accessible by employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What other factors besides the ones mentioned do you think would describe how participative leadership style would affect organizational employee commitment?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART FIVE: Effect of Achievement-Oriented Leadership Style on Employee Commitment

12. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on achievement oriented leadership style by using the scale of 1-5 where 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral (N), 4 Agree (A) and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement- Oriented Leadership Style</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (A)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Quality Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager consistently sets goals for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance that are quite challenging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employee goals set by the leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are specific and clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals assigned to the employees are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in line with the organization strategic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager ensures that allocated goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are always accomplished within specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement and Recognition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees design their own strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for accomplishing the given goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are given constant feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on their goal performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a reward system in place for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who attain the given goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are asked to think ahead and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop longer term plans for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What other factors besides the ones mentioned do you think would describe how achievement-oriented leadership style would affect organizational employee commitment?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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PART SIX: Employee Commitment

14. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on employee commitment by using the scale of 1-5 where 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Neutral (N), 4 Agree (A) and 5 Strongly Agree (SA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Commitment</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (D)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (A)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity with the organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organizations values are very similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very happy being a member of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy talking about my organization to people outside the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how my work contributes to the organizations goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to stay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to stay in this organization because of the support I have from my manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My current position is inspiring for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I worry about what might happen if something was to happen to this organization and I was no longer a member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational loyalty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel inspired to provide the best service to our partners and/or my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I owe this organization quite a bit because of what it has done for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Any other comment regarding leadership styles and employee commitment

_____________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and response