

## The Impact of Managers Leadership Style on Organizational Commitment of Staff in Zahravi Pharmacy Company

<sup>1</sup>Mohammad Kargar Shouraki and <sup>2</sup>Saeed Zanjani

<sup>1</sup>Department of Human Capital, Tamin Pharmaceutical Investment Company, Tabriz Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Industrial Management, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Tabriz, Iran

---

**Abstract:** This study is aimed at investigating the relationship between manager's leadership styles and the organizational commitment of staff. Therefore to determine the managers leading styles and the amount of organizational commitment, two questionnaires were used. The sample was North Azarbayjan (Iran) Agriculture organization that consisted of 40 managers and 400 staffs, selected through random sampling. Pierson correlation test and t- test was used for data analysis. The findings show that there is a positive relationship between manager's developmental and transfer-oriented leadership styles and effective, normative organizational commitment of the staff. Also there is a negative relationship between manager's chaotic and effective (emotional) organizational commitment of the staff. There is also no relationship between manager's leadership styles and constant organizational commitment of the staff.

**Key words:** Manager's leadership style, organizational commitment of the staff, data, relationship, Iran

---

### INTRODUCTION

Now a days, economical power and wealth of each contrary depends on its effective use of resources. In this regard, human resources are the most important element in organization's competing with one another. argues that companies' competitive edge before production is laid within individuals. According to Gunnigle *et al.* (1971), individuals as companies' vital forces, are organizations' most valuable resources. And no organization can reach a stable competitive advantage and its aims unless staff's aim is compatible with the organizations' aims. There is nothing more important for a company other than its staff, work more honestly and willingly day by day. Taking into account individuals as the main resources of companies' competitive advantage, therefore, their commitment plays a vital role in organizations success (Swanpoel, 2000).

Swanpoel (2000) emphasized that the ability of an organization in performing and implementing business strategies, gaining competitive advantage and optimizing human resources depend to a large degree on leadership styles that help encouraging commitment of the staff, therefore, the leadership ability to keep committed staff has an important role in a company's success and maintenance. He showed that leadership styles encouraging staff's commitment is necessary in

successfully performing business strategies, in achieving the aims and competitive advantages and optimizing human resources.

Taking into account that, among the studies done on leadership styles and organizational commitment up to now, a small number was about the relationship between the leadership styles and organizational commitment and also taking it into account that nowadays the main element of an organizations is competitive advantage and the improvement of these resources' commitment is required for optimization of the organizations, so conducting researches on these issues can help organizations in terms of improving optimization through advancement of staff commitment. So the current study aims at investigating the impact of leadership styles on staff commitment.

**Literature review:** Scholars of Humanities argue the concept of leadership from different perspectives and offered many definitions. Yukl (1989) said authors usually define leadership in terms of their own personal aspects which they are more interested. Sorenson stated that the first handbook about leadership was written by Stogdill's, after him there conducted 40725 studies about leadership but Stogdill's himself stated that adding endless number of experimental data, give us no coherent concept of leadership. Northouse (2012) stated that although there is a great deal of literature on the issue, leadership remains

as the main challenge for individuals concerning and researchers interested in understanding the nature of leadership. Leadership is a valuable and at the same time complicated issue.

Babakus *et al.* (2003), Collins (2001) and Lee and Chang (2006) found out that leadership effectiveness is related to the commitment of staff and organizational results within that organization. Stojkovic and Farkas (2003) suggested that effective organizational leaders in direct comparison with non-effective leaders gain better results. Montgomery (2006) understood that one sign for effective leadership is the ability to transfer friendliness and dedication for organization aims in a way that causes subordinates and followers choose achieving organization aims interestingly (p. 40). Dhar and Mishra (2001) supported the reflection of effective leadership in the behavior of their staff. Felfe and Schyns (2004) found out that leadership behavior facilitates leadership's particular results supported by means of subordinates' additional efforts.

Hautala (2006), Hetland *et al.* (2008), Moss (2009) and Tekleab *et al.* (2007) argued that one of the central elements of leadership is followership. Ilies *et al.* (2006) found out that followers within an organization are raised through effective leadership in order to achieve the organization's goals and serving the people. Factors affecting the effectiveness of leadership include: leader's personality, previous experiences, expectations, expectations and behaviors of senior managers, followers' characteristics, expectations and behavior, job requirements, organizational culture and policies and colleagues' expectations and behaviors.

Different researcher such as Vecchio (1997) and Zaleznik showed that a leader can be a manager but a manager is not necessarily a leader. A leader of a group may be informally selected by members of the group (Vecchio, 1997). If a manager can influence people to achieve the goals of the organization without using his power, he can be said a leader. Anyway, a leader deals with inspiring interpretation, motivation and influencing. The difference between management and leadership is that the followers satisfactorily follow the leader because they willingly not by force follow him (Avolio *et al.*, 1991). A manager may not use his power to punish or award (Kotter, 1998). He believes that his leadership power can be transferred to him through follower's satisfaction of what they want of him. On the other hand, managers can use formal power to influence their staff on achieving their goals. Leaders having an insight about their staff, have priority over them, their fixed insight is

of value for staffs (Kotter, 1998). Management, on the other hand, has methods, systems in a way you understand.

The way the leader makes use of his power to achieve his goals is called leadership style or leadership style is manager's behavior patterns when influencing other's activities as others understands manager's behavior or techniques used in influencing and directing other's activities. In another definition, leadership style is called to a number of behaviors that constantly considers each individual and their needs in different occasions. Taking into consideration the studies done in the leadership field up to now, we can say that leadership over times come along with different theories that are classified in some historical approaches focusing on both features, behaviors and leadership situations and management process:

Outstanding traits approach (personality approach) focuses on individual's instinct characteristics and states that individuals usually born with specific appearance characteristics such as intelligence, responsibility, creativity, self confidence, sociability, success, having influence on others and etc that turn them into great managers.

Behaviorist approach in which the behavior of the manager was evaluated. Researchers investigating behaviorist approach stated that in general, management behavior is of two types: responsibility-based and relationship-based behaviors (Northouse, 2012). X and Y theories of Mac Gerigur, Ohio and Michigan Universities' theories management network models was among theories relating to this approach. Taking this approach into consideration, a leader can be along each of these groups, in fact behaviorist approach talks about what and which leader is effective. Taking behaviorist leadership approach into account, it may be effective in one occasion and not necessarily in colleagues.

Contingency approach described leader's role in suitable occasions and state that there is not any common style as the best leadership style for all occasions. This approach focuses on the situation the leader is experiencing, not the leader himself. In 1964 Philter introduced the concept of contingency theories and stated that leadership is of three concepts: leadership styles, taking occasions into consideration and the results.

Northouse (2012) stated that effective leaders work to build a good relationship with their subordinates so as to gain a common goal. Hsieh and Guy (2008) found out that a leader is busy having inside and outside group relationships with their followers. Also in final remarks of the discussion on leadership approaches, he focused on

new approaches (transformational leadership styles, change and chaos). Behaviorist, cognitive and contingency approaches agree upon how leaders can have influence on their followers, have no generality and care and a no working standard measure and therefore new approaches emerged.

Transformational leaders consist of three parts: contingent rewards, management based on active exceptions and management based on inactive exceptions:

- Contingent rewards which follow transformational leadership style often think of a possible reward to improve their subordinates act
- Management based on active exceptions: leaders having management based on active exceptions often control their subordinates when their freedom is limited and can lead to an unfavorable action or negative behavior (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993; Masi and Cooke, 2000). Studies on leaders having management based on active exceptions are proactive, and the actions will be supervised to make sure of achieving organizational standards. These leaders also make reformative actions to optimize the actions and standards (Bass and Ovolio, 1990)
- Management based on inactive exceptions: leaders taking management based on inactive exceptions into account, while coming across problems, low performance, and not achieving the standards are reactive, meddler

Chaotic leaders let their subordinates free to do their jobs; however, they wish and do not meddle in decision making (Bass, 1990). Deluga (1990) insisted on a meddler leadership as an extremely passive one and subordinate's great freedom in order to conferment their responsibilities. In fact, this extreme style shows lack of leadership. Tatum *et al.* (2003) found out that chaotic leadership usually tend to give their subordinates freedom for self-management considering the written policies and methods. Tatum *et al.* (2003) describe chaotic leaders as passive avoidance, management based on exception and administrative management. Chaotic management is the result of lacking management. Chaotic leaders do nothing about leadership. Moreover, they are unwilling to make decisions and don't want to use their power, therefore, delay their activities and ignore their leadership responsibilities. They often provide their followers little direction and make little effort in satisfying them and do not improve themselves and their followers (Hoy and Miskel, 2008).

Attitudinal approach toward commitment to a large degree looks at staff's attitudes or a set of behavior demands. pointed out at organizational commitment characteristics as .strong believe in accepting the aims and organization values, Willingness in considerable effort from the organization, strong interest in staying in the organization.

Second approach points out to commitment as behavior (Zanagaro, 2001). In this approach, the staff works for investigation: spending time in organization, friendship within organization, retirement advantages, ties the staff to the organization.

Hsieh and Guy (2008) used leadership styles and organizational commitment. Hsieh and Guy (2008) made use of both in Chinese culture and came into the conclusion that both developmental and transformational leadership styles have a positive effect on organizational commitment even though the effect of developmental leadership is more. Abrego made use of both leadership style and organizational commitment in telecommunication industry. Skeese made use of these two variables in general schooling system and found out that both transformational and developmental leadership styles influence organizational commitment. Kamencik and Adadev, made use of these two variables in nursing and found out that developmental leadership style has a positive effect on organizational commitment. Adadevoh, also found out that transformational leadership style (contingent rewards) has a positive effect on organizational commitment. Al-Ammaj also found out that developmental and transformational leadership styles have a positive effect on organizational commitment, although transformational leadership style has more effect.

Eddy and Sears did a survey on manager's developmental and transformational styles in relation with time diversification, intermediate social role and management age and showed that developmental leadership is largely based on various methods implementation. Wallace *et al.* (2011) through questionnaire distribution among 438 Irish pioneer retailing bank branches in studied this issue that how values were accepted among staffs in a bank and showed that one structure and leadership style circular is effective in motivating to accept bank values. Ismail *et al.* (2011) a research entitled "an experimental relationship between developmental leadership, improvement and organizational commitment" by questionnaire distribution among 118 individuals of United States subsidiary organization in East Malaysia investigated the effect of empowerment (empowered) in relation with developmental leadership style and organizational

Table 1: Review of previous literature

Important results	Research year	Researcher	Research topic
Developmental leadership has a relationship with performing diversity methods and transformational leadership with diversity management.	2011	Gorge J. Sears	Manager's leadership style and using organizational diversity: mediator effects of social value and age
A structure and circular of leadership style is effective in encouraging accepting. Staff's commitment is important in this acceptance	2011	Wallance, Leslie de Chernatory,	How leader and commitment influences bank staff, compliance with bank values
Empowerment and developmental leadership style have a positive and considerable relationship with organizational commitment	2011	Azman Ismail, Hasan Al-Banna	An experimental relationship between evolution leadership improvement and organizational commitment
Developmental leadership directly effects good behavior and indirectly decreases willingness to leave the organization through staff's commitment	2011	Srithongrung,a	Causal relationships between developmental leadership, organizational commitment and staff's effectiveness
Developmental and transformational leadership are positively and considerably related to organizational	2010	Hung Q.kaieu	Leadership styles and organizational efficiency A predictive analysis
Chaotic leadership has a direct and negative relationship with organizational performance			
Diversity leadership styles differently affect staff's organizational behavior. Chaotic leadership style has a considerable relationship with organizational commitment and feeling efficient	2010	Leon T.Geter, SR	A quantitative study on the relationship between transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and feeling useful and effective
There is a positive and meaningful relationship among supplier, cooperative empowerment leadership styles and staff's job satisfaction	2010	Mohamad Hadi Asghari Davoud Kia Nujumi	Investigating the relationship between manager's leadership styles and job satisfaction of empowerment department of Mazandaran
Change in leadership can lead to change in staff's commitment level	2009	Kenneth B.Granger	The relationship between staff's commitment and change in management, and leadership styles shows great change

commitment. Srithongrung in a paper entitled “causal relationships between developmental leadership, organizational commitment and staff effectiveness” come to the conclusion that developmental leadership especially regards idealization influence and inspiration motivation components directly improve good behaviors and indirectly through internalization, identification and exchanging organizational commitments make the staff stay in the organization. Hung Q. Kieu a research entitled “leadership styles and organizational efficiency: a predictive analysis” analyzing data gathered from among 151 staff with IT knowledge of a mass communication organization in United Nations showed that developmental and transformational leadership have a positive and considerable relationship with organizational performance. In contrast, chaotic leadership has a direct and negative relationship with organizational performance (Table 1).

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The present study is applicable in terms of purpose and in terms of data collection method for descriptive surveys. Primary data are gathered by questionnaire and secondary data by organization's documents and library information. Questionnaire's audience were managers, staffs of each sampling group. To choose number of samples cokran formula was used. Also, intended samples were chosen randomly (Table 2).

Table 2: Shows number of people and number of selected samples

Staff	Managers	Samples
400	30	Number of people
164	25	Number of people in the sample

**Instrument:** In order to gather data, we made use of two questionnaires: one about leadership styles (36 questions) and one about staff's commitment (12 questions) and Liker's spectrum is the basis for evaluating all. The questionnaires were given to case studies by paying a visit and finally 25 managers and 164 staffs answered the questions. In the following table, leadership style dimensions, organizational commitment and buoys being used for evaluating each is shown. Table 3 Leadership style dimensions and organizational commitment and each ones' buoy.

**Reliability and validity of the study:** In order to evaluate the reliability and validity in the present study, we made use of expert and university instructors' views. For evaluating the reliability, we make use of Korenbakh's Alfa coefficient. Estimated Alfa coefficient for the questionnaires was about 90% that showed an acceptable reliability number. Estimated Alfa coefficient for variables in this study was shown in Table 3. As it is shown in Table 4, questions regarding the study have a proper reliability.

**Research hypothesis:**

- Manager's leadership style affects organizational commitment

Table 3: Leadership style dimensions and organizational commitment and each ones' buoy

Number of questions	Buoys	Dimensions	Variable
4	Idealized influence (attributed)	Development	Leadership style
4	Idealized influence (behavior)		
4	Inspirational motivation		
4	Individualized consideration		
4	Intellectual stimulation	Transformational	
4	Contingent rewards		
4	Management based on active exception		
4	Management based on passive exception		
4		Chaotic	Organizational commitment
4		Effective	
4		Continuous	
4		Normative	

Table 4: Reliability coefficients for leadership style and organizational commitment

Kronbakh alfa	Number of questions	Variables
89	36	Leadership style
86	12	Staff's commitment
90	58	Total

- Developmental leadership style positively affects continuous organizational commitment
- Developmental leadership style positively affects continuous organizational commitment
- Developmental leadership style positively affects normative organizational commitment
- Passive leadership style does not positively affect effective organizational commitment
- Passive leadership style positively affects continuous organizational commitment
- Passive leadership style does not positively affect normative organizational commitment
- Chaotic leadership style negatively affects effective (motional) organizational commitment
- Chaotic leadership style does not negatively affect continuous organizational commitment
- Chaotic leadership style does not negatively affect normative organizational commitment
- Manager's and staff's view point about leadership styles is different
- Manager's and staff's view point about staffs' organizational commitment is different

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Data analysis:** According to data from Table 4, 59.3 % of the whole sample, are 41-50 years old. 91.5 percent are male, 55.6 had worked for more than 21 years in the organization. Also, 67.2% had work with the present manager for 3-5 years and finally 86.8 percent of the existing sample is staff and 13.2% are managers.

According to data in Table 5, among leadership styles, the greatest average is related to developmental

leadership style with the average of 3.47 and among staff's commitment, the greatest average is related to effective commitment with the average of 3.73. Other results are shown in Table 6.

Manager's dependant or staff's variable at nominal level is bi-sided and staffs' commitment variables and leadership styles are at distance level, therefore, suitable statistics for investigating the relationship between these two t variables is of two samples. Lioner test is one this study's presuppositions that the relationship between these two variables is investigated with equality and inequality variance of two groups. In order to interpret the results of this test, we must first consider the equation of the two variables variance hypothesis. If significance level of Lioner test is greater than 0.05, in this case the hypothesis accepts variance equation of the groups. Also, if the significance level of Lioner test is smaller than 0.05, in this case the hypothesis accepts variance equation of the groups is rejected. And finally considering equality and inequality, it comes to interpreting the results. Shown in Table 7

According to data from Table 7, Lioner test for developmental leadership style is not meaningful and we must refer to second column of the table which shows the variance inequality to t statistics. Statistics number (t = 4.04 and sig = 0) shows that the average of managers and staffs about leadership styles has a meaningful difference with each other. Also as it is concluded from the Table 8 Lioner test is meaningful for other variables (sig. >0.5), therefore, the variance equation hypothesis is accepted and first row data must be used. Also, as concluded from the data in t row and sig of t test, we can say about chaotic leadership styles that the average for managers and staffs has a meaningful difference with each other. But for the transformational leadership style and organizational commitment dimensions have no meaningful relationship with each other (Table 8). Pierson coefficient results about two by two variable relationships with each other is shown in Table 9. Confidence level of this test is 95%.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics research

Age	21-30	310-40	41-50	50	Total	
Frequency	11	45	112	21	189	
Frequency percentage	5.8	23.8	59.3	11.1	100	
Calmative frequency percentage	5.8	29.6	88.9	100		
Gender	Male	Female	Total			
Frequency	173	16	189			
Frequency percentage	91.5	8.5	100			
Calmative frequency percentage	91.5	100				Total
Years of service	5-Mar	10-Jun	15-Nov	16-20	21	189
Frequency	21	18	11	34	105	100
Frequency percentage	11.1	9.5	5.8	18	55.6	
Calmative frequency percentage	11.1	20.6	26.5	44.4	100	Total
Years of service with present manager	5-Mar	11-Jun	15-Nov	16-20	21	189
frequency	127	28	18	7	9	100
Frequency percentage	67.2	14.8	9.5	3.7	4.8	
Calmative frequency percentage	67.2	82	91.5	95.2	100	
Manager/staff	Manager	Staff	Total			
Frequency	25	164	189			
Frequency percentage	13.2	86.8	100			
Calmative frequency percentage	13.2	100				

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of leadership style variables and staffs' commitment

Organizational commitment				Leadership style		
Continuous	Effective	Normative	Chaotic	Transformational	Developmental	Parameters
3.15	3.73	3.4	2.29	3.27	3.47	Average
0.97	0.84	0.87	0.86	0.59	0.071	Standard deviation
-0.16	-0.62	-0.27	0.28	-0.12	-0.021	Skew
-0.48	0.19	-0.003	-0.098	-0.29	-0.036	Elongation

Table 7: T test statistic deviation from average standard deviation

Deviation from average	SD	Average	Number	Group	Variable
0.78	0.39	3.81	25	1	Developmental
0.58	0.74	3.41	164	2	
0.12	0.58	3.44	25	1	Transformational
0.47	0.60	3.28	164	2	
0.141	0.71	1.68	25	1	Chaotic
0.66	0.85	2.35	164	2	
0.14	0.70	3.87	25	1	
0.7	0.86	3.72	164	2	Effective
0.23	1.14	3.13	25	1	Continuous
0.7	0.95	3.16	164	2	
0.14	0.68	3.48	26	1	Normative
0.07	0.89	3.39	164	2	

Table 8: T-Test resultsT

T test					Lioner test				
High	low	Standard deviation	Average difference	Sig(2-tailed)df	t	sig	f	Variable	
0.59	0.2	0.98	0.397	0.0000 54.726	4.04	0.002	9.88	Developmental leadership style	
0.44	-0.06	0.13	0.19	0.138 187	1.49	0.21	1.58	Transformational leadership style	
-0.32	-1.01	0.178	-0.67	0.000 187	-3.75	0.113	2.54	Chaotic leadership style	
0.505	-0.204	0.179	0.15	0.404 187	0.836	0.217	1.53	Effective commitment	
0.38	-0.44	0.209	-0.028	0.89 187	0.136	0.23	1.45	Continuous commitment	
0.46	-0.28	0.187	0.089	0.632 187	0.479	0.24	1.38	Normative commitment	

Table 9: Pierson coefficient results

Normative commitment	Continuous commitment	Effective commitment	Parameters	Styles
0.362	0.052	0.373	Pierson coefficient	Developmental leadership style
0.0000	0.477	0.0000	Significance level	Consisting Transformational leadership style
189	189	189	number	
0.261	0.86	0.284	Pierson coefficient	
0.0000	0.241	0.0000		
189	189	189	Number	
-0.071	-0.124	-0.0154	Pierson coefficient	Chaotic leadership style
0.332	0.89	0.035	Significance level	
189	189	189	Number	

Regarding data from pierson coefficient test in Table 7, we can say with 99% confidence that there is a positive relationship between developmental leadership style and effective and normative commitment, between transformational leadership style and effective and normative commitment. Also, we can say with 95% confidence that, there is a negative relationship between chaotic leadership style and effective commitment, in other words, the more managers' chaotic leadership style is, the less effective is the staffs' commitment.

**Testing hypothesis:** Leadership style variables affect organizational commitment. This hypothesis is implicitly evaluated through some subsidiary hypotheses, which the evaluation results of those hypotheses focus on acceptance or rejection. Regarding the evaluation results of the following hypotheses, and accepting many of them, this hypothesis is too accepted. Developmental leadership style positively affects effective (motional) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there is a positive relationship between developmental leadership and effective commitment. In other words, we can say with 99% confidence that, improving the developmental leadership style among managers, effective commitment among staffs improves (to 0.373). So this, hypothesis is proved.

Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, there is no relationship between developmental leadership style and continuous commitment. So this hypothesis is rejected. Developmental leadership style positively affects normative (standard) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that, there is a positive relationship between developmental leadership style and normative commitment. In other words, we can say with 99% confidence that improving the leadership style among managers, normative commitment among staff improves (to 0.362). So, this hypothesis is proved.

Transformational leadership style does not positively affect effective (motional) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and effective commitment. So, the hypothesis regarding lack of relationship, is not proved. Passive leadership style positively affects continuous organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there no relationship between transformational leadership style and continuous commitment. So, this hypothesis is rejected.

Passive leadership style does not positively affect normative (standard) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and normative commitment. So, the hypothesis regarding lack of relationship, is not proved. Chaotic leadership style negatively affects effective (motional) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there is a negative relationship between chaotic leadership style and effective commitment, so, this hypothesis is proved. Chaotic leadership style does not negatively affect continuous (motional) organizational commitment.

Chaotic leadership style does not negatively affect normative (standard) organizational commitment. Considering the results gained from Pierson correlation, it is clear that there is no relationship between chaotic leadership style, continuous and normative commitment, so the two above mentioned hypotheses are proved. Manager's and staffs' point of view about manager's leadership style is different.

Results gained from t-test shows that the average response of managers and staff about developmental and chaotic leadership styles has a meaningful difference with each other. On the other hand, average response of managers and staff about transformational leadership style has no meaningful difference with each other, so the existing hypothesis is just proved about developmental and transformational leadership style. Manager's and staffs' point of view about staffs' organizational commitment is different. Results gained from t-test shows that the average response of managers and staff about staffs' organizational commitment does not meaningfully differ. So, the existing hypothesis is not proved.

## CONCLUSION

The present study investigated the effect of leadership style on staffs' commitment. As it was said before, the results show a meaningful effect of leadership style on staffs' commitment. In this section, we discuss and conclude the results and these results are compared with theoretical foundations and experimental studies. To this end, the results gained from data analysis are said in three research questions:

- Does developmental leadership style affect (effective, continuous, normative) organizational commitment. The results gained from the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between developmental leadership style and effective, normative

organizational commitment, which these results are in accordance with studies of Ismail *et al.* (2011), Wallace *et al.* (2011) and Hong Kieu

- Does transformational leadership style affect (effective, continuous, normative) organizational commitment The results gained from the study revealed that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and effective, normative organizational commitment which these results are in accordance with studies of Wallace *et al.* (2011) and Hong Kieu
- Does transformational leadership style affect (effective, continuous, normative) organizational commitment The results gained from the study revealed that there is a negative relationship between chaotic leadership style and effective, normative organizational commitment, which these results are in accordance with studies of Wallace *et al.* (2011)

Finally, we can say that manager's and staffs' view point just differs in terms of chaotic manager's leadership style. On the contrary, managers and staffs have similar view points about transformational leadership style and staffs' effective, continuous and normative organizational commitment

## REFERENCES

- Avolio, B.J., D.A. Waldman and F.J. Yammarino, 1991. Leading in the 1990s: The four Is of transformational leadership. *J. Eur. Ind. Training*, 15: 9-16.
- Babakus, E., U. Yavas, O.M. Karatepe and T. Avci, 2003. The effect of management commitment to service quality on employees affective and performance outcomes. *J. Acad. Marketing Sci.*, 31: 272-286.
- Bass, B.M. and B.J. Avolio, 1990. The Implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team and Organizational Development. In: *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Staw, B.M. and L.L. Cummings (Eds.). Vol. 4. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT., USA., ISBN-13: 9781559380768, pp: 231-272.
- Bass, B.M., 1990. From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organiz. Dyn.*, 18: 19-31.
- Collins, D.B., 2001. Organizational performance: The future focus of leadership development programs. *J. Leadersh. Organizational Stud.*, 7: 43-54.
- Deluga, R.J., 1990. The effects of transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership characteristics on subordinate influencing behavior. *Basic Appl. Social Psychol.*, 11: 191-203.
- Dhar, U. and P. Mishra, 2001. Leadership effectiveness: A study of constituent factors. *J. Manage. Res.*, 1: 254-266.
- Felfe, J. and B. Schyns, 2004. Is similarity in leadership related to organizational outcomes? The case of transformational leadership. *J. Leadersh. Organiz. Stud.*, 10: 92-102.
- Gunnigle, P., N. Heraty and M. Morley, 1997. *Personnel and Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice in Ireland*. Gill & Macmillan, Dublin, Ireland.
- Hautala, T. M., 2006. The relationship between personality and transformational leadership. *J. Manage. Dev.*, 25: 777-794.
- Hetland, H., G.M. Sandal and T.B. Johnsen, 2008. Followers personality and leadership. *J. Leadersh. Organizational Stud.*, 14: 322-331.
- Hsieh, C.W. and M.E. Guy, 2008. Performance outcomes: The relationship between managing the heart and managing client satisfaction. *Rev. Public Personnel Administration*, 29: 41-57.
- Ilies, R., T. Judge and D. Wagner, 2006. Making sense of motivational leadership: The trail from transformational leaders to motivated followers. *J. Leadersh. Organizational Stud.*, 13: 1-22.
- Ismail, A., H.A.B. Mohamed, A.Z. Sulaiman, M.H. Mohamad and M.H. Yusuf, 2011. An empirical study of the relationship between transformational leadership, empowerment and organizational commitment. *Bus. Econ. Res. J.*, 2: 89-107.
- Kotter, J.P., 1988. *The Leadership Factor*. The Free Press, New York, ISBN-13: 9780029183311, Pages: 161.
- Lee, Y.D. and H.M. Chang, 2006. Leadership style and innovation ability: An empirical study of Taiwanese wire and cable companies. *J. Am. Acad. Bus. Cambridge*, 9: 218-222.
- Masi, R.J. and R.A. Cooke, 2000. Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms and organizational productivity. *Int. J. Organizational Anal.*, 8: 16-47.
- Montgomery, M.J., 2006. Leadership in a correctional environment. *Corrections Compend.*, 31: 1-5.
- Moss, S., 2009. Cultivating the regulatory focus of followers to amplify their sensitivity to transformational leadership. *J. Leadersh. Organizational Stud.*, 15: 241-259.
- Niehoff, B.P. and R.H. Moorman, 1993. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 36: 527-556.
- Northouse, P.G., 2012. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications, USA., ISBN: 9781452203409, Pages: 485.



- Stojkovic, S. and M.A. Farkas, 2003. *Correctional Leadership: A Cultural Perspective*. Thomson/Wadsworth, New York, USA.,.
- Swanepoel, B., 2000. *South African Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*. Juta and Co. Ltd., Kenwyn, UK., ISBN-13: 9780702177507, Pages: 856.
- Tatum, B.C., R. Eberlin, C. Kotttraba and T. Bradberry, 2003. Leadership, decision making and organizational justice. *Manage. Decision*, 41: 1006-1016.
- Tekleab, A.G., H.P. Sims, S. Yun, P.E. Tesluk and J. Cox, 2007. Are we on the same page?. Effects of self-awareness of empowering and transformational leadership. *J. Leadersh. Organizational Stud.*, 14: 185-201.
- Vecchio, R.P., 1997. *Leadership: Understanding the Dynamics of Power and Influence in Organizations*. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN.
- Wallace, E., D.L. Chernatony and I. Buil, 2011. How leadership and commitment influence bank employees adoption of their banks values. *J. Bus. Ethics*, 101: 397-414.
- Yukl, G., 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *J. Manage.*, 15: 251-289.
- Zangaro, G.A., 2001. Organizational commitment: A concept analysis. *Nur. Forum*, 36: 14-21.