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Abstract

The objective of this research was to examine the relationship between leadership practice and organizational commitment in employees in faith-based organizations. The research utilized Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Leader Form and Meyer and Allen’s Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. The purpose of the research was to determine whether there was a relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment. Attributed idealized influence (IIA), behavioral idealized influence (IIB), inspirational motivation (IM), and contingent reward (CR) predicted affective commitment. Attributed idealized influence (IIA), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), individual consideration (IC), active management-by-exception (MBEA), and transactional leadership predicted continuance commitment. Intellectual stimulation (IS) and passive management-by-exception (MBEP) predicted normative commitment. Transformational leadership predicted all commitment types (affective, continuance, and normative). Although a slight linear relationship was discovered, there was no statistical significance between the variables of leadership style and organizational commitment of employees in faith-based organizations.
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Section 1: Foundation of the Study

Leadership can be conceptualized as activities or behaviors that leaders in top management positions practice to maximize organizational performance (Grandy, 2013). Leaders shape workplace performance and significantly influence an organization’s culture (Hage & Posner, 2015). Leadership is a crucial issue in a world of global competition. Leaders have a strong influence on follower behavior when they engage in differing styles or practices (Keskes, 2014). Leadership theories include The Great Man, Personality or Trait, Behavioral, Contingency, and Relational Leadership, which can be characterized into three main styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (Dartey-Baah, 2015). Within these core theories, there are subsets of leadership practice as follows: Authoritarian, Authentic, Autocratic, Charismatic, Democratic, Ethical, Entrepreneurial, Participative, People-Oriented, Performance-Oriented Style, Servant, and Situational Leadership (Garg & Jain, 2013; Giltinane, 2013; Grasmick, Davies, & Harbour, 2012; Kempster & Parry, 2014a; Kenney, 2012; Nyberg & Sveningsson, 2014; Pyngavil, 2015; Renko, El Tarabishy, Carsrud, & Brännback, 2015; Thompson & Glasø, 2015; Yu-Chi & Ping Ju, 2012; Zander, Mockaitis, & Butler, 2012).

Employee commitment, or an employee’s organizational commitment, has long been a topic of interest to organizational researchers (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1984; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). One of the main reasons for its popularity is that organizations have continued to find and sustain competitive advantage through teams of committed employees (Leow, 2011;
Mitchell, 2015). Workplace engagement determines loyalty, the level of commitment toward the organization, and increases productivity (Seifert, Brockner, Bianchi, & Moon, 2016). Organizational commitment is a multidimensional concept that can be classified into the following subcomponents: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). There are many research studies available on personal leadership styles and practices and their effects on an employee’s organizational commitment; however, there is a lack of data related to the faith-based sector. To ensure the longevity of faith-based organizations, it is important to understand the relationship between leadership practices and organizational commitment.

**Background of the Problem**

Global environments are complex and uncertain, and effect organizational commitment (Kriger & Zhovtobryukh, 2013). Leadership practice balances multiple generational dynamics, goals, numerous decision-making processes, role differentiation, and personality dynamics of leadership teams, which also impact organizational commitment (Kriger & Zhovtobryukh, 2013). Additionally, Garg and Ramjee (2013) argue that leadership style has not been adequately addressed, and that there is a need to gain understanding about the effects on organizational commitment. The results of earlier research investigating the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment have been inconclusive (Garg & Ramjee, 2013).

Lisbon (2010) posited that there is a problem in effective leadership practice in a multigenerational workplace and that meaningful work is a key to an employee’s organizational commitment and retention. Research findings reveal that transformational
and transactional leadership effects employee organizational commitment (Clinebell, Škudienė, Trijonyte, & Reardon, 2013). In a dissertation on leadership behaviors and organizational commitment, Mitchell (2015) suggested further research on the transformational leadership style would be useful in the future.

Ronquillo (2011) postulated that leadership theory applies to profit and to nonprofit organizations. General nonprofits and faith-based organizations have many things in common (Francis, Townes, & Firesheets, 2012). Nonprofits, and specifically faith-based organizations, may only survive and grow through a better recognition of effective leadership practice (Ronquillo, 2011). Faith-based organizations are a critical part of a community’s infrastructure and have a unique advantage in facilitating change as compared to secular organizations (Francis, Townes, & Firesheets, 2012). However, there is a lack of research on leadership studies in faith-based organizations (Longman & Lafreniere, 2012). Although churches are considered the ‘longest-living organizations in the world,’ in a global individualist society, full of rapid fluctuations in culture, it is impossible to predict changes that will occur over the next decade (Ershova & Hermelink, 2012). Research of leadership styles and organizational cultures is both specific and significant within organizations with a faith purpose (Bassous, 2015). Furthermore, there is a need for more research on leadership practice in the non-profit sector (McMurray, Islam, Sarros, & Pirola-Merlo, 2012).

Bassous’ (2015) research found a statistically significant association between leadership practice and various age groups working for faith-based nonprofit organizations. Soane, Butler, and Stanton (2015) theorize that a follower’s personality
has influence on perceptions of leadership style and this relationship affects follower commitment. Moreover, understanding how leadership influences employees will assist organizations in recruitment, development, retention, and improved leadership practice (Ruth, 2015). Mowday, Steer, and Porter (1979) indicated that further study related to organizational commitment and predictors, such as age demographics, should be examined. This research sought to provide additional research on the effect of leadership practices on organizational commitment in faith-based organizations.

**Problem Statement**

Organizations represent multiple industries, products, and services, and typically exhibit more differences than similarities (“Putting people first”, 2011). One commonality of organizations is the dependency on employee knowledge, experience, and skills (“Putting people first”, 2011). Future growth and longevity of faith-based nonprofits will require strong leadership and employee commitment to impact the world (Grandy, 2013). Pyngavil (2015) found that leadership style may negatively impact organizational health measured by the demonstrated organizational commitment of employees. Research in the field of faith-based organizations is underdeveloped, and although employees of faith-based organizations typically remain passionate and committed for many years to their organization, employee organizational commitment cannot be taken for grant or ignored (Fischer, 2004; Francis, Townes, & Firesheets, 2012). In general, there is limited research on the theme of leadership in the nonprofit sector (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).
Organizational commitment is a multifaceted complex construct that has been defined in various ways over the years rendering it difficult to synthesize the accumulated research results (Meyer et al., 1993). Although multiple research studies on leadership and organizational commitment exist, there was no literature available about the relationship between personal leadership style and organization commitment within faith-based organizations. The problem to be addressed was the lack of research on the impact of broad leadership types as measured through organizational commitment in faith-based organizations. The focus of the research was to examine the relationship between personal leadership styles and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational research was to test Bass and Avolio’s (1992) broad leadership theory types and Meyer and Allen’s (1993) theory of organizational commitment in employees of a faith-based organization (FBO). The study may provide a greater understanding about the relationship between leadership and organizational commitment in employees of FBOs. The independent variable was defined as perceived personal leadership style as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The dependent variable was self-perceived levels of personal organizational commitment as measured by the Three-Component Model (TCM) of Employee Commitment (Meyer et al., 1993).
Nature of the Study

Researchers have a responsibility to clearly define an appropriate research method and design. Additionally, the method and design chosen provide explanation of the research problem. Selecting an applicable method and design simplified the process of gathering data and assisted with data analysis. The method and design were selected based upon the data needed to consider the relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

Research Question

The research was designed to answer one research question: Is there a relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations? The research examined personal perceived leadership and personal workplace commitment in employees of faith-based organizations. Faith-based organizations have a significant role nationally (Moyer, Sinclair, & Diduck, 2014). FBO sustainability requires adaptability and learning (Moyer, Sinclair, & Diduck, 2014). Market competition creates an environment where organizational expectations of employees exceed basic job descriptions (Morin, Vandenberghe, Turmel, Madore, & Maïano, 2013). Faith-based organizational employees need essential attributes of good leadership (Shaw, Cartwright, Sankaran, Kelly, Dick, Davies, & Craig, 2013). The various attitudes of organizational commitment were antecedents related to role performance (Morin, et al., 2013). Bassous (2015) conducted similar research investigating the factors that influenced the motivation
of workers in FBOs. Data from the study revealed a positive and significant correlation between factors such as motivation and leadership (Bassous, 2015).

**Hypotheses**

The corresponding null (H₀) and alternative (Hₐ) hypotheses were:

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

Hₐ₁: There is a statistically significant relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for the research was based on Bass and Avolio’s (2004) broad leadership theory and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) theory of employee commitment. Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measures leadership types ranging from passive leadership to transformational leadership. The MLQ is a validated research instrument that measures human behavior and personality. It related to the research by providing a framework for measurement of broad range leadership types and to identify leadership characteristics (Figure 1).
The MLQ identifies transformational leadership characteristics. Decades of research have been dedicated to the positive effects of transformational leadership on organizational outcomes (Afshari & Gibson, 2016; Bass & Avolio, 1992; Breevaart, Bakker, Hetland, Demerouti, Olsen, & Espevik, 2014; Judge & Bono, 2000; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). An example of the positive effects of transformational leadership on commitment was demonstrated in high levels of employees' satisfaction, effort, and overall performance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Studies on transformational leadership have demonstrated promise in understanding the relationship between leadership style and positive outcomes on variables such as commitment (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). The following are components of
transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

Transactional leadership theory includes contingent reward and management-by-exception and assesses outcomes of extra effort, leader effectiveness, and employee satisfaction (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Afshari and Gibson (2016) suggest that transactional leadership may not positively contribute to the development of organizational commitment. However, another study demonstrated a positive correlation between transactional leadership and organizational commitment (Fasola, Adeyemi, & Olowe, 2013).

Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) theory of employee commitment is based on the construct that organizational commitment is a psychological state consisting of three components that effect how employees feel about their organization. The TCM Employee Commitment Survey defines organizational commitment using three components: affective, continuance, and normative. Meyer and Allen (1991) utilized the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire’s three-dimensional organization commitment scale, which indicated a relationship between behavior and the organizational commitment of employees, contributing to the body of literature on organizational commitment.
Studies indicated a relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment (Gatling, Kang, & Kim, 2016; Sabir, Sohail, & Asif Khan, 2011). The purpose of this quantitative research was to test for a relationship between the theories of personal perceived leadership style using Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and organizational commitment using Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) TCM Employee Commitment Survey and served as the theoretical framework for this research.

**Definition of Terms**

**Baby Boomers:** For the purposes of this research, a Baby Boomer was defined as individuals born between 1946 and 1964 (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011; Parker & Chusmir, 1990; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Strauss & Howe, 1991).

**Employee (Organizational) Commitment:** Organizational commitment was defined as commitment measured by affective attachment, commitment viewed through the lens of the cost affiliated with leaving the organization, and the employee’s sense of...
commitment related to a perceived obligation to stay at the organization (Meyer et al., 1993).

_Faith-Based Organization:_ Organizations that have a faith-based purpose, are registered as a 501©(3) Public Charity, and have annual gross receipts exceeding $25,000.

_Generation X (Gen X):_ For the purposes of this research, Generation X represented those born between 1965 and 1980 (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011; Strauss & Howe, 1991).

_Generation Y (Gen Y, Millennials):_ For the purposes of this study, Generation Y (also known as Millennials) represented those born between 1981 and 1999 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

_Leadership:_ The process of influencing others (Jost, 2013).

_Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire:_ The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) provided a measure of leadership types developed by Bass and Avolio (1992). It is the most extensively utilized and comprehensive survey instrument on the theory of leadership and includes a wide range of leadership styles (Kanste, Miettunen, & Kyngäs, 2007).

_TCM Employee Commitment Survey:_ The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey links a validated instrument developed to measure employee organizational commitment as desired-based (affective commitment), obligation-based (normative commitment), and cost-based (continuance commitment) (Meyer & Allen, 1997).
Traditionalism: For the purposes of this research, Traditionalist represented those born between 1925 and 1945 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Assumptions

The following items were assumed to be true. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is a self-assessment tool. The TCM Employee Commitment Survey contains questions of self-analysis relative to the current working environment; including queries related to a sense of belonging and obligation, potential longevity, and feelings of emotional attachment. Both instruments measure personal self-perception, therefore, research participants included both leaders and followers from job functions within a faith-based organization. The MLQ and TCM survey instruments were combined but not modified as specified by the copyright. Additionally, the MLQ and TCM survey instruments were investigated in academic and professional literature to substantiate the use of these tools for the purposes of this research.

Since both survey instruments have been proven reliable, it was expected that Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and Meyer and Allen’s (1997) TCM Employee Commitment Survey would provide consistent results, demonstrate any linear relationships, and offer valid data related to leadership and employee organizational commitment. It was assumed that participants would understand and answer survey questions honestly. There were higher risks associated with these assumptions. If the survey instruments were misunderstood, the results could become skewed. To mitigate the risk of misunderstanding the questions, the survey
instrument required a forced response and participants selected ‘Unsure’ if an item was irrelevant, or they do not know the answer (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

**Limitations**

Creswell (2013) defined limitations as influences outside of the researcher’s control. The research design was limited to generalizability as the sample was restricted to faith-based organizations and may not be valid to other industries. The term ‘faith-based organization’ was broadly applied, and this ambiguity made it difficult to fully grasp the breadth of services, which included religious congregations, and faith-based social services that operated under different standards (Terry et al., 2015). This analysis only described an association without controlling for other extraneous, mediating or moderating variables that may have influenced (directly or indirectly) the results. Additionally, the instrument was not designed to answer open ended questions for deeper contextual insights. Data was not available to provide clarity of causality as correlation cannot confirm cause and effect.

Although Bass and Avolio’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire measured a broad spectrum of leadership types, in a study of virtual learning instructors, researchers found a low internal consistency specifically with active management-by-exception leadership style (Bogler, Caspi, & Roccas, 2013). Avolio and Bass (2004) also indicate there are limitations with leadership surveys; however, they have worked for more than 20 years to provide validated evidence for the MLQ Form 5X, which has demonstrated consistency across multiple industries, regions, raters, and cultures. Moreover, Allen and Meyer’s Three-Component Model only considered variables of employee types and
organizational commitment specifically related to affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Both leaders and followers were surveyed and there were no demographic questions to determine the effects of the employee’s position on the responses. Likewise, the research was conducted on a voluntary basis, was self-administered, and it was possible that participants may not have understood all questions as presented in the survey. The research was limited by the participant responses and whether they were voluntary and confidential. The research was limited by the participant responses and whether they provided a candid and accurate self-reflection. Finally, the research was limited because it captured perceptions at a fixed moment in time and it is probable that employee commitment may change over time.

Delimitations

The research was limited to followers in faith-based organizations. Participants were required to have worked in a FBO, and have cumulative tenure of at least one year, regardless of when. The tenure criterion was selected to ensure the sample represented employees with experience. The scope of the research was related solely to leadership and organizational commitment. Outside the scope of the research was the follower’s current leadership situation and opinion of the current leadership or leadership-follower experience. The research focused on personal perceived leadership style and personal level of organizational commitment. The research did not consider measures related to optimal leadership.
Significance of the Study

Reduction of Gaps

The research should contribute to the body of knowledge of business management in faith-based organizations, leadership, and organizational commitment. For more than four decades, organizational commitment has been a topic of study in the public, private, and non-profit sector (Khan, Naseem, & Masood, 2016). Although the literature provided information related to organizational commitment and leadership, there was limited research related to faith-based institutions. Additionally, employee turnover costs make it imperative for faith-based organizations to understand organizational commitment and the effects of leadership (Yucel, McMillan, & Richard, 2014). Garg and Ramjee (2013) indicated that there is a need for a better grasp of the connection between leadership and organizational commitment. The research was conducted to benefit leadership in faith-based organizations and to provide data on relationships between the constructs.

Implications for Biblical Integration

There are multiple biblical examples of leaders and leadership qualities; however, Moses is the only biblical leader that knew the great I AM face to face (Deuteronomy 34:10). Moses was an accidental leader, whose leadership journey spanned decades and his personal leadership style and level of commitment developed over time (Ben-Hur & Jonsen, 2012). He was shaped by culture and multiple influences, and argued with God about his inadequacies in leadership (Ben-Hur & Jonsen, 2012; Exodus 4:10). In many cases, leadership can be a pursuit of the ambitious, in Moses’ case, humility promoted
him to this responsibility (Numbers 12:3). Compare this to Pharaoh, a transactional leader, who sent taskmasters and afflicted the Israelites (Exodus 1:11). Moses experienced leaders and followers with various personal leadership styles and levels of commitment.

Moses suffered the effects of the Israelite followers as they complained, even after all that God has done (Numbers 11:1, 10). They floundered in their commitment towards God and operated in continuance commitment, constantly considering the supposed cost of leaving Egypt (Gatling et al., 2016). At one point, Moses asked God why he was afflicted with these followers (Numbers 11:11). Over six hundred thousand men, who had various personal leadership styles and levels of commitment were on this wilderness journey (Numbers 11:21). Proverbs 16:3 instructs, “Commit your works to the Lord, and your thoughts will be established.” “Commit your way to the Lord, trust also in Him…” (Psalms 37:5). Humanity will always have a conditional approach to the idea of commitment, only God makes commitments unconditionally.

The purpose of the research was to understand if there was a relationship between personal leadership style and personal organizational commitment. The population for the research was employees of faith-based organization. Although a faith-based organization’s mission differs from a for-profit business, faith-based organizations still operate using business practice. Therefore, it is important that organizational leaders understand the impact of leadership practice and its influence on organizational commitment (Kleine & Weißenberger, 2014).
Believers serve a God that values people. Moreover, God states, “I am the God of your father—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Exodus 3:6, NKJV). These descendants are His people in which He states, “And I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and your descendants after you” (Genesis 17:7, NKJV). God’s everlasting covenant is representative of commitment. He demonstrated His commitment through an unbreakable covenant relationship with His followers and as the leader of His people, God represents a connection between leadership and commitment.

Developing a leadership perspective is vital for the kingdom to reach and disciple others for the sake of Christ. Continuing God’s work through faith-based organizations will be imperative in the future and leadership impacts organizational commitment. Furthermore, Paul writes that he became a servant to all and adopted a fluid representation of the faith to become all things to all people so that he “might win those who are without law” (1 Corinthians 9:19 – 23). As more leaders and followers in faith-based businesses are aware of the impact of leadership practice, they will become better leaders who can more effectively serve the kingdom, which in turn impacts organizational commitment.

Relationship to Field of Study

Leadership enables individual and team collaboration and is a crucial influencer on employees and organizations (Gyensare, Anku-Tsede, Sanda, & Okpoti, 2016). This research was directly related to leadership as the literature review evaluated and
considered various leadership traits, behaviors, theories and the influence on organizational commitment and employee motivation. In the body of literature, leadership is a complex term that can be defined as ideas of personality, characteristics, behaviors, or style, position, responsibility, or influence, and as an instrument for goal achievement (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2007). Garg and Ramjee (2013) link organizational commitment to numerous variables such as leadership style. Additionally, leadership style can create a positive organizational culture, which leads to an increase in commitment (Gulluce, Kaygin, Kafadar, & Atay, 2016). Foti, Bray, Thompson, and Allgood (2012) suggest that future research should include actual leadership evaluations.

A Review of the Professional and Academic Literature

Organizations are defined by their purpose and the idea of profit is a distinguishing factor. The National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) divides non-profit organizations into three distinct categories, and within the non-profit sector are organizations defined as faith-based (NCCS, 2016). The term faith-based organizations encompass a variety of industries (Bielefeld & Cleveland, 2013). Additionally, faith-based organizations differ in purpose and doctrine, and employees tend to embrace these ideals (Benefiel, Fry, & Geiflat; Cochrane, 2013). The faith-based workplace is an emerging topic in scholarly literature (Benefiel, Fry, & Geigle, 2014).

Academic and professional literature presented multiple leadership practice, perceptions, and theories. The details below provide evidence of a plethora of leadership styles, behaviors, and practices. Transactional, transformational, and ethical leadership are among the broad leadership theories (Kenney, 2012). Transformational leadership
considers ideas such as influence and motivation, and constructs such as rewards and management-by-exception (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). A review of the literature revealed a strong emphasis on the idea of transformational leadership. Avolio and Bass’ (2004) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) also appeared throughout the literature as a viable tool in assessing broad leadership behavior.

Literature also suggested a connection between leadership and organizational commitment. Attitude and behavior are strong contributors to organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Sabir et al., 2011). The most widely accepted theory of organizational commitment in the literature is Allen and Meyer’s (1990) (Gulluce et al., 2016). Organizational commitment is comprised of three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

As the topic of faith-based organizations further develops, it is important to understand the relationship and impact of leadership and organizational commitment. The theories of leadership and organizational commitment are complex constructs of positively related outcomes that impact organizational loyalty (Meyer & Allen, 1997). More purposely considered is the awareness of positive transformational leaders, their impact on affective commitment, and influences on organizational commitment (Gulluce et al., 2016).

**Faith-Based Organization Employees**

In developing a definition for faith-based organizations, Bielefeld and Cleveland (2013) reviewed 889 books and peer-reviewed journals written over a period of 100 years and suggested that it is defined by the organizational mission, maintains a religious
identity from its founding, and attracts and motivates its employees and volunteers. The industry is further distinguished by differences that exist between the environments of the public and private sectors in terms of goals, organizational structure, and the influence of leadership style on follower perceptions (Garg & Jain, 2013). The economy is moving constantly, a subject to ongoing processes of change, and organizations in the private sector face ever-changing environments that require adaptation (Hauser, 2014; Oreg & Berson, 2011). Organizations must keep pace with changing market economies to remain competitive (Hauser, 2014). Scholars who ignore faith-based organizational culture and structures miss opportunities to understand important aspects of support systems, such as geographic communities and networks of people (Schneider, 2012). Benefiel, Fry, and Geigle (2014) indicate that the role of religion and spirituality in the workplace is a somewhat new topic of inquiry emerging from scholarly disciplines.

Faith-based organizations are faith communities, and their members and employees work to reach the community in areas such as justice and charity, supporting the organization's faith purpose (Schneider, 2012). Faith-based organizations may or may not have explicit religious doctrines, and vary in religious affiliation (Cochrane, 2013). FBO employees work in various fields, including education, child services, and national and international support (Bielefeld & Cleveland, 2013). Schneider (2012) wrote that ideas of theology, culture, and financial support of the religious community are a part of defining the faith-based organization and its employees who are stewards of the organization.
Faith-based organizations attract and retain key talent because of the sense of purpose and deep meaning associated with the organization (Deaton et al., 2013). Berger (2003) wrote that employees in faith-based companies identify with the organizational mission, support one or more religious or spiritual teachings or traditions, and work to encourage ideals toward the collective good. Employees in faith-based organizations have a social connection through a vocational calling that interweaves cultural and personal values (Benefiel, Fry, & Geigle, 2014).

Employees are involved in a wide range of services in both communicates and in research (Terry et al., 2015). These employees either work in areas of organizational control (funding resources and decision-making authority), with the purpose of expressing religion (self-identity, religiosity, and measuring outcomes), or in program implementation (services provided) (Bielefeld & Cleveland, 2013). Workers align with the organization to support a reduction in suffering, to increase wellness (spiritual or physical), and to provide for the needs of others (Terry et al., 2015). The non-profit sector will need more than 78,000 senior managers, and the literature indicated that non-profit organizations inadequately develop internal talent (Deaton et al., 2013). A sector of the non-profit marketplace includes faith-based organizations. With a record number of senior leaders expected to retire during the next decade, these companies will face a leadership crisis (Deaton, et al., 2013).

**Organizational Commitment**

Research on employee organizational commitment is rooted in the seminal work of Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), and followed by authors Mathieu and Zajac
(1990), Meyer and Allen, (1991, 1984), and Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) (Mercurio, 2015; Sabella, El-Far, & Eid, 2016). However, Becker (1960) conducted earlier studies and believed commitment to be a construct that provides an explanation for the various behaviors of individuals within an organization. Etzioni (1961) is attributed with developing the first typology of organizational commitment (Bogler et al., 2013). Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) have the most generally recognized definition of organizational commitment (Gulluce et al., 2016). Organizational commitment is the employee’s relational tie to the organization, and is further defined as self-identification with and attention to the organization (Mowday et al., 1979).

Research on organizational commitment has focused on antecedents, consequences, and components of organizational attitude (Bull Schaefer, Green, Saxena, Weiss, & MacDermid Wadsworth, 2013). Commitment is viewed as a static cause and effect relationship (Solinger, Hofmans, & van Olffen, 2015). Moreover, research into the importance of organizational commitment has been conducted in a multitude of contexts, with various people at different positions, and across diverse labor forces (Devece, Palacios-Marqués, & Pilar Alguacil, 2016). There are commonalities to the various definitions of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). It should also be noted that the definition of organizational commitment varied in the academic literature and every day terms such as attachment, allegiance, and loyalty were used as well (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). However,
Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated that the construct must be defined and supports a narrowed definition as proposed in the TCM: affective, normative, and continuance.

Contemporary researchers believe that there are two different perspectives of organizational commitment: attitudinal and behavioral (McGee & Ford, 1987). These views have been labeled affective and continuance commitment, and have been acknowledged as important approaches (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Commitment can be considered as either affective or attitudinal, whereby the individual self-identifies with the organization and commits to maintain membership (McGee & Ford, 1987). A different position is the idea of commitment being behavioral in nature, and is a binding of the employee and the organization through unconnected interests (such as employee benefits), rather than affection towards the organization (McGee & Ford, 1987). Allen and Meyer (1990) believe that researchers can better examine organizational commitment by analyzing three areas of commitment simultaneously: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) published the Three-Component Model (TMC) of Employee Commitment, which explains the psychological state of an employee’s organizational commitment using the three distinct components. Over the past decades, researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994) validate that each facet of the Three-Component Model (affective, continuance, and normative commitment) should be considered when evaluating employee loyalty, measured by normative commitment.

Globalization and technological advances have created an environment where organizations need to improve efficiencies and add value to product offerings (Leow,
Committed employees are enthusiastic about their membership and organizational commitment is a means for companies to garner a competitive advantage (Leow, 2011). An employee’s organizational commitment will be impacted by personal interests, goals, and needs, which should dovetail with those of the organization to provide the best possible partnership (Chiu & Ng, 2015).

It is critical for organizations to determine affective commitment and how to improve employee morale and productivity (Leow, 2011). Okinyi (2015) indicated that managers in faith-based organizations should seek out options for improving employee loyalty through reward practices. However, few studies have been conducted on employee devotion in faith-based organizations (Okinyi, 2015). McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, and Islam (2010) concur citing that very few studies have been conducted on the relationship between employee commitment and leadership in nonprofit organizations. Meyer and Allen (1997) stated that an employee’s commitment to its organization is characterized by the relationship between the employee and the organization; a psychological state that creates a desire to maintain a connection. Keskes (2014) wrote that research literature defines organizational steadfastness as a follower’s self-identification to the organization’s mission, goals, and vision.

**Traditional Theories of Motivation**

Theories of motivation must plainly describe the purpose of motives (Wright, 2016). Motivation can refer to a wide dispensation of affinities and include a desire towards recurrent patterns and repetitive behavioral tendencies (Baumeister, 2016). Motivation leads to a self-realization by the employee, and is a way to optimally develop
and achieve personal fulfillment (Hauser, 2014). Motivation comes in two forms, either through forces acting on or from within a person that inspires them to act in a focused and driven manner (Honore, 2009). Motivation has been defined by Vroom (1964) as the inner energy an individual requires for self-encouragement towards accomplishment. Workplace motivation is impacted by employees' individuality, needs, interests, attitudes, and values, and is different for everyone (Honore, 2009). There have been many advances in the research of motivation (Baumeister, 2016). Moreover, there are multiple theories of motivation; however, seven are considered major contributions to the modern understanding of the construct: Maslow’s (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg’s (1959) Two-Factor Theory, Alderfer’s (1969) ERG Theory, McClelland’s (1975) Acquired Needs Theory, Ryan and Deci’s (2000) Cognitive Evaluation Theory, Adams’ (1963) Equity Theory, and Tolman’s (1930) Expectancy Theory.

**Hierarchy of motivational needs.** Maslow (1954) developed a classification of motivation and categorized human basic needs into five groupings: physiological, safety and security, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization (Lester, 2013). Maslow hypothesized that needs are sequential, developmental, and that the lower the need, the more necessary it is to an individual’s psychological health (Lester, 2013). Therefore, the lower-level needs must be satisfied prior to the next sequential need, to truly motivate the employee (Honore, 2009). According to Maslow, when an individual worker needs more money, based upon the hierarchy, they assume that harder work will lead to more money, which in turn meets this need (Ugah & Arua, 2011). Maslow’s theory is based on the idea that people work to realize their basic and individual needs and as each need
is met, the next level of needs becomes important (Honore, 2009). Maslow’s theory has received criticism for its foundation in Western culture; however, other studies in Eastern culture support the model, and that individuals within cultures have a generalizability related to motivation (Taormina & Gao, 2013).

**Two factor theory of motivation.** Employee motivation leads to customer satisfaction and improved productivity (Hyun & Oh, 2011). Herzberg (1959) proposed a motivational theory related to job satisfaction and hygiene factors (Vijayakumar & Saxena, 2015). Herzberg determined that some job factors create only job dissatisfaction or a short-lasting motivation; however, there have been other determinants that can involve a more lasting and positive feeling towards organizational commitment (Sell & Cleal, 2011). Herzberg proposed that work environments could create avoidance behavior (hygiene factors) or a greater job effort (motivators) (Khandekar, 2012). Known as the two-factor theory, Herzberg postulated that motivators include factors such as job recognition, personal achievement, growth opportunities, organizational advancement, job responsibility, and the overall work itself, which promote greater job effort (Khandekar, 2012; Vijayakumar & Saxena, 2015). Motivators, such as achievement, advancement, and recognition are internal forces that drive human behavior (Khandekar, 2012). Herzberg also concluded that hygiene factors related to working conditions, job security, and items such as salary, work relationship, supervision, and corporate policy also impact job satisfaction, and if these are lacking, it leads to job dissatisfaction (Hyun & Oh, 2011; Vijayakumar & Saxena, 2015). To motivate employees, organizations must attempt to increase job satisfaction or reduce job
dissatisfaction (Vijayakumar & Saxena, 2015). Motivators, over hygiene factors, are the true stimuli for employees to work hard and enjoy their labors (Hyun & Oh, 2011).

**ERG theory.** Alderfer (1969) recognized the limitations of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and proposed the ERG Theory, which categorized human needs into three core areas: Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. Maslow’s lower needs, Physiological and Safety, are Alderfer’s category of Existence, which is the need for basic items, such as food, salary, working conditions, and fringe benefits (Ko, Rhee, Walker, & Lee, 2014). The ERG differs from Maslow’s hierarchy in that multiple needs may operate simultaneously (Ko, Rhee, Walker, & Lee, 2014). Alderfer (1969) postulated that the three core needs provide the essentials for motivation and many times, individuals express their ‘wants’ in terms of goals, which may include a mixture of basic needs. The ERG theory has seven major propositions that form the basic testable hypotheses and was originally proposed to offer a solution to the issue of how need-satisfaction related to need strength (Alderfer, 1969).

**Achievement motivation theory.** McClelland (1975), a seminal theorist, recommended that organizations utilize competence over intelligence as a predictor of job performance (Bouteiller & Gilbert, 2016). Later in 1975, McClelland developed the Achievement Motivation Theory. McClelland categorized motivation into three basic forms: affiliation, power, and achievement (Yi & Park, 2014). McClelland’s theory is from the perspective of internal human needs, which are main motivators of human behavior (Khandekar, 2012). Additionally, whereas Maslow and McClelland’s theories
are considered internal motivators, Herzberg’s theory focuses on external factors of motivation (Khandekar, 2012).

**Cognitive evaluation theory.** Ryan and Deci (2000) developed the Cognitive Evaluation Theory, which focuses on social and environmental influences that impact intrinsic motivation (Riley, 2016). This differs from external factors which affect internal motivation (Shi, Connelly, & Hokisson, 2016). The Cognitive Evaluation Theory suggests that there are three physiological needs that foster self-motivation: competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Riley, 2016). Competence is a key factor associated with extrinsic goals and feelings of efficaciousness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Autonomy, not to be confused with independence, describes an employee’s experience related to the feeling of choice, desire, and perceived freedoms (Stone, Deci, & Ryan, 2009). Moreover, autonomy and competence highly influence an employee’s intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Furthermore, relatedness is the idea of belonging, a feeling of connecting with the organizational goal (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Equity theory.** Adams’ (1963) Equity Theory examines worker motivation in relation to perception, treatment, and fairness (Skiba & Rosenberg, 2011). Equity Theory is rooted in the ideas of social actors, their exchanges, the outcomes from leader-follower relationships, and the idea of a reciprocal return (Hayibor, 2012). It is a theory founded in the idea of fairness connected to reward systems, and is considered an important part of the twentieth-century workplace (Skiba & Rosenberg, 2011). The philosophy emerged during a period of management job motivation models and built on Maslow (1954), McClelland (1961), Vroom (1964), and Herzberg’s (1959) models (Skiba & Rosenberg,
Equity is determined by the perception of either equality or inequality in the relationship (Hayibor, 2012). In the case of employee motivation, this relationship is between either the leader-follower or the employee-employer (Hayibor, 2012).

**Expectancy theory.** Tolman (1930) framed the Expectancy Theory which proposes that expectation is a stronger motivator of human behavior than a response to stimuli (Ugah & Arua, 2011). Vroom furthered the idea of Expectancy Theory, which was founded in four assumptions: employees have requirements; conduct is deliberate; employees have needs; and employees will make choices based on their personal needs (Lazaroiu, 2015). The underlying thoughts behind the theory surfaced from studies on how external pressures effect internal motivators, such as the desire to do right (Renko, Kroeck, & Bullough, 2012).

**Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.** The idea of dualism and motives divides humans into categories, such as intrinsic-extrinsic motivation (Reiss, 2012). Motivation is rooted in the idea of being moved to take action or act in some way (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation is founded upon the idea of doing something because it is interesting or for enjoyment, while extrinsic motivation produces an outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Okinyi (2015) researched both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards on employee organizational commitment in a faith-based health organization and concluded that there was a strong correlation between employee organizational commitment and reward practices.

**Intrinsic motivation.** Classically, intrinsic motivation is a pervasive construct and reflects a human’s propensity to assimilate and learn (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is the
involvement in an activity for satisfaction, fun, challenge, or participation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Intrinsic motivation does not consider the consequence of involvement and activity relative to prompts, forces, incentives or compensation (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is rooted in the notion of doing something for something's sake (Reiss, 2012). Okinyi's (2015) study on intrinsic rewards and employee organizational commitment concluded a strong relationship between employee recognition and commitment. It also assumed a weak relationship between responsibility and employee organizational commitment (Okinyi, 2015). In addition, the results indicated a positive and solid relationship between employee organizational commitment and recognition, career advancement, and learning opportunities (Okinyi, 2015). Lastly, the feeling of satisfaction in doing a job well is an intrinsic reward (Honore, 2009).

**Extrinsic motivation.** Extrinsic motivation can reflect self-regulation or can represent an external control (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is frequently associated with the pursuit of tangible objectives (Kenney, 2012). An extrinsic reward is received in appreciation for accomplishment (Honore, 2009). Employees in faith-based organizations show a strong correlation between employee organizational commitment and changes in pay, bonuses, benefits, and promotions (Okinyi, 2015). Extrinsic motivation differs from intrinsic motivation and is a construct rooted in instrumental value related to activities accomplished to attain a desired outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

**Leadership Theory**

Leadership is a constant evolution of new contexts, concepts, tools, and concerns which are impacted by the demands of various situations on leaders (Kenney, 2012).
Leaders play multiple major roles and have numerous responsibilities that entail certain skills, challenges, and obligations (Kenney, 2012). Furthermore, leadership involves initiative, followers, resource allocation, behavior, and internal drive to achieve goals (Dartey-Baah, 2015). Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, and Shaikh (2012) state that leadership is a process of social influence between leader and follower to reach organization goals. Jost (2013) defined the phenomenon as an influential process between leaders and followers that involves activities related to accomplishing tasks and achievement.

Sethuraman and Suresh (2014) defined a leader as an individual who is responsible for influencing one or more followers and who directs them to achieve a specified objective. Bhatti et al. (2012) wrote that a leader recognizes needs, knows what is needed to make things happen, and makes it happen. Leaders have various methods, and some lead by example while others lead through strategic direction, inspiration, motivation, confrontation, or even intimidation (Keith & Buckley, 2011). Organizational culture is significantly influenced by leaders who shape employee performance (Hage & Posner, 2015). Nicholas (2016) posited that directing follower actions towards a shared goal is the responsibility of a leader.

Broad leadership theories include transactional, transformational, and ethical leadership (Kenney, 2012). Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, and Hu (2014) identified sixty-six various areas of leadership theory and methodological approaches. Additionally, there are several established theories that continually capture the interest of researchers, including trait theory and leader-follower exchange (Dinh et al., 2014).
Furthermore, there is a growing interest in emerging leadership theories containing thematic ideas such as strategic leadership (Dinh et al., 2014). Leadership theory is impacted by three emergent processes: global, compositional, and computational (Dinh et al., 2014). However, there are other theories that are experiencing a decline in interest including contingency and path-goal theory of leadership (Dinh et al., 2014). As more and more research is added to the body of knowledge of leadership theory, a more refined understanding has developed and some theories are losing support. A broader understanding of leadership process helps to demonstrate theory limitations and allows for a deeper understanding and application to relevant practice (Langley, Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013).

Leadership practice. Why do some leaders impact followers more than other leaders (Afshari & Gibson, 2016)? How are these leaders perceived more positively (Afshari & Gibson, 2016)? Leadership style or practice is described by the degree to which a leader delegates strict authority over a task and the amount in which the leader acts in the interest of the follower (Jost, 2013). There are multiple leadership styles that individuals can employ (Boykins, et al., 2013). The idea of leadership style is a highly-debated management concept that has influenced a multitude of leaders and followers (Gooraki, Noroozi, Marhamati, & Behzadi, 2013). As leaders pursue various goals, they must utilize a wide variety of styles with followers (Kenney, 2012).

Theories of leadership focus on what leaders do, not on who they are, and have a closer connection to the leader’s environment. Moreover, various situations call for different leadership approaches (Boykins, Campbell, Moore, & Nayyar, 2013). The
theory of situational leadership was developed by Hersey and Blanchard, and highlights four specific leadership styles ranging from directing to delegating (Thompson & Glasø, 2015). Leaders employing situational leadership adjust their style based upon the needs of the follower (Thompson & Glasø, 2015). Through this process, leaders are continuous learners, which enables followers to learn through reflection (Lynch, 2015).

Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy (2014) wrote that a leader’s style impacts organizational and employee performance and productivity. Leadership impacts outcomes such as productivity, motivation, morale, and retention, and effects follower perception (Zamperion, Spanio, Bernardi, Milan, & Buja, 2013). Derecskei’s (2016) research findings indicated that leadership was strongly correlated to organizational creativity. Additionally, leadership impacts follower quality of work life (Nanjundeswaraswamy & Swamy, 2014). Understanding leadership practice, and specifically leadership style, is important to organizational success and outcomes (Zamperion et al., 2013).

Sethuraman and Suresh (2014) challenge leaders to recognize that their personal leadership style has a direct influence upon the performance of their followers. Employee performance is strongly affected by leadership styles or practice (Mtikulu, Naranhee, & Karodia, 2014). Furthermore, a leader may be influenced by individual beliefs, values, preferences, and by organizational culture (Almansour, 2012). Mtikulu, Naranhee, and Karodia (2014) contend that there is a relationship between leadership style and employee performance. Finally, Cates, Cojanu, and Pettine’s (2013) research indicated that among the generational cohorts, leadership styles differ based upon the
generational dynamics, which is significant relative to employee motivation and job performance, both factors of organizational commitment. There were various leadership styles presented in the literature (Yu & Miller, 2005). Lastly, there are many times where leader effectiveness is conceptualized linearly indicating that certain styles are better than others (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015).

**Leadership perceptions.** Followers and leaders are vital to leadership, and there is limited research regarding follower perception and their role during the leadership process (Notgrass, 2014). Considering the relationship between follower perceptions and leadership is important and can be used to measure leader success (Zancher, Rosing, Henning, & Frese, 2011). Furthermore, research is needed in the areas of followership, leadership, and the follower/leader relationship regarding followers' perception and preferred leadership (Notgrass, 2014). It is important to understand the implications of various leadership styles on followers (Schuh, Zhang, & Tian, 2013). However, it must be understood that follower perceptions are subjective and prone to bias (Černe, Dimovski, Marič, Penger, & Škerlavaj, 2014). In many cases, followers seek out signals, hoping they may reveal a leader’s intentions (Schuh, Zhang, & Tian, 2013) or a better understanding of desired leadership. Notgrass (2014) found a positive and significant relationship between a follower’s perception and the leader’s style.

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.** The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5X is based upon a six-factor model of transactional and transformational leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Hater and Bass (1988) indicated that transformational and transactional leadership are related in that these styles
focus on goal achievement. In a study on leadership style and organizational commitment, Sabir et al. (2011) concluded that leadership style is a compelling aspect of organizational commitment, and is stronger when the employees' values are shared with the organizational culture. Transformational leadership has the following components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Moreover, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) tests transactional leadership constructs as follows: contingent reward and management-by-exception (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Additionally, the questionnaire assesses three outcomes: extra effort; leader effectiveness; and employee satisfaction with their leader (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). The MLQ instrument includes nine factors (five transformational, three transactional, and one passive avoidant) (Xu, Wubbena, & Stewart, 2016).

**Trait Theory of Leadership**

Leadership trait theory dates to the 20th century and is considered the God-given distinctive abilities of individuals (Smalley, Retallick, Metzger, & Greiman, 2016). Multiple research studies have been conducted on leader traits and behavior (Derue, Nnahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011). Trait theory emphasizes human characteristics and assumes that leader traits are developable (Frazier, 2015). Trait theory began with the work of Stogdill (1948), who defined leadership traits to include sociality, intelligence, insight, responsibility, alertness, persistence, initiative, and self-confidence. Later, Stogdill (1974) added traits such as risk-taking and drive. Leadership trait theory
focuses strictly on the leader and does not consider the follower (Smalley, Retallick, Metzger, & Greiman, 2016).

The theory proposes that leaders are differentiated from other individuals by certain traits (Colbert, Judge, Choi, & Wang, 2012). Moreover, leaders are identified and selected based upon possession of certain traits (Khan, 2013). Leadership traits relative to task competence include qualities such as intelligence, emotional stability, a conscientiousness nature, and an openness to experience, which predict the leader’s approach to risk taking, problem solving, challenging assumptions, and the structuring of task work (Derue et al., 2011). Research indicated that leader traits evolve over time (Xu, Fu, Xi, Zhang, Zhao, Cao, & Ge, 2014). Derue et al. (2011) wrote that leader traits include demographic variables such as gender, intelligence, and natural personality. Moreover, Stogdill (1948) contended that the possession of a combination of leadership traits does not make a person a leader but rather a leader has characteristics, activities, and overall objectives related to followers. Certain leadership traits may become stronger or weaker over time (Xu et al., 2014). Furthermore, leader traits may be extrinsic, the idea that one trait replaces another, or intrinsic, whereby a trait can change in intensity (Xu et al., 2014).

Xu et al. (2014) studied trends in leadership trait research and discovered a significant increase in longitudinal studies. However, Colbert, Judge, Choi, and Wang (2012) maintain that research results on effective leader traits are inconsistent. Today, the trait approach is almost never used in isolation, and is not a sole criterion for assessing or exemplifying a candidate’s abilities (Khan, 2013). Additionally, the term
‘trait’ covers a wide spectrum of characteristics and researchers have been unable to identify a consistent set of leadership traits (Frazier, 2015; Xu et al., 2014). Although the trait approach has inherent weaknesses, it continues to maintain a presence in leadership theory (Khan, 2013).

Leadership characteristics. Leadership characteristics can be defined as an inspiring set of personal attributes that are perceived by followers and inspire them to their full potential (Keith & Buckley, 2011). Leader characteristics are a component of leadership theory and practice. Initially, leadership theory focused extensively on leader characteristics (Gregory, 2011). Today, exploratory research provides contextual details on the perceptions of leadership characteristics (Gregory, 2011). Leadership characteristics transcend all industries including academics, business, social, and political communities (Keith & Buckley, 2011). Understanding leadership characteristics may help organizations identify behaviors needed to encourage effective new leader integration with incumbent executives (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012).

Kouzes and Posner (2012) developed a list of ten most admired leadership characteristics: ambition, caring, competence, determination, forward looking, and leadership characteristics including honesty, imagination, inspiration, loyalty, and self-control. Leadership research suggests that dominance and cooperation are the two most important characteristics (Nichols, 2016). Additionally, as followers gain experience, the characteristics desired change and trait preferences might be a predictor of experience (Nichols, 2016).
Behavioral Theories of Leadership

Over the past 70 years, there have been significant efforts in the defining and describing of organizational leadership behavior. In a literature review of leader behavior, Fleishman, Mumford, Zaccaro, Levin, Korotkin, and Hein (1991) noted 65 distinct classes of leader behavior, which can be categorized as follows: task-oriented behaviors, relational-oriented behaviors, change-oriented behaviors, and passive leadership. However, there are major differences in the theoretical frameworks employed by the various researchers in areas of methodology and classification (Fleishman et al., 1991). Moreover, the differences in samples, organizational levels and settings, along with various descriptions produce a variety of leadership behavior dimensions (Fleishman et al., 1991).

According to Derue et al. (2011), a leader’s behavior has greater validity than individual traits in the production of leader effectiveness, which affects employee motivation. A leader’s behavioral tendencies are proximal to the actual act of leadership, and are predictive of overall leader effectiveness (Derue et al., 2011). The following styles, behaviors, or leadership practice were investigated in the literature: Authentic, Authoritarian, Autocratic, Charismatic, Democratic, Ethical, Entrepreneurial, Laissez-faire, Leader-Member Exchange, Participative, People-Oriented, Performance-Oriented Style, Transactional, Transformational, Servant, and Situational Leadership.

**Authentic leadership.** A leader acting as their true self characterizes authentic leadership (Nyberg & Sveningsson, 2014). It is an attractive ideal because it provides reassurance of perceived traditional power held in a leader’s position (Nyberg &
An authentic leader is driven by self-perception rather than forces outside of self; however, Nyberg and Sveningsson (2014) question whether there is such a concept as ‘true self’. Authentic leadership is leader-centric and leaders recognize their personal values, motives, strengths, and weaknesses including self-knowledge, a thoughtful self-perception, and an awareness of personal beliefs, desires, and feelings (Černe, Dimovski, Marič, Penger, & Škerlavaj, 2014). Authentic leaders view employees as assets and work to develop leader-follower relationships (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The authentic leadership model gives more attention to the multifaceted leader-follower consciousness in areas such as values, goals, identity, emotions, and the relational outcomes of trust and sustainable performance (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). As individuals know and accept their own strengths and weaknesses, they develop stability and a freedom from bias demonstrating values, beliefs, and actions, consistent with authentic leadership (Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008). It is a leadership approach that is suitable for improving employee job satisfaction through follower perception of leader-follower relationships as a leader’s “true self” is apparent (Černe et al., 2014).

Authenticity is defined as involving the ideas of self-acceptance and awareness (Walumbwa et al., 2008). It is a term that has become associated with a moral foundation in leadership and throughout the fields of business and management (Lawler & Ashman, 2012). The literature on authenticity has several themes including trust, honesty, and genuineness (Lawler & Ashman, 2012). Sparrow (2015) wrote it is not always easy to achieve authenticity, especially when an environment is unsuited towards the natural
preferences of the individual. Moreover, authenticity is viewed as having a dependency on individual values and is rooted in personal character (Lawler & Ashman, 2012).

Authentic leaders are unique and original individuals and they do not fake leadership (Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Furthermore, they do not engage in leadership for the sake of status, recognition, or individual gain and base their actions on their personal moral compass (Shamir & Eilam, 2005). Alavi and Gill (2016) wrote that authentic leaders are original and do not duplicate behaviors in their interactions with others, but rather act based on their personal values. Additionally, authentic leaders are highly aware of their personal bias and judgment, and this empowers the leader to control opinion and feelings (Gardner, Cogliser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011).

Authentic leadership is rooted in the philosophies of Harter (2002), Heidegger (1962), and Rogers (1959). Additionally, a definition of authentic leadership was developed through the work of Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, and Walumbwa (2005) which attempted to consolidate multiple classifications and viewpoints (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Authentic leadership in organizations is a construct that ties together positive psychological competences and an advanced organizational framework, which ensures a greater self-consciousness and positive self-control by the leaders and followers which fosters an environment of growth (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). The notion of authentic leadership is based upon high ethical standards and positive morals as a beacon for decision-making and behavior (Gardner et al., 2005). A self-based model was developed for follower growth, which focuses on self-awareness and regulation as elements of authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2005).
Walumbwa et al. (2008) described authentic leadership as a behavioral pattern that attracts and supports ethics and positive psychological abilities that nurture a greater self-perception. Authentic leaders embrace a strong moral perspective, balance knowledge, work to develop candidness with followers, and foster positive self-improvement (Walumbwa et al., 2008). Rightly or wrongly, authentic leadership is associated with a morality applied to organizational life (Lawler & Ashman, 2012).

**Authoritarian leadership.** Followers in a relationship with an authoritarian leader tend to be reserved in expressing views and simply accept directives from the leader with no comment (Yu-Chi & Ping Ju, 2012). This is because the authoritarian leader’s behavior may degrade the follower’s self-appraisal of capability, impact the employee through a restriction in job autonomy, and limit follower opportunities for task contribution (Du & Choi, 2013). Authoritarian leaders tend to be self-focused, having no consideration for the opinion or well-being of their subordinates (Yu-Chi & Ping Ju, 2012). Derecskei (2016) wrote that an authoritarian style is inhibiting. In contrast, for environments where change is low, followers may willingly accept a leader’s strict control and directive style (Du & Choi, 2013). Accordingly, followers accept an attitude of passivity towards work engagement and performance, settling for the status quo versus a pursuit towards excellence or a desire for change (Du & Choi, 2013).

**Autocratic leadership.** An autocratic leader centralizes all decision-making power and focuses on the task over a relationship with the follower (Garg & Jain, 2013). Leaders with this style provide very clear expectations on the ‘what, when, and how’, and make decisions independent of the group (Garg & Jain, 2013). An autocratic leadership
style is a dominating leadership practice that leads to employee dissatisfaction, employee turnover, and inefficient performance, and in turn creates ineffective working environments (Pyngavil, 2015). Mtimkulu, Naranhee, and Karodia (2014) suggested that autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles were effective with previous generations but are restrictive styles that may not inspire members of Generation X or Y.

**Charismatic leadership.** Kempster and Parry (2014a) wrote that charisma is a mystical stigma and is an attribute bestowed by God, as a gift, and originates from a set of characteristics. A Google search of ‘charismatic leadership’ yielded as many hits as the popular ‘transformational leadership’ which clearly suggests a romantic mythology even within the business context (Kempster & Parry, 2014b). The authors postulate that the leader-follower relationship is stimulated through the follower’s voluntary giving of trust, power, and authority, and the willingness to be the recipient of the outcome, placing an emphasis on the follower’s perception (Kempster & Parry, 2014a). Charismatic leaders demonstrate affection and compassion that is reciprocated with warmth and respect from followers (Kempster & Parry, 2014a). Moreover, from the perspective of the follower, the charismatic relationship produces emotions such as affection and warmth (Kempster & Parry, 2014b). When compared to movie genres, it most resembles emotions felt from a comedy and family movie, and it produces feelings of a positive relationship (Kempster & Parry, 2014b). Charismatic leaders provide followers with an energizing environment and clear purpose (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Leaders exhibiting this style are role models that demonstrate ethical conduct that builds leader-follower identification and a connection with the leader’s vision (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Although
leadership essentialists view the idea of charismatic leadership directly with the leader, research from the perspective of lived experience indicates that the charismatic leader-employee relationship is inconsistent and multifaceted (Kempster & Parry, 2014b).

**Democratic leadership.** A literature search on democratic leadership yielded more resources written from a political perspective, however, democratic leadership in and of itself is a leadership practice and moves beyond the mere rhetoric into areas such as education and research (McKeown & Carey, 2015). Courage, motivation, awareness, judgments, and a personal code of ethics, are the foundation for democratic leadership; while at the heart are sacred values (Molina & Klinker, 2012). Derecskei (2016) wrote that a democratic style is perceived to stimulate the follower’s work environment. Democratic leaders elicit input from team members in the decision-making process, which increases follower satisfaction (Bhatti et al., 2012). Boykins, Campbell, Moore, and Nayyar (2013) state that a democratic style works to build team consensus and to gain input for positive plan implementation. Giltinane (2013) indicated that democratic leaders tend to be considerate and share responsibility with followers.

**Ethical leadership.** The idea of ethical leadership stems from an emphasis on a social system and a set of leadership behavior standards that are perceived by followers (Agezo, 2013). Ethical leadership is an independent leadership theory and is embedded in the paradigm of charismatic and transformational leadership (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005). In a research study on senior executives and follower perception related to ethical leadership, three themes emerged: value alignment, governance, and relationship-centeredness (Crews, 2015). Crews (2015) found that ethical leadership is
perceived through characteristics such as integrity, courage, and trustworthiness and more importantly, ethical leaders are observed to demonstrate a strong alignment between what they say and what they do. Additional studies concluded that organizational commitment has a mediating function relative to ethical leadership and that ethical leadership, in turn, have a positive relationship to organizational commitment (Çelik, Dedeoglu, & Inanir, 2015). Furthermore, an ethical leader is relationally-centric, and qualities of fairness and altruism define the leader’s engagement with others (Crews, 2015). In situations of governance, ethical leaders rely on a more formal system of accountability and engage discernment in decision-making (Crews, 2015). Many of the attributes of ethical leadership are embedded in other leadership behaviors (Crews, 2015).

**Entrepreneurial leadership.** An entrepreneurial leadership style is characterized by innovation, the ability to adapt to a changing environment, and can preside in organizations of various sizes, types, or longevity (Renko et al., 2015). Followers of entrepreneurial leaders are positively influenced by the leader’s beliefs and the actions needed to achieve the leader’s goals (Koryak, Mole, Lockett, Hayton, Ucbasaran, & Hodgkinson, 2015). Entrepreneurial leaders are known for creativity, risk-taking, vision, and resilience (Middlebrooks, 2015). Furthermore, these leaders demonstrate some behaviors and attributes that characterize transformational leadership (Renko et al., 2015). They display a distinctive knowledge and skill set, and an overall disposition that tends to maximize innovative thinking (Middlebrooks, 2015). These leaders fuel continuous energy throughout the organization and during improvement processes (Middlebrooks, 2015). They also tend to see and pursue opportunities; however, taking
the lead as an entrepreneur should not be confused with entrepreneurial leadership (Middlebrooks, 2015). Entrepreneurial leadership is a role, a leadership style, an unique leadership ability, and is the overlapping of two concepts that create a distinctive theory (Middlebrooks, 2015). Attributes of entrepreneurial leadership are also embedded in other leadership behaviors (Renko et al., 2015).

**Leader-member exchange theory.** Relationships impact the organization, and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory is based on a partnership between leaders and followers to accomplish organizational goals. The theory was developed by Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975). Gerstner and Day (1997) conducted a meta-analysis which involved an influence on the follower. This follower does not require an authoritative hierarchy based on employment contracts, but rather is influenced by contractual obligations (Memili, Welsh, & Kaciak, 2014). LMX emphasizes leader-follower relationships that drive affirming outlooks and actions (Burch & Guarana, 2014). Positive LMX relationships create a reciprocity of continued exchanges, a higher level of optimism, an increase in flexibility, efficiency, and optimism, which ultimately leads to more innovative processes (Memili, Welsh, & Kaciak, 2014). The literature review conducted by Gerstner and Day (1997) suggest that job performance, satisfaction, organizational commitment, role conflict and clarity, competencies, and turnover demonstrated significant relationships with LMX. Research supports that LMX theory creates a favorable leader-follower collaboration which correlates with improved individual performance (Joseph, 2016). Finally, LMX is consistent with transformational leadership (Gerstner & Day, 1997).
**Participative leadership.** A large variety of scholars share the belief that participative leadership is valuable in areas of organizational and team efficiency (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). Research by Miao, Newman, and Huang (2014) demonstrates that participative leadership has an important role in promoting positive work outcomes and social exchanges between followers. In participative leadership, the follower’s commitment is heightened because of the perception of ownership that is sensed (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). It is a leadership style that is active, highly collaborative, and is a visionary practice that builds environments for a wider participation (Grasmick, Davies, & Harbour, 2012).

**People-oriented leadership.** A people-oriented leadership style is democratic, servant authentic, ethical, and participative, focusing on human relations and teamwork, which improves productivity and job satisfaction (Dorn, 2012; Mtimkulu, Naranhee, & Karodia, 2014). People-oriented leadership includes other leadership styles such as transformational and servant leadership (Zander, Mockaitis, & Butler, 2012). This leadership practice differs from its traditional counterparts, which focus on directive and authoritarian leadership responses (Zander, Mockaitis, & Butler, 2012). Moreover, Zander et al., (2012) theorized that people-oriented leaders actually respond to contemporary changes in follower work values and expectations, and support retaining talent and skills organizations need in a harsh labor market faced with competition and financial turbulence.

**Performance-oriented leadership.** The performance-oriented leadership style is characterized by innovation and leader decisiveness (Cox, Hannif, & Rowley, 2014).
Leaders with this style establish high standards and place an emphasis on the core values of an organization (Cox et al., 2014). Additionally, performance-oriented leaders inspire followers through a shared vision or goal which creates a passion that motivates followers to perform enthusiastically (Cox et al., 2014).

**Servant leadership.** Carter and Greer (2013) describe servant leaders as those that place the needs of the follower and the importance of multiple stakeholders over self-interest. Servant leaders exhibit relational-oriented leadership behavior (Derue, Nnahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011). Van Dierendonck’s (2011) conceptual model of servant leadership provides six key characteristics: empowerment, people development, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, and a style that demonstrates stewardship and provides a sense of direction. Rodriguez (2014) stated that servant leaders gain more than they give from their service. Furthermore, servant leaders recognize a multitude of responsibilities, including organizational goals, the personal development of followers, and a wide range of stakeholders, which include the consideration of community (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012). Finally, research indicates that servant leadership is distinctive and relevant to work outcomes (Peterson, Galvin, & Lange, 2012).

Hersey and Blanchard developed the theory of situational leadership, a grouping of four leadership styles, which range from directing to delegating, to match a specific leadership situation as needed (Thompson & Glasø, 2015). Thompson and Glasø (2015) indicate that job performance is positively and significantly correlated to leader support, job level, supervisory ratings, and follower self-rating. A situational leader partners with
the follower for improved performance, and requires flexibility in the leadership style (Lynch, 2015). These leaders support a process of continued learning and enable the follower to gain a greater understanding and deeper self-assessment through reflectivity (Lynch, 2015).

**Transformational leadership.** Leaders who take notice of the needs of their employees, encourage them on an intellectual level, establish high expectations, and create a shared vision, demonstrate transformational leadership behavior (Gulluce et al., 2016). Burns (1978) developed the theory of transformational leadership and is attributed with the term. Bass (1990, 1999), Bass and Riggio (2006), Bass and Steidlmeier (1999), and Bass and Avolio (1993) further develop the construct along with Kouzes and Posner (1987) who advanced the theory as a model of leadership practice. Transformational leadership style focuses on the leader’s ability to inspire and influence followers through their goals, creativity, visions, and actions (Salahuddin, 2011). Employees are encouraged to be more committed to their organization through transformational leadership behavior (Saha, 2016). Needs of the individual and the personal development of followers are the focus of transformational leadership (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Many positive outcomes for individuals, groups, and organizations have been experienced through transformational leadership, which impacts behaviors, attitudes, and performance (Arnold & Loughlin, 2013). These leaders are amenable to follower’s wants and needs (Khanin, 2007).

This model has had a significant influence on leadership success (Schuh, Zhang, & Tian, 2013). Moreover, this leadership style provides an easier pathway to high
commitment and organizational success (Gulluce et al., 2016). In this case, leaders inspire followers to go beyond expectation which increases overall organizational commitment (Gulluce et al., 2016). Franke and Felfe (2011) challenge that transformational leaders operate from a dark side when they abuse power and can negatively impact organizational commitment. Leaders should be aware that expecting employees to perform at high levels can create a decline in organizational commitment due to overload and strain (Franke & Felfe, 2011).

Transformational leadership theory consists of four leader behaviors: idealized influence (either attributed or behavioral), inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass & Avolio, 1997). The degree that a leader attends to a follower’s needs, listens to concerns, and acts as a coach or mentor is individualized consideration (Bacha & Walker, 2012). Transformational leaders stimulate followers to challenge assumptions (Bacha & Walker, 2012). Followers are encouraged to take risks, and transformational leaders engage with followers through soliciting ideas (Bacha & Walker, 2012). They stir emotions and encourage the achievement of followers (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Transformational leaders motivate followers to go beyond the status quo, to set challenging expectations, and to have a higher performance (Leong & Fischer, 2011). Moreover, these leaders tend to have followers who are more satisfied and deeply committed because the follower is empowered, and the leader provides the attention and individualization needed (Leong & Fischer, 2011).
Leaders exhibiting the style of transformational leadership adopt a democratic approach, and work to improve potential through the enhancement of their follower’s abilities and skills (Giltinane, 2013). Effective transformational leaders cultivate a trust with followers (Giltinane, 2013). They are credited with encouraging development and organizational change (Basham, 2012). Considered heroes, transformational leaders support the organizational mission and possess a charismatic personality who influences followers (Basham, 2012). Transformational leaders are also characterized as having deeply held personal values (Basham, 2012). These leaders work to develop close follower relationships by regarding employee needs as important and paying specific attention to a follower’s individual needs (Gulluce et al., 2016). Finally, transformational leaders encourage higher levels of innovation and creativity through intellectual encouragement (Gulluce et al., 2016).

Idealized influence is a leadership characteristic that indicates whether the leader maintains a follower’s trust, faith, and respect, while demonstrating dedication, appealing to a follower’s hopes and dreams, and provides an appropriate role model (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Leaders who demonstrate idealized influence will place followers needs above their own and will be prepared to take risks and demonstrate devotion to established values (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Behavior that places the benefit of the group above those of the individual exhibit the idea of idealized influence (Quintana, Park, & Cabrera, 2015). Idealized influence can be further categorized as either attributed or behavioral. Attributed influence indicates
leadership charisma, and behavioral influence is actual, as leaders inspire followers to follow the vision (Bogler et al., 2013).

Inspirational motivation measures a leader’s ability to create a shared vision and the use of symbols and imagery to focus followers on work, which provides the employee with a sense of significance (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Some leaders have a visionary outlook of the future, which can energize followers and stress ambitious goals (Bogler et al., 2013). Furthermore, inspirational motivation is a process of stirring followers, and authentic leaders provide a sense of meaning, challenge, and understanding in their work (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Subordinate consideration is an important part of the leader-follower interaction and allows leaders to develop solid relationships with their followers (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Individualized consideration indicates the degree to which the leader shows interest in the wellbeing of others, creates opportunities for individuality, and invests in followers who may be disengaged from the group (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). This is a situation where the leader pays personal attention to the follower and individuals are treated equitably but differently (Bogler et al, 2013; Quintana et al., 2015). As leaders consider followers' individualization, there is a focus on understanding follower needs and a dedication to work on continuous development towards the goal of helping followers reach their full potential (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Learning experiences are stimulated as the leader delegates projects, provides teaching and coaching, and offers individualized leader-follower experiences (Hater & Bass, 1988). When leaders engage in an attitude of
consideration relative to follower needs, and appreciate the work of their followers, they demonstrate characteristics of coaching and development (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Additionally, when they delegate responsibilities to followers with the prospect of developing them, they further employ the idea of individualized consideration (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

Intellectual stimulation demonstrates the degree that a leader encourages others to be creative and innovative. Leaders demonstrating this characteristic provide a nurturing environment geared to their follower’s values and beliefs, as aligned to the organization (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Intellectual stimulation causes followers to question conventional problem-solving techniques and encourages innovative deductive reasoning and methods for continuous improvement (Avolio & Bass, 2004). It is the fourth facet of transformational leadership and provides individual followers with challenges to identify and problem solve for themselves (Quintana et al., 2015). Leaders engaged in intellectual stimulation with followers are motivated to think innovatively and to explore extraordinary ideas to solve problems (Bogler et al., 2013). When engaging intellectual simulation, followers are aroused by the leader and asked to think outside the box (Hater & Bass, 1988). Moreover, intellectual stimulation includes concepts such as problem-solving skills, and followers are encouraged to think before taking any form of action (Hater & Bass, 1988). Avolio and Gardner (2005) indicate that scholarly stimulation provides an atmosphere that encourages followers to challenge assumptions, rethink problems, and it also creates an enthusiasm towards innovative thinking.
**Transactional leadership.** Transactional leadership is about the relationship between managers and followers in areas such as economic exchange, politics, and psychological values (Dai, Dai, Kuan-Yang, & Hui-Chun, 2013). It is a leadership style that focuses on daily follower-leader relationships (Kenney, 2012). Transactional leadership can be defined as a relationship exchange between followers and their leader when the leader is expected to maintain the status quo to fulfill the self-interest and needs of the follower (Bogler et al., 2013). However, transactional leadership is restrictive in relation to employee development, innovation, and creativity, and can hinder organizational and follower growth (Dai et al., 2013). Transactional leadership is viewed as a leadership behavior that is less considerate than transformational leadership, and it does not contribute to the development of organizational commitment (Afshari & Gibson, 2016). Transactional leaders are more task-oriented and focus on outcomes and results instead of follower perceptions and needs (Dartey-Baah, 2015). In a transactional culture, relationships are contractual and everything is focused on implicit and explicit relationships (Bass & Avolio, 1993). These associations have been meaningful and contribute to the organization's leadership, and research indicated it can provide a supportive relationship relative to employee perception and behavior (Dai et al., 2013). Moreover, recent research indicated that transactional leadership may have a positive influence on employee behavior (Afshari & Gibson, 2016).

Contingent reward is measured in terms of a leader’s recognition of a follower’s achievements and is a system of rewards and expectations. Leaders provide followers rewards when performance meets contracted expectations or as followers expend effort
(Hater & Bass, 1988). The idea of contingent reward is based on the exchange between leaders and followers (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). It provides clarification on follower expectations and clearly defines the rewards a follower will receive when performance levels are achieved (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Management-by-exception is a position of status quo where leaders are content with a standard follower’s performance and is a dimension of transactional leadership (Quintana et al., 2015). Leadership behavior related to management-by-exception is task-oriented and is considered a passive leadership behavior (Derue et al., 2011). As a leader avoids providing direction and working conditions stay the same, followers maintain status quo, if performance expectations are met (Hater & Bass, 1988). Hater and Bass (1988) divided the practice of management-by-exception into sub categories of active and passive leadership.

The active monitoring of follower task execution for mistakes, inaccuracies, or reacting to complaints is active management-by-exception leadership (Bass, & Steidlmeier, 1999). It also includes providing ongoing criticism for the purposes of correction, negative reinforcement, and supervision (Bass, & Steidlmeier, 1999). Individuals engaging in this leadership style monitor performance and initiate corrective action when the follower deviates from the prescribed standards (Quintana et al., 2015). With this style, there is a focus on monitoring the execution of tasks for problems, and it attempts to correct areas of concern while maintaining performance levels (Avolio & Bass, 2004). In an active management-by-exception scenario, as problems or mistakes occur, leaders systematically assess and intervene based upon the follower’s performance
and the perceived need of the leader to be actively involved to coach and correct (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016).

Passive management-by-exception is a situation when there is no systematic reaction related to problem solving (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). In fact, leaders with this style tend to avoid decision making and abdicate responsibility (Westerlaken & Woods, 2013). Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) believe that passive management-by-exception aligns with laissez-faire leadership practice. It has also been termed as passive avoidant leadership behavior through which a leader avoids making decisions and only reacts after problems have escalated (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Such leaders take an attitude of waiting to see what happens and only become involved when mistakes have been made or problems occur (Avolio et al., 1999).

A laissez-faire leadership style is considered a non-interference type of leader who provides followers complete freedom and no specific guidance in goal attainment (Bhatti et al., 2012). Laissez-faire leadership does not impact follower perception of organizational creativity (Derecskei, 2016). Laissez-faire leaders ignore differences such as generational dynamics (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). The idea of laissez-faire leadership relies on a leader’s ability to be tolerant and self-controlled when faced with conflicting situations (Bell & Mjoli, 2014). Laissez-faire is a perspective where leaders require little of followers, allow for autonomy, and exhibit a hands-off leadership style (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Absent from laissez-faire leadership are extrinsic and intrinsic incentives such as feedback, rewards, and a leader’s involvement (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) argue that this leadership is a lack of leadership.
Theories of Organizational Commitment

Suma and Lesha (2013) claimed that over the past three or four decades, organizational commitment has become a fashionable variable. As with any other psychological construct, it has no universal definition (Suma & Lesha, 2013). Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) believe that organizational commitment includes the consideration of employee strengths and level of involvement. It can be characterized by a minimum of three factors: a trust in and agreement on the organization's goals and values, a spirit of cooperation and an exertion of considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a distinct desire to maintain membership within the organization (Porter et al., 1974). Individuals who are committed to an organization work harder, exhibit a higher work attendance, possess higher job satisfaction, demonstrate increased productivity, and have less inclination of leaving employment (Patiar & Wang, 2016). Conversely, those that exhibit less organizational commitment demonstrate absenteeism, poorer work performance, have high turnover, and are overall costlier to the organization (Patiar & Wang, 2016).

Organizational commitment can be divided into two parts, attitude and behavior (Sabir et al., 2011). Meyer and Allen’s (1997) theory of organizational commitment suggests that understanding commitment and its impact of a follower’s attitude and behavior, supports an organization’s sustainability. Moreover, a more developed awareness of the theory will increase sustainability by helping to predict the impact of change within the organization and provide ways to manage it more successfully (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Aydin, Sarier, and Uysal (2011) defined organizational commitment as a
positive desire to continue membership in the organization for purposes of self-identification and loyalty. Additionally, the employee hopes for organizational success and demonstrates a willingness to expend extra effort to benefit the organization (Aydin et al., 2011). Gulluce et al. (2016) wrote that Meyer and Allen's classification of organizational commitment is the most widely accepted in literature.

Allen and Meyer’s (1990) theory identifies three types of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective and continuance commitment can be distinguished from each other in that affective commitment describes organizational attachment through emotion, identification, and involvement while continuance commitment considers the supposed cost of leaving the organization (Gatling et al., 2016). These differ from normative commitment which suggest a responsibility to stay with the organization (Gatling et al., 2016)

As stated, organizational commitment occurs across three dimensions, one of which is Meyer and Allen’s (1997) proposed affective commitment. Employees who maintain a strong affective commitment stay at their organizations because they want to, they need to, or the feel they should (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Meyer and Allen (1991) define affective commitment as a position of attitude whereby individuals reflect on their organizational relationship in terms of personal values, and the alignment of these beliefs with the overall organizational goals. Employees who accept organizational goals are motivated to work toward the betterment of the organization (Yucel et al., 2014). Moreover, authentic leadership is an important stimulus of employee affective organizational commitment (Gatling et al., 2016). Clinebell et al. (2013) concur with
this assessment and state that continued employment is a product of the employee’s motivation. Employees who have good transformational leaders have a high affective commitment and are more satisfied, which leads to better work performance and a more successful organization (Gulluce et al., 2016). Additionally, authentic leadership style has both a positive and significant relationship to affective commitment (Gatling et al., 2016).

Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) conducted a meta-analysis and found that affective commitment was highly correlated with job satisfaction and commitment. Stazyk, Pandey, and Wright (2011) indicate that affective commitment correlates with employee attitudes. Affective commitment can be divided into distinctive groups including: personal characteristics, job characteristics, work experiences, and structural characteristics (Dunham, Grube, & Castañeda, 1994; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1992; Yousef, 1998). Moreover, a study by Steers (1977) concurs indicating organizational commitment significantly is influenced by an employee’s personal characteristics, the job characteristics, and personal work experiences.

Monday, Steers, and Porter (1992) examined the role of personal characteristics and found that the attributes a person brings to a work environment can predict organizational commitment. In a study on personal characteristics (gender, age, education, salary, and work experience) and organizational commitment, Ogunjinmi, Onadeko, Ladebo, and Ogunjinmi (2014) utilized the Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression analysis and found a significance influence between personal characteristics and employee organizational commitment. Other personal characteristics
include marital status, organizational tenure, and job status (Olukayode, 2013). Abreua, Cunhab, and Rebouças (2013) examined the long-term influence of five specific personal characteristics (employment type, job level, gender, education level, and tenure) on affective, normative and continuance commitment. Findings indicate the employee’s type of work or position had the strongest influence on affective and normative commitment (Abreua et al., 2013). Furthermore, time of service and the level of education were the stronger indicators of continuance commitment (Abreua et al., 2013). Lastly, an employee’s gender and job level had negligible effect on commitment (Abreua et al., 2013).

Job characteristic influence active commitment, including mediators such as feedback from job, task variety, task autonomy, and decision-making autonomy (Dunham et al., 1994; Gillet & Vandenberghe, 2014). Organizational commitment can be impacted by factors, including task identity, task significance, skill variety, autonomy, and feedback (Bakri & Ali, 2015). In a study of job characteristics, transformational leadership, and organizational commitment, Gillet and Vandenberghe (2014) found support for previous findings and a positive correlation between transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and the purposeful characteristics of work. Follower perception of job characteristics is an important psychological factor that is linked to active organizational commitment (Gillet & Vandenberghe, 2014).

Steers (1977) defined the measure of work experience to include an employee’s attitude towards the company. Work experience is also measured by the extent that the employee’s expectations mirror reality (Steers, 1977). Employee self-perception of
importance is compared to the organization actions over time, and the perceived
dependability of the organization relative to implied commitments (Steers, 1977). Work
experience is directly proportional to an employee’s commitment, and it is found to be
closely related to organizational commitment, even over personal or job characteristics
(Steers, 1977).

The impact of structural determinants on employee turnover and job satisfaction
is a valuable exploration for organizational sustainability and follower leadership
(Arekar, Jain, Desphande, & Sherin, 2016). Structural characteristics deal with the place
of work and work setting (Arekar et al., 2016). It includes factors such as the
employment sector, occupation, job level, or geographical location (Zatzick, Deery, &
Iverson, 2015). It can contain characteristics such as sector, industry, and organizational
size (Gerber, 2012). Structural features of a job can also be comprised of distributive
justice, autonomy, opportunity for promotion, and perceived social support (Arekar et al.,
2016). Abreua at al. (2013) discovered that structural reform produced long-term and
positive effects on the level of employee organizational commitment. Issues with
structural characteristics and the work environment are more easily identified and
adjustable (Arekar et al., 2016). Structural variables such as job routinization and job
stress have a negative effect on employee organizational commitment as measured by job
satisfaction (Arekar et al., 2016).

Relationships between employees and their organizations are important for
success and sustainability (Khan, Naseem, & Masood, 2016). An employee’s level of job
satisfaction impacts organizational commitment, which is correlated to employee
continuance commitment (Khan et al., 2016). The notion of continuance commitment is founded on an employee’s need to remain in the current organization and can stem from the perceived lack of options or a fear of losing benefits (Clinebell et al., 2013; Khan, et al., 2016). In this case, an employee is at a disadvantage when faced with leaving the organization (Aydin et al., 2011). Continuance commitment may also be impacted by antecedents such as the employee’s age or tenure, level of career satisfaction, and intent to leave the organization (Dunham et al., 1994).

McGee and Ford’s (1987) research indicated there are two subcomponents of continuance commitment. First is the notion of ‘low alternatives’, which is when an employee’s commitment is based on a seeming shortage of employment options (McGee & Ford, 1987). The second is ‘high personal sacrifice’, and is based upon a perceived loss if the employee leaves the organization (McGee & Ford, 1987). The side-bet theory reflects the belief that continuance commitment increases when side bets are accumulated (Becker, 1960; Meyer & Allen, 1984). The term side-bet is used to explain the phenomena of an employee’s maintained membership within the organization through the idea of consistent lines of activity (Becker, 1960; Meyer & Allen, 1984). If the employee discontinues the activity (i.e. employment), there is a risk of losing the side bet or extraneous benefits (Becker, 1960; Meyer & Allen, 1984).

The degree an organizational member commits to the organization’s values and norms is normative commitment (Winston, Cerff, & Kirui, 2012). It is a sense of obligation, for moral or ethical reasons, to remain (Paramanandam, 2013). This theory presumes the more the member commits to the organization's principles and standards,
the more they will be motivated (Winston et al., 2012). Employees with high levels of normative commitment simply feel a need to remain employed out of an obligation towards the organization (Clinebell et al., 2013). This obligatory view results from experiences or observations of role models, or intrinsic or extrinsic motivations that add to the employee’s socialization experiences and triggers normative commitment (Yucel et al., 2014).

The Multidimensional Nature of Organizational Commitment

Multidimensional constructs are used extensively to characterize multiple unique dimensions as a single hypothetical idea (Edwards, 2001). Organizational commitment can be defined as a psychological connection between the follower and the organization that reduces the likelihood of voluntary organizational separation (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Organizational commitment can take on multiple directions due to the influence of attitudes and behaviors of both leaders and followers (McGee & Ford, 1987). The multidimensionality of commitment can be considered in both form and focus (Meyer & Allen, 1997). A focus on commitment implies that the employee is committed to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

A multidimensional psychological attachment between employees and their organizations is an outcome of organizational commitment and is multifaceted in nature (Aladwan, Bhanugopan, & Fish, 2013; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Furthermore, organizational commitment is complex because it consists of affective and normative commitment, two constructs of positively related outcomes (Afshari & Gibson, 2016). Additionally, the degree of employee attachment with the organization will vary from
person to person (Sabir et al., 2011). Organizational commitment is multidimensional and encompasses worker loyalty, a willing spirit to employ more effort for the organization, a loyalty to organization’s values, and a dedication to a relationship with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Factors such as religion, gender, and education influence workplace behavior (Hage & Posner, 2015). Moreover, managerial strategies that identify the multidimensional nature and related variables are necessary to elevate levels of employee organizational commitment (Rodriquez, Franco, & Santos, 2006).

**Contemporary Studies Linking Leadership and Commitment**

Various studies indicate that leadership style is an antecedent of organizational commitment (Sabir et al., 2011). Leadership style is a major influencing factor of organizational commitment (Saha, 2016). There is strong relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment (Gatling et al., 2016). However, researchers seem to pay more attention to transactional and transformational leadership when considering the construct (Sabir et al., 2011). Shim, Jo, and Hoover (2015) explored the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment within the police force culture. The research results indicated that culture was the mediator linking commitment and transformational leadership (Shim et al., 2015). Rego, Lopes, and Nascimento (2016) conducted a quantitative study on authentic leadership and organizational commitment and outcomes demonstrated positive psychological capital as an intermediary between the constructs. In a non-profit study of secondary education, researchers found a positive correlation between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (Feizi, Ebrahimi, & Beheshti, 2014).
Moreover, idealized influence demonstrated the greatest impact on the dedication of educators (Feizi et al., 2014).

Research on transformational leadership and organizational commitment indicated a relationship between the constructs and suggested that affective commitment was the most impactful variable (Gulluce et al., 2016). Results from a study of school teachers indicated a positive and significant correlation existed between transformational leadership and organizational commitment (Feizi et al., 2014). Moreover, in this study, idealized influence had a greater impact on organizational commitment (Feizi et al., 2014). Another study found a positive relationship between organizational commitment and transformational leadership behaviors (Garg & Jain, 2013). Small and medium-sized businesses in the manufacturing and service industry were surveyed using Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (1996) and Porter's organizational commitment questionnaire (1974), and the results indicated that transformational leadership had a positive impact on organizational commitment (Mesu, Sanders, & van Riemsdijk, 2015). Mesu et al. (2015) recommended that small and medium organizations in the service industry should encourage their leaders to employ transformational leadership styles, while those in the manufacturing sector should engage in various types of leadership to promote employee organizational commitment.

Khasawneh, Omari, and Abu-Tineh (2012) conducted a research study on the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in vocational education. The findings provided a strong, significant, and positive statistical relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.
(Khasawneh et al., 2012). Moreover, McLaggan, Bezuidenhout, and Botha (2013) found that transformational leadership inspired employees in the Mpumalanga mining to be more committed to their organization and the research strongly linked leadership style and organizational commitment.

Zehir, Sehitoglu, and Erdogan (2012) conducted research in Turkey and concluded that there was a significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership and commitment. In a research study on the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership, and organizational commitment, the authors discovered a positive correlation, and results showed that transactional leadership style was more effective in enhancing levels of organizational commitment in Nigerian bank employees (Fasola et al., 2013). Susanj and Jakopec (2012) explored the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment and found a positive link to leadership style and organizational commitment. Lastly, in a cross-sectional survey on the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment in full-time employees working various helpdesks in a Malaysian contact center, Aghashahi, Davarpanah, Omar, and Sarli (2013) concluded that transformational leadership predicts affective and normative commitment.

Research Variables

The independent variable for this research was personal perceived leadership style measured using the broad leadership questionnaire, which considers transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive-avoidant leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004). More specifically, transformation leadership was divided into four distinct areas:
idealized influence (attributed and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transactional leadership was measured based upon contingent reward and management-by-exception, active or passive (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Lastly, passive-avoidant leadership was assessed considering the laissez-faire leadership style (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The dependent variable was personal perceived organizational commitment measured by Meyer and Allen’s TCM Employee Commitment Survey. Understanding commitment and its impact on attitude and behavior is important for organizational longevity (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The TCM Employee Commitment Survey identifies three types of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Multiple research studies suggested a relationship between the variables of leadership style and organizational commitment (Aghashahi et al., 2013; Fasola et al, 2013; Feizi et al., 2014; Garg & Jain, 2013; Gatling et al., 2016; Gulluce et al., 2016; Khasawneh et al., 2012; McLaggan et al., 2013; Mesu et al., 2015; Rego et al., 2016; Sabir et al., 2011; Saha, 2016; Shim et al., 2015; Susanj & Jakopec, 2012; Zehir et al., 2012). This research utilized correlational analysis to examine associations between leadership and organizational commitment.

**Transition and Summary**

Academic literature provided insight on faith-based organizations, and for this research was defined as a 501©(3) organization with a faith purpose and gross receipts exceeding $25,000 annually. Research in faith-based organizations was limited in the academic literature; nevertheless, the work of these organizations is important.
Investigation of the literature provided understanding of the construct of motivation and seven major theories contribute to the modern understanding. Organizational commitment is a construct that considers employee behaviors. Theories of organizational commitment emphasize employee strengths, attitude, and behavior, as well as level of involvement.

Leadership theory encompasses social influence and goal achievement and there are more than sixty-six theories that have shaped the idea and includes concepts such as leadership practice and perception. There are multiple trait theories of leadership which emphasize human characteristics. Behavioral theories of leadership highlights concepts such as tasks, relationships, change, and passive leadership. There is extensive research on both leadership behavior and organizational commitment and both topics are important to business. Studies suggest that in general, leadership style influences organizational commitment and may even pose a significant and positive relationship (Garg & Jain, 2013; Gatling et al., 2016; Khasawneh et al., 2012; Saha, 2016). Finally, organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct of singular ideas including emotional attachment, identification, loyalty, effort, and responsibility. The subsequent section addresses the research project.
Section 2: The Project

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to test a comprehensive collection of broad-range leadership styles (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The questionnaire examines individual leadership behaviors ranging from avoidant to transformational (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Although the questionnaire can be used with multiple audiences and a broader range of leadership behaviors, it is suitable for all levels within an organization and across various industries (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The MLQ has been utilized in numerous research studies and doctoral dissertations (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The concept of leadership is examined given work-related relevance and the broader context of an individual’s life space (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Leadership research has created a higher order of change in accelerating individual effort and improving group performance (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Leadership can also radically shift viewpoints of individuals and their definition of meaningful work (Avolio & Bass, 2004). This section provides a summary of the research methodology and design, population and sample data collection approaches, survey instruments, and information on reliability and validity.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational research was to test Bass and Avolio’s (1992) broad leadership theory types and Meyer and Allen’s (1993) theory of organizational commitment in employees of a faith-based organization. The research provides a greater understanding about the relationship between leadership and
organizational commitment in faith-based organizations. The independent variable was defined as perceived personal leadership style as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The dependent variable was perceived personal organizational commitment as measured by the Three-Component Model (TCM) of Employee Commitment (Meyer et al., 1993).

**Role of the Researcher**

Quantitative research requires a devotion to the research method and design; the development of research questions and hypotheses. Furthermore, the researcher must investigate and implement sound approaches to the research study (Chin, Junglas, & Roldán, 2012). The process was a learning experience for the researcher as new understanding was gained through the empirical investigation (Chin et al., 2012). Stake (2010) concurred indicating that researchers are responsible for topic selection, study development, and the presentation of research outcomes. Overall, the researcher was responsible for the entire process.

The researcher has volunteered or worked in a faith-based organization for the past 20 years, in a variety of capacities. Additionally, the researcher was familiar with several faith-based organizational types, and had noted the importance of leadership and business practice. However, there was limited research conducted in faith-based organizations on the constructs of leadership and commitment. The researcher investigated a variety of leadership and commitment survey instruments and selected two notable, valid, and reliable tools that had been used extensively in scholarly research.
The researcher investigated options for the use of these instruments and worked with Mind Garden, Inc. to develop a combined instrument to test a relationship between broad leadership styles and organizational commitment. The researcher selected several demographic questions that were also included in the electronic survey. The researcher was responsible for the review and testing of the survey process prior to distribution.

The researcher’s role during the survey development process was to identify several faith-based organizations for the selective sample and obtain permission for the research from the organizations. Creswell (2014) indicated that it is important for the researcher to respect the research site and cause as little disruption as possible. Therefore, the researcher contacted a leader with authority within the faith-based organization to centralize the process of communicating information regarding the survey process.

Mind Garden, Inc. provided the researcher with special links for survey distribution and the researcher emailed the survey information as prearranged with the organizational leader. In some cases, the survey was distributed to all email address provided to the researcher, in other cases the organizational leader distributed the link to the organization to ensure clarification regarding participation (i.e., that the researcher had permission for the research). During the data collection process, Mind Garden, Inc. electronically collected and stored the data results, and at the completion of the survey period, provided the raw data to the researcher. The researcher focused on data analysis and organization. Using the quantitative method allowed for the researcher to approach the analysis with impartiality, since the data was objectively obtained from the
participant’s personal perceived leadership style and level of organizational commitment. The researcher used regression analysis to explore for a relationship between leadership and commitment, to generate new insight, and to dig deeper into the topics (Chin et al., 2012).

**Participants**

The research was conducted in seven faith-based organizations and included a cross representation of organizational type, employee job function, tenure, and level of responsibility. Participants were from two large mega-churches, a K-12 Christian school, a Christian University, two small ministries, and a national Christian certification agency. These organizations had a faith-based purpose, were registered as a 501©(3) Public Charity, and had annual gross receipts exceeding $25,000. The researcher may have had a working relationship or personal connection with employees in the organizations; however, any employee who worked directly for the researcher was excluded. In all cases, the participants were contacted via e-mail and invited to participate.

Research conducted with human subjects is under federal protection through the Department of Health and Human Services. An Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a committee of faculty who reviews research requests to ensure the participants’ rights, welfare, and concerns such as privacy ethics, are reviewed and approved. Additionally, the IRB process requires informed consent and confidentiality for the protection of the participants. Approval from Liberty University’s IRB was necessary prior to the collection of data (Appendix F). Ethical protection of participants was enforced, and a third-party research organization was used for the data collection process. An email
received by potential participants described the purpose of the research, the data collection process, survey directions, and how the findings would be shared. Personal identifiers were excluded.

**Research Method and Design**

The research utilized a quantitative, non-experimental, regression model to test the relationship between the independent variable, personal perceived leadership style, and the dependent variable, organizational commitment. Through the research of a sample drawn from the population, options, trends, and attitudes can be described through a survey methodology (Creswell, 2014). The instruments used in the research was Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) TCM Employee Commitment Survey, and provided values for the examination of casual social science variables; leadership behavior, and organizational commitment.

**Research Method**

Scholarly research is conducted using three research methods: qualitative, quantitative, or a combination of the two known as mixed-methods. Typically, qualitative data is open-ended while quantitative research is used to test a theory (Creswell, 2014). Additionally, quantitative and qualitative research may contain some aspects of the other to better explain the collected data or observations (Creswell, 2014). Exploring each method helped determine the method selected. The following outlines each method and provides an explanation, supported by literature.
**Qualitative method.** Keegan (2009) states that qualitative research places an emphasis on validity, reliability, and methodology, and certain types of research are more aligned towards qualitative studies including exploratory and market or brand specific research. Stake (2010) suggests that qualitative research is a focus on personal experience, human perception, understanding, intuition, and skepticism to refine theories and experiments; moreover, qualitative inquiry can be interpretive, experimental, situational, and based on individual personality. Creswell (2013) proposes that qualitative research is used when problems or issues need to be studied. Qualitative researchers gather data that can be utilized to obtain results relative to trends or themes based on words and not statistics (Patten, 2009). Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach, and Richardson (2005) write that the qualitative research method is a systematic approach used to further understand the essential nature or qualities of an occurrence or change relative to an actual framework.

**Quantitative method.** Quantitative methods use statistical data, systematically investigating social phenomena (Watson, 2015). Quantitative approaches assume studying, measuring, and analyzing data relationships (Watson, 2015). Research procedures and plans for the research approach span all aspects of the data collection method, data collection and analysis, and data interpretation (Creswell, 2014). Patten (2009) writes that a distinctive feature of quantitative research is in the methods that researchers use to gather data, which are quantifiable and allow for statistical analysis. Quantitative methods rely on linear characteristics, dimensions, and statistical analysis (Starke, 2010).
Mixed method. Mixed-methodology research employs both qualitative and quantitative methodologies and should be used when either method in isolation may fail to provide insight on the research problem than either method would supply individually (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2010). During the data collection process, both methods are used to provide a broader interpretation of the problem (Creswell, 2014). Deciding to choose mixed-method research hinges on multiple items include the research question and purpose of the study (Venkatesh, Brown, & Bala, 2013).

The method selected in this research was quantitative correlation using standard simple and multiple regression to test for a relationship between the theories. Quantitative research was selected because the specific purpose was to test a theory and the nature of the research question. Additionally, a regression model uses correlational statistics to measure the relationship of variables (Creswell, 2014). Mixed and qualitative methods were not selected as the research method because, in most cases, qualitative data is open-ended and the specific focus is on the use of validated survey tools (Creswell, 2014).

Thompson and Panacek (2007) suggest using, whenever possible, validated instruments rather than developing a new survey due to the potential of misunderstandings and for increased validity. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is an 18-item assessment, typically utilized as a 360-degree feedback instrument and for this research, the participant answered questions based upon personal perceived leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Alternative leadership surveys exist, such as the Servant Leadership Survey (SLS); however, its underlying premise is to test servant leadership theory while the
MLQ considers broad leadership types (Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011). The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner (2012) measures five key leadership traits through self-reporting along with a 360-degree feedback process, and although the instrument is popular, it was not an affordable option for research purposes. Another leadership survey example is the Authentic Leadership Questionnaire (ALQ) developed to assess four leadership characteristics; however, the questionnaire is narrow in scope, focusing only on authentic leadership behaviors (Walumbwa et al., 2008). With the goal to evaluate broad leadership behaviors, the MLQ was determined to be the most appropriate instrument and provided a cost-effective and flexible option. Additionally, there is over 20 years of published research based on studies that utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Generally, it is recognized that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer and Allen (1997) developed and defined the Three-Component Model (TCM), which served as the framework to develop the initial survey. The measures were further developed, revised, and published, and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) Employee Commitment Survey has more than 20 years of published research, and both the MLQ and TCM are validated and reliable.

**Research Design**

Creswell (2014) suggests that the quantitative approach tests theories through the examination of variable relationships. The quantitative method has two broad categories: experimental and descriptive (Watson, 2015). Two additional designs are correlational
and quasi-experimental. The choice of design will be based on the research methodology and the problem to be addressed through the research (Creswell, 2014).

**Experimental.** Experimental research seeks to find a cause and effect relationship (Abdul Talib & Mat Saat, 2017). Unique to experimental research is the ability to control the environment (Charness, Gneezy, & Kuhn, 2012). Experimental studies manipulate experiences to observe the effect of the dependent variable on the independent variable and will impact how the data is collected, analyzed, and construed (Watson, 2015).

**Descriptive.** In a descriptive study, researchers observe relationships between the variables (Botti & Endacott, 2005). The variables are measured and data can be analyzed using statistics (Creswell, 2014). Descriptive research involves naturalistic data, where research settings occur without manipulating the variables (Nassaji, 2015). Descriptive research is used to describe phenomenon (Nassaji, 2015). This research focus is more on the ‘what’ of the findings than ‘how or why’ (Nassaji, 2015). Typically survey instruments and observations are the methods used to gather data for a descriptive study (Gall et al., 2010).

**Correlational.** Within qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods are research design approaches that provide specific guidance for inquiry methods (Creswell, 2013). The nature of this research was correlational and the purpose was to test for a relationship between leadership and workplace commitment. The quantitative design utilized a combination of survey instruments: Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) TCM Employee Commitment
Survey to address the research question. Research on the relationship between personal perceived leadership style and personal perceived organizational commitment addresses a gap within the literature of faith-based organizations. The research question inquired into the relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment of employees in faith-based organizations. The selective sample was from the population of faith-based employees.

Typically, the MLQ is utilized as a 360-degree feedback instrument, however, for research purposes, the MLQ can be used to examine individual leadership profiles (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Depending on the research choice, it is appropriate to have a leader complete a self-rating and, in this case, the MLQ provided a suitable assessment of perceived personal leadership behavior (Mind Garden FAQ, 2016). The MLQ was administered from the perspective of self-rating, and participants expressed their personal perceived leadership style. The independent variable was defined as the perceived personal leadership style as measured through the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Meyer and Allen’s TCM Employee Commitment Survey utilizes a multidimensional construct that measures affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The dependent variable was used to gather data on participants’ personal perceived organizational commitment. The TCM was developed to provide further understanding of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Personal perceived leadership style and employee organizational commitment are two vital components relative to the employee. The reason the research question was chosen was to examine whether there was truly a relationship between personal perceived
leadership style and organizational commitment, and if there was any statistically significant relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment of employees in faith-based organizations. Persistence in a course of action implies commitment, and committed employees work harder to achieve organizational goals (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Moreover, Meyer and Allen (1991) suggest that commitment might influence behavior and that the relationship between any of the commitment types may provide outcomes of interest. The literature suggested that there were limited studies within faith-based organizations and on the relationship between leadership practice and organizational commitment (Okinyi, 2015).

**Population and Sampling**

Data regarding leadership and organizational commitment was collected through the combined survey instruments: Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) TCM Employee Commitment Survey. To test for a relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment of employees in faith-based organizations, the population was defined as follows. The National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS) provided a definitional structure on nonprofit organizations, which included a subset of faith-based organizations.

Non-profit organizations are divided into three categories: 501©(3) Public Charities, 501©(3) Private Foundations, and Other Exempt Organizations (NCCS, 2016). Additionally, NCCS further divides 501©(3) Public Charities into two categories: Registered with the IRS and Unregistered (NCCS, 2016). The NCCS’ most recent data
from 2013 indicated more than 1,108,652 501©(3) Public Charities exist within the United States, and of those organizations, 271,311 are reported under the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) classification of ‘religious’ or faith-based (NCCS 501©(3) Public Charities Core File).

The United States Department of Labor Statistics provides research data on the nonprofit sector focusing on 501©(3) organizations. The most recent data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) was from 2012 and indicated a potential of 769,882 employees within the NAICS Sector number 813 (religious, grant making, civic, and professional organizations) (National NAICS 2-digit, 2012). However, the actual number of employees within the subset of faith-based organizations was undetermined because there is not a central registry capturing this information.

The population for this research was employees who work for faith-based organizations that had a faith-based purpose; were registered as a 501©(3) Public Charity in the United States (determined by the Internal Revenue Service); and had annual gross receipts exceeding $25,000. Additionally, participants were both full or part-time employees at any level within their organization (they did not need to hold a leadership position), and were 18 years of age or older, and the research excluded individuals who solely volunteer their services. Participants were required to have worked in a faith-based organization, and have cumulative tenure of at least one year regardless of when. The tenure criterion of one year was selected to ensure the sample represented employees with experience.
When designing survey research, it is important to determine the minimum sample size to obtain data that represents significant variances in populations (Nisen & Schwertman, 2008). The researcher used a non-probability sample and respondents were selected based upon convenience and availability (Creswell, 2014). Convenience sampling was the most logical selection rationale since the population was undetermined, which made it difficult to select a random sample or a systematic sample (Creswell, 2014). The researcher first identified several faith-based organizations within the population and secured permission to conduct research at these organizations (Creswell, 2014).

The selection sample for this research was ±500 employees from across seven faith-based organizations. The sample was drawn from the seven faith-based organizations and included two congregations, a certification organization, a Christian university, a Christian school, and two small ministries. The sample size formula utilized in this research is provided in Figure 3.
The sample size was calculated using an a-priori analysis for multiple regression with a 5% margin of error, a 95% level of confidence (Charan & Biswas, 2013). Based on the G*Power sample size calculation, 56 completed responses were required (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009). The average response rate for an online survey is 20% (Laguilles, Williams, & Saunders, 2011). Given the expected response rate and the sample size, a minimum of 280 invitations were distributed.

**Data Collection**

**Instruments**

The MLQ (5X-Short) questionnaire is a 45-item organizational survey that has been validated through research (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The three leadership styles
(transformational, transaction, and passive/avoidant) are measured by 36 questions and nine questions measure leader effectiveness (Sudha, Shahnawaz, & Farhat, 2016). The purpose of the questionnaire was to identify and measure key leadership behaviors, which have been linked to individual and organizational success (Avolio & Bass, 2004). On average, the 45 question MLQ requires 15 minutes to complete (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Participants were asked to read each question and indicate their response using a five-point Likert-type rating scale (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Avolio and Bass (2004) state that 14 samples were used to validate and cross-validate the MLQ Form 5X. Cronbach’s coefficients of reliability for the MLQ Form 5X range from 0.74 to 0.94 (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Through Avolio and Bass’ (2004) research, more than 3,700 respondents provided self-ratings on leadership style. Fit indices were reviewed in 1995 based on the initial validation results (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The 1999 data set was tested, and the six-factor model of the MLQ demonstrated fit indices that exceeded the minimum cut-offs and demonstrated a best absolute fit (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The MLQ has been tested against other conceptual models from literature, and the six-factor model demonstrates the best-fit indices with low discriminate validity while results provide strong support of the six-factor model (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Moreover, further testing of the nine-factor model demonstrated best fit, and findings indicated concluding outcomes that examined broad range leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The third edition, which was the most recent manual available for the MLQ, provided support for research use of the nine-factor model (Avolio & Bass, 2004).
Finally, with the purchase of the MLQ Form 5X, a letter of permission was granted through Mind Garden, Inc. along with a copyright statement to use (Appendix A).

The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey was developed and validated by Meyer and Allen (2004). Meyer and Allen’s (2004) TCM survey reliability is supported by results from empirical studies. The three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) provide evidence of reliability (Meyer & Allen, 2004). A coefficient alpha has been used to estimate internal consistency of the three scales and median reliabilities were .85, .79, and .73 for affective, continuance, and normative commitment, respectively (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

The survey instrument contained questions related to the employee perception (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Meyer and Allen (1997) view commitment as a psychological state impacted by the employee-company relationship, and commitment (or a lack of commitment) will be the major predictor of an employee continuance. As participants read each question, they were asked to indicate their selection using a 5-point Likert scale (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Meyer and Allen (2004) recommend that for survey administration purposes, questions pertaining to the three scales (affective, continuance, and normative) are not asked sequentially, but in a consistent though random order (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Additionally, best results are received when the survey is completed anonymously (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Meyer and Allen (2004) recommend that either correlation or regression be used as the data analytic (Meyer & Allen, 2004).

Meyer and Allen (2004) indicated that the response scale on the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey may be altered from the 7-
point Likert to a 5-point scale. It is also recommended when combining instruments that statements are mixed (if a common scale is used) (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Therefore, for this research, a standard 5-point Likert-type scale was used. According to the authors, a coefficient alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the TCM (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Additionally, the findings matched the hypothesis and provided further evidence for construct validity (Meyer & Allen, 2004). Permission to use and publish the Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey was granted by the authors. (Letter of approval is found in Appendix D).

**Data Collection Technique**

The research survey was distributed through the Mind Garden Transform System, and invitations were sent via email from invite@mindgarden.com. Potential participants received an email explaining the confidentiality of the survey and the survey's purpose along with information on voluntary participation. The survey was self-administered and participants read and acknowledged the statement of informed consent, which preceded the survey. Survey participants completed the questionnaire from a personal perspective of how frequently they observed their engagement in the specific leadership behaviors and attributes (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Lastly, participants were notified that the research outcomes would be published, and no personal information related to participants will be included in the published results.

The survey instructions asked participants to answer with the most accurate response using a five-point Likert-type rating scale (Table 1), and the survey instrument was designed to be completed within 20 to 30 minutes.
Table 1

*Survey Response Values/Options*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Once in a while</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Likert-type scales are considered ordinal, the measurement of data variables for leadership style and organizational commitment were transformed into interval levels of measurement for parametric testing (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Participants were required to answer all items (forced response) and were instructed to select a response of ‘Unsure’ if an item was irrelevant, or they do not know the answer (Avolio & Bass, 2004). According to Mind Garden, Inc., when a participant selected ‘Unsure’, the data was treated as if the participant skipped the question (Avolio & Bass, 2004). It was not within the scope of this research to understand the reason for missing values, and there were multiple options available for dealing with missing data (Avolio & Bass, 2004). For this research, incomplete survey responses (where the participants closed the survey without finishing) were excluded from analysis (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The scoring for each of the MLQ scales was an average of all item responses for the given scale divided by the number of items in the scale (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Missing data
(when a participant selected the response ‘Unsure’) were not considered as responses and were excluded; however, the sum of the responses for each subscale was divided for a mean score by Mind Garden and provided in the data output (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

**Data Collection Plan.** All attempts for survey completion were through an electronic survey link created through the Mind Garden Transform System, and emailed to potential participants. Survey participants were asked to complete the electronic survey within 14 days. A reminder email was sent on the thirteenth day to all participants who had not completed the survey. After the 21-day period, if the required response rate was not met, the researcher sent a final email to non-respondents providing 7 additional days and requesting that they complete the survey within that time. Another reminder was sent out one week following the email reminder to those participants who had not completed the survey.

**Data Organization Techniques**

The initial survey data was collected, assembled, and secured through Mind Garden, Inc. A final data file was provided to the researcher in electronic form. Confidentiality of the data was maintained by the researcher, the data was stored electronically, and the file was password protected. Furthermore, a backup copy of the data was stored at the current residence of the researcher in a fireproof safe, and access was restricted and password protected. The researcher will maintain the data over a period of 3 years. Additionally, Mind Garden, Inc. has a data retention policy addressed in the Terms of Service, Section 4 (f) Data Retention Limitation (see Appendix H).
Data Analysis Technique

The research was correlational using a survey instrument to gather data to examine relationships between the variables of personal perceived leadership and organizational commitment. Regression and correlation analysis were used to determine the relationship between the variables and to evaluate the null hypothesis (Creswell, 2014). Data output was provided through Mind Garden, Inc., and IBM’s SPSS was used to analyze the data. Data was tested by residual analysis and found to be normally distributed. The findings did not uncover any evidence of statistical errors.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity were incorporated in the design as were necessary components of scholarly research. Reliability is the quality and consistency of a measure and is relevant because it indicates the accuracy and consistently of the research instrument results (Heale & Twycross, 2015). In quantitative studies, validity is considered the extent in which concepts are accurately measured (Heale & Twycross, 2015). There are three forms of validity: content, criterion, and construct (Creswell, 2014). The following sections discuss the reliability and validity of the research.

Reliability

Although an exact calculation of reliability is impossible, reliability can be estimated through different measures (Heale & Twycross, 2015). Creswell (2104) indicates that it is important to determine when using surveys, whether scores from previous results demonstrate reliability. For example, in a test of employee motivation, a participant should have approximately the same response on each test completion (Heale
& Twycross, 2015). In the case of this research, reliability was obtained through the data collection procedure. Data collection incorporated seven faith-based organizations; however, data collection methods were consistent across all organizations. This ensured a quality and consistency of the measures (Heale & Twycross, 2015).

Initially, the researcher secured documents indicating agreement for participation from an individual with authority at each of the seven faith-based organization. All agreements have been retained by the researchers. The combined survey instrument was reviewed multiple times by the researcher and three live test surveys were completed by volunteers to ensure there were no issues with the process. Finally, a secured link was created by Mind Garden, Inc., and provided to the researcher. Documentation via email was retained indicating exact days of distribution to the lead representative in each organization. Further discussion on the reliability of the research instruments is in the Instrument section above.

Validity

Accuracy in the measurement used in quantitative studies is the concept of research validity (Heale & Twycross, 2015). Creswell (2014) indicates that there are three traditional forms of validity: content reporting (content validity), predictive criteria (criterion validity), and construct validity. Content validity is the degree to which the research instrument provides an accurate measure in all areas on the theory (Heale & Twycross, 2015). Face validity is a subset of content validity and considers whether a research instrument truly measures the concept for which it was intended (Heale & Twycross, 2015).
Construct validity occurs when inadequate measure and definitions of variables are used (Creswell, 2014). Construct validity is the degree to which a research tool provides a measure for the intended theory (Heale & Twycross, 2015). Criterion validity is the degree to which the instrument relates to other instruments (Heale & Twycross, 2015).

The MLQ has been validated through research (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Heale & Twycross, 2015). Content validity of Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) TCM Employee Commitment Survey was established previously and the MLQ Form 5X has been validated and cross-validated which demonstrates these instruments accurately measure all aspects of the constructs (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Heale & Twycross, 2015). As indicated above, internal consistency of the TCM has been estimated using a coefficient alpha (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Furthermore, empirical findings provide evidence of construct validity, are consistent with predictions, and add to the confidence of the validity of the construct measures (Meyer & Allen, 1997, 2004). Meyer and Allen (2004) indicate that research findings provide evidence of validity of affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Statistical Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀₁. There is no significant</td>
<td>IV: Transformational</td>
<td>IV: Sum of the means</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationship between personal leadership style (IV) and organizational commitment (DV)  

Transaction (1, 4, 11, 16, 22, 24, 27 & 35)  
Passive/Avoidant (3, 5, 6, 12, 17, 20, 28 & 33)  
DV: Affective Commitment DV: Sum of the means (46-53)  
Normative Commitment (54-61)  
Continuance Commitment (62-69)  

Table 2 illustrates the null hypothesis, specific survey questions as they relate to the independent and dependent variables, and proposed statistical tests. The MLQ contains nine questions (37-45) that do not measure leadership styles but rather the outcomes of leadership behavior and will be excluded in the data interpretation.

There are two forms of threats to research validity: internal and external. Internal validity considers the design of the research, the collection of the data, whether the participants can make confident judgements, without bias, about the variables being tested, and whether the researcher’s analysis supports the research findings (Wilson,
Internal validity can be compromised and can impact the researcher’s ability to make inferences about the population from the data (Creswell, 2014). Internal validity can also occur when surveys are conducted inconsistently, therefore, to counter threats to internal validity, the researcher used a consistent survey instrument and method for data collection across all organizations. Internal validity can also be threatened by statistical regression and subject selection. To reduce this threat, the research was conducted across several faith-based organizations of various size and purpose, and participation was open to all employees over the age of 18 with at least one year of work experience in an FBO. Additionally, instrumentation measurements and data analysis were treated consistently across all participants. The research design was correlational and data was analyzed using multiple regression, which addressed threats to internal validity.

External validity considers the correctness of ethical judgements on whether the research experiment can be generalized across a variety of contexts (Wilson, 2016). It is more difficult to ensuring external validity (Wilson, 2016). External threats to validity can occur when incorrect inferences are drawn from the sample data (Creswell, 2014). External validity of the research is evidenced in the multiple studies available in scholarly and professional literature that have used both instruments. Leadership style is as antecedent as well as major influencing factor of organizational commitment (Sabir et al., 2011; Saha, 2016). Research indicated a statistically significant relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment (Gatling et al., 2016). Studies have been conducted in multiple industries including emergency services, governmental agencies, call centers, education, banking, mining, manufacturing and service industries (Fasola et
al., 2013; Feiziet al., 2014; Khasawneh et al., 2012; Mclaggen et al., 2013; Mesu et al., 2015; Shim et al., 2015). To reduce the threat to external validity, the research was conducted across several faith-based organizations. Also, the survey instruments have been used globally across various organizational sizes and in a variety of cultures demonstrating generalizability of the research (Fasola et al., 2013; Mclaggen et al., 2013; Mesu et al., 2015; Zehir et al., 2012; Susanj & Jakopec, 2012).

**Transition and Summary**

This section provided details on the research purpose, role of the researcher, population, sampling technique, and participants. Additionally, specifics on the research method and design, survey instruments, data collection process, method of data organization, and data analysis techniques were included. The section concludes with information on reliability and validity. The research approach was deemed suitable for testing leadership style and organizational commitment. A systematic method was used to consider the research and

The following section presents an overview of research along with the results and an interpretation of the findings. Additionally, details of the categorical variables, descriptive statistics, and regression analysis are presented. The researcher provides details on the contribution to academic and professional literature and recommendations based on the results obtained.
Section 3: Application to Professional Practice and Implications for Change

An overview of the application to professional practice and research implications are presented below. The researcher provides an overview of the study and a presentation of the findings. Data results include frequencies and descriptive statistics. This section provides details on the conclusions made from the research, and recommendations for action as well as future studies. Lastly, the researcher's experience of the process is detailed along with a reflection on biblical integration.

**Overview of Study**

Leadership and employee commitment are important concepts in business; however, in the industry of faith-based organizations, the current body of research provided little data. The purpose of this research was to test Bass and Avolio’s (1992) broad leadership theory types and Meyer and Allen’s (1993) theory of organizational commitment. A combined survey instrument was developed and distributed to employees in seven faith-based organizations. The research was designed to answer one research question: Is there a relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations? Detail on the research findings are presented in the sections below.

**Presentation of the Findings**

The research was conducted using a survey distributed electronically to seven faith-based organizations representing five organizational types (K-12 education, ministry, church, higher education, and accreditation/certification). Organizations varied
in demographics and faith-based purpose. Participants varied in their employment status (full or part time), in addition to other demographic factors (age and gender).

**Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics**

Data results were analyzed using frequencies and percentages. A total of 102 faith-based employees completed the survey and the responses were analyzed for this research. Appendix G provides data on the moderating variables. Males accounted for 55% of the participants and 44% were females, one participant chose to withhold their gender. The respondents were predominately Caucasian and accounted for 93.1. Baby Boomers and Generation X were the largest groups equally representing 33.3%. Millennials were represented at 31.4% and Traditionalist were the smallest group at 2%. Over 82.4% of the respondents were employed full time and 17.6% were employed part time. Of the faith-based organization types, participants most frequently worked for churches and represented 38.2% of the responses. Over 27% of the respondents work in ministry, and 23.5% work in higher education. The smallest group of respondents were employees in K-12 Education, which accounted for 7.8%, and Christian accreditation/certification, which accounted for 2.9%.

Table 3 represents the descriptive statistics for employee leadership style measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The highest mean score of FBO employee’s self-rated leadership style was individual consideration (IC), and was consistent with the MLQ 5X 2004 normative data. Leaders with individual consideration (IC) pay special attention to the needs, achievement, and growth of followers through coaching and mentorship (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Overall, the self-rating mean scores of
FBO employees were higher than the normative data in the following areas: acting with integrity (IIB), encouraging others (IM), innovative thinking (IS), individualized consideration (IC), and active management-by-exception (MBEA). However, the lowest mean score in both samples (FBO’s and MLQ normative data) was the laissez-faire (LF) leadership style. The research indicated that collectively, transformational leadership had the highest mean scores of the three broad leadership types.

Table 3

| Descriptive Statistics for Employee Leadership Style Self-Rating |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                       | N    | Mean  | SD    |
| Transformational Leadership |     |       |       |
| Idealized Influence                            | 102  | 2.930 | .5404 |
| Inspirational Motivation (IM)                   | 102  | 3.106 | .6098 |
| Intellectual Stimulation (IS)                    | 102  | 2.996 | .5556 |
| Individual Consideration (IC)                    | 102  | 3.283 | .5263 |
| Transactional Leadership                         |     |       |       |
| Contingent Reward (CR)                           | 102  | 2.894 | .6068 |
| Management-by-Exception                           |     |       |       |
| Active (MBEA)                                     | 102  | 2.015 | .7559 |
| Passive (MBEP)                                    | 102  | 1.030 | .6937 |
| Passive-Avoidant Leadership                      |     |       |       |
| Laissez-Faire (LF)                                | 102  | .626  | .5470 |

*Scale 0 – 4

Table 4 represents the descriptive statistics for employee commitment measured by the Three-Component Model (TCM) of Employee Commitment. Affective commitment is a desire-based commitment, while normative commitment implies the employee feels a responsibility to stay with the organization (Gatling et al., 2016).
Continuance commitment considers the cost to the employee of separating from the organization (Gatling et al., 2016). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment create some form of attachment to the organization and help to decrease the prospect of an employee leaving, but each has differing implications on employee workplace behavior (Meyer, Stanley, & Parfyonova, 2012).

The results indicated that across the FBOs surveyed, affective commitment had the highest mean score (3.894). Affective commitment involves employee engagement with the organization on an emotional level. This was followed by normative commitment with a mean score of 3.485, and implies that FBO employees feel an obligation to their organization. Of the commitment types, normative commitment, the consideration of the cost of leaving the organization, had the lowest mean score (2.787).

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Employee Commitment Self-Rating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.894</td>
<td>.8779</td>
<td>1.3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.787</td>
<td>.8052</td>
<td>1-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>.8437</td>
<td>1-4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale 1-5

The three commitment types should be viewed together as a commitment profile indicating that in the case of FBOs, employees have a strong affective and normative commitment profile (Meyer et al., 2012). When a strong affective commitment is combined with normative commitment, it can be experienced as a commitment to ‘do the right thing’ or as a strong sense of morality (Meyer et al., 2012).
Correlations

Data results were analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The significance level selected was $\alpha=.05$, an industry standard, and signified the acceptable amount of risk the researcher was willing to accept given the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis, if in fact it was true (Hemsworth, Muterera, & Baregheh, 2013). The corresponding null ($H_0$) and alternative ($H_A$) hypotheses were:

$H_0$1: There is no statistically significant relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

$H_A$1: There is a statistically significant relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations.

The null hypothesis was tested using the Pearson correlational analysis and is presented in Table 5 below. While at best, correlations were very weak, comparatively, inspirational motivation (IM) demonstrated the strongest correlation and was positively correlated ($r=.302$) with affective commitment, and negatively correlated ($r=-.326$) with continuance commitment. Affective commitment (emotion, identification, and involvement) differs from continuance commitment, which considers a presumed sacrifice of leaving the organization (Gatling et al., 2016). More specifically, affective commitment is a desired-based commitment while continuance commitment is a cost-based commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The positive correlation between inspirational motivation (IM) and affective commitment demonstrated a weak attachment
through desire, emotion, personal identification, or involvement to the faith-based organization. The negative correlation between inspirational motivation (IM) and continuance commitment demonstrated that as a FBO employee’s motivation increased, continuance commitment, or the feeling that there are limited employment options, decreased.

Affective commitment was also correlated with attributed (IIA) and behavioral (IIB) idealized influence. Idealized influence is leadership charisma and was positively correlated to affective commitment (attributed, \( r = .259 \)) and (behavioral, \( r = .268 \)). However, in both instances, this only demonstrated a weak association.

Intellectual stimulation (IS) is one of the four transformational leadership theory behaviors (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass & Avolio, 1997). In testing the relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment in faith-based organizations, intellectual stimulation (IS) was negatively correlated to all commitment types, but more significantly to continuance commitment (\( r = -.246 \)). Intellectual stimulation (IS) considers the degree to which leadership encourages creativity, innovation, and nurtures the employee’s values and beliefs (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Bass, 1990, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). The negative correlation indicated that as intellectual stimulation (IS) increased, normative commitment, and more specifically continuance commitment, decreased. It can also be inferred that as the employee more self-identified with intellectual stimulation (IS), commitment was driven by opportunities of innovation. Overall, it is important to recognize that correlation does not imply causation and at best, these correlations were very weak. There were several individual correlations found to
be significant at .01 and .05, and the research results demonstrated both positive and negative correlations.

Considering the outcome of the correlation analysis of all components of transformational leadership and affective commitment, the results indicated transformational leadership (except for individual consideration (IC) and intellectual stimulation (IS)), accounted for the strongest linear relationships in affective commitment ($r=.436$) (Table 6). Passive management-by-exception (MBEP) demonstrated a negative and weak linear relationship in affective commitment ($r=-.031$) and represented the highest correlation to continuance commitment ($r=.197$).

Table 5

*Pearson Correlations between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.210*</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active (MBEA)</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.197*</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive (MBEP)</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire (LF)</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation at $\alpha=0.01$ (2-tailed)
*Correlation at $\alpha=0.05$ (2-tailed)
Data results were analyzed using regression analysis and are presented in Tables 6-44. Table 6 provides a summary of the fit of leadership style to affective commitment. Considering the three commitment types individually, there was an expectation that affective commitment would influence positive effects on employee performance and workplace commitment (Meyer et al., 2012). In analyzing the $R$ value for the three broad leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire), the regression model demonstrated a weak relationship. Transformational leadership, which had a cumulative $R$ value of $.436$ demonstrated a positive and weak strength to affective commitment. Furthermore, when $R$ squared is equal to one, the model demonstrates perfect predictability; however, if there is no predictability, then $R$ squared is equal to zero. In the case of affective commitment, the highest $R^2$ value was transformational leadership (.190) indicating little to no predictability.

Table 6

| Summary of Simple Regression of Leadership Style and Affective Commitment |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|
| **Leadership Style** | $R$ | $R^2$ | SD  |
| Transformational Leadership | .436 | .190 | .8105 |
| Idealized Influence | | | |
| Attributed | .259 | .067 | .8522 |
| Behavioral | .268 | .072 | .8501 |
| Inspirational Motivation | .302 | .091 | .8412 |
| Intellectual Stimulation | -.068 | .005 | .8803 |
| Individual Consideration | .052 | .003 | .8811 |
| Transactional Leadership | .199 | .040 | .8735 |
| Contingent Reward | .197 | .039 | .8651 |
| Management-by-Exception | | | |
| Active | .080 | .006 | .8795 |
| Passive | -.031 | .001 | .8819 |
Table 7 provides the results of a multiple regression analysis of each individual leadership style and the relationship to affective commitment. The regression analysis demonstrated that intellectual stimulation (IS) contributed the most to affective commitment followed by behavioral idealized influence (IIB). Considering the outcomes of all components of leadership and affective commitment, the results indicated (except for intellectual stimulation (IS), a component of transformational leadership), leadership style does not account for variations in affective commitment.

A p-value less than or equal to .05 demonstrates that the null hypothesis should be rejected, while a p-value greater than .05 would not provide enough evidence and indicates the results occurred by chance. Intellectual stimulation (IS), the leadership idea of encouraging innovative thinking, had a p-value of .028. This provided little evidence that affective commitment was influenced by a component of transformational leadership.

An analysis on collinearity was conducted and the variance information factor (VIF) for all leadership styles and affective commitment indicated there was no collinearity between the variables. The highest collinearity was individual consideration (IC) which had a value of 2.453, and behavioral individualized influence (IIB) with a value of 2.444; however, these values were not correlated and do not explain variability in the data.
Table 7

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis and Collinearity Statistics of Leadership Style and Affective 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>.443&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.8248236231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF), Rewards Achievement (CR), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Fights Fires (MBEP), Builds Trust (IIA), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Coaches; Develops People (IC), Encourages Others (IM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>15.266</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>.013&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>62.591</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale

<sup>b</sup> Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF), Rewards Achievement (CR), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Fights Fires (MBEP), Builds Trust (IIA), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Coaches; Develops People (IC), Encourages Others (IM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.010</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>4.199</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Trust (IIA)</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts with Integrity (IIB)</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Others (IM)</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>1.630</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS) | -0.451 | 0.202 | -0.285 | -2.232 | 0.028 | 0.535 | 1.868
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Coaches; Develops People (IC) | -0.253 | 0.244 | -0.152 | -1.037 | 0.303 | 0.408 | 2.453
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Rewards Achievement (CR) | 0.113 | 0.183 | 0.078 | 0.618 | 0.538 | 0.545 | 1.833
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA) | -0.006 | 0.121 | -0.005 | -0.052 | 0.958 | 0.801 | 1.249
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Fights Fires (MBEP) | -0.060 | 0.149 | -0.047 | -0.402 | 0.689 | 0.634 | 1.578
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Avoids Involvement (LF) | -0.024 | 0.190 | -0.015 | -0.128 | 0.898 | 0.626 | 1.598
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale

Tables 8-16 provide a detailed illustration of the analysis of variance of each individual leadership attribute as it related to the individual dependent variable affective commitment. The p-value for each variable tested the null hypothesis. Table 8, 9, and 10 represent transformational leadership characteristics of attributed idealized influence (IIA), behavioral idealized influence (IIB), and inspirational motivation (IM), and had p-values significant at $\alpha=0.05$. The regression model for these individual transformational attributes predicted affective commitment. Additionally, contingent reward (CR) (Table 13) had a significant p-value, and predicted affective commitment. The data analysis indicated that the remainder of leadership styles, individual consideration (IC),
intellectual stimulation (IS), management-by-exception (MBEA and MBEP), and laissez-faire (LF) did not predict affective commitment.

Table 8 demonstrates the analysis of variance of attributed idealized influence (IIA) (transformational leadership) on affective commitment. The $F$ statistic determined whether the model predicted statistical significance, where $F(1,101)= 7.199$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than a 0.9% chance that an $F$ statistic this large would occur if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict affective commitment and there was statistical significance between the variables. Although there was predictability, the positive $R$ value (.259) did not represent a strong linear relationship between attributed idealized influence (IIA) and affective commitment.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.228</td>
<td>7.199</td>
<td>.009b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>72.628</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Builds Trust (IIA)

Table 9 illustrates the analysis of variance of behavioral idealized influence (IIB) (transformational leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)= 7.730$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was a 0.6% chance that an $F$-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict
affective commitment and there was statistical significance between the variables. Although there was predictability, the positive $R$ value (.268) did not represent a strong linear relationship between behavioral idealized influence (IIB) and affective commitment.

Table 9

ANOVA of Idealized Influence (Behavioral) on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>7.730</td>
<td>.006b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>72.270</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Acts with Integrity (IIB)

Table 10 illustrates the analysis of variance of inspirational motivation (IM) (transformational leadership) on affective commitment where $F(1,101)= 10.05$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 0.2% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict affective commitment. There was predictability, and the positive $R$ value (.302) represented a weak linear relationship between inspirational motivation and affective commitment. Even though it did not represent a strong linear relationship, inspirational motivation (IM) had the strongest correlation to affective commitment.
Table 10

ANOVA of Inspirational Motivation on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.094</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>.002b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>70.763</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 11 illustrates the analysis of variance of intellectual stimulation (IS) (transformational leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)=.468$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than a 49.6% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.

Table 11

ANOVA of Intellectual Stimulation on Affective Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.496b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>77.494</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS)
Table 12 illustrates the analysis of variance of individual consideration (IC) (transformational leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)=.274$, and $p>.05$.

This indicated that there was less than 60.2% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.

Table 12

ANOVA of Individual Consideration on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.602b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>77.644</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches; Develops People (IC)

Table 13 illustrates the analysis of variance of contingent reward (CR) (transactional leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)=4.018$, and $p<.05$.

This indicated that there was less than 4.8% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict affective commitment. Although contingent reward (CR) had a positive $R$ value (.197) this did not represent a strong linear relationship between the variables.
Table 13

*ANOVA of Contingent Reward on Affective Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.007</td>
<td>4.018</td>
<td>.048b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>74.849</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Table 14 illustrates the analysis of variance of active management-by-exception (MBEA) (transactional leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101) = .641$, and $p > .05$. This indicated that there was less than 42.5% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.

Table 14

*ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Active) on Affective Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.425b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>77.361</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA)
Table 15 illustrates the analysis of variance of passive management-by-exception (MBEP) (transactional leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)=.099$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 75.4% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.

Table 15

ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Passive) on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.754b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP)

Tables 16-18 provide a summary of the analysis of variance of each leadership style (transformational, transactional, laissez-faire) as it relates to the individual dependent variable affective commitment. Table 16 illustrates the analysis of variance of laissez-faire (LF) (passive-avoidant leadership) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)=1.029$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 31.3% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis were false; therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.
Table 16

Summary ANOVA of Laissez-Faire Leadership on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>.313b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>77.064</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF)

Table 17 illustrates a summary of the analysis of variance for all transformational leadership characteristics: idealized influence, attributed (IIA) and behavioral (IIB), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)= 4.501$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than a .1% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the summary transformational regression model did predict affective commitment. Additionally, transformational leadership demonstrated predictability and a weak strength ($r= .436$) (Table 6).

Table 17

Summary ANOVA of Transformational Leadership on Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>14.787</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>4.501</td>
<td>.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.070</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches; Develops People (IC), Builds Trust (IIA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 18 illustrates the analysis of variance for all transactional leadership characteristics, contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception active (MBEA) and passive (MBEP) on affective commitment, where $F(1,101)= 1.346$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 26.4% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis were false; therefore, the regression model did not predict affective commitment.

Table 18

**Summary ANOVA of Transactional Leadership on Affective Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>74.776</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.856</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Table 19 provides a summary of the simple regression analysis of each leadership style on continuance commitment. The results of the regression analysis indicated that the highest variation was accounted for by inspirational motivation (IM), an independent variable representing the transformational leadership style.
Table 19 also provides $R$ values and the adjusted $R^2$ values of the broad leadership styles and the relationship to continuance commitment. In analyzing the $R^2$ value the three broad leadership styles (transformational, transaction, and laissez-faire), the regression model showed a weak relationship. However, the most impactful relationship between leadership and continuance commitment was transformational leadership, which had a cumulative $R^2$ value of .127, and was lower than the $R^2$ for affective and normative commitment. The individual leadership characteristics with the greatest $R^2$ value of .106, was inspirational motivation (IM). The least impactful relationship was contingent reward (CR), which had a $R^2$ value of .024, indicating there was low predictability.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed (IIA)</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.7938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (IIB)</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.7945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.7650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>-.246</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.7844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.7911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.7997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-Exception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active (MBEA)</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.7934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive (MBEP)</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.7969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire (LF)</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.7942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 provides a multiple regression analysis of each leadership style and the relationship to continuance commitment. The results indicated that active management-by-exception (MBEA), an independent variable representing the transactional leadership style, contributed the most to continuance commitment. Unlike the correlations, the regression results of all components of leadership and continuance commitment indicated (except for active management-by-exception (MBEA) and inspirational motivation (IM)), leadership styles did not account for variations in continuance commitment.

An analysis on collinearity was conducted and the variance information factor (VIF) for all leadership styles and continuance commitment indicated there was no collinearity between the variables. The highest collinearity was individualized consideration (IC), which had a value of 2.453; however, this was low and did not explain variability in the data.

Table 20

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis and Collinearity Statistics of Leadership Style and Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary(^b)</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>.440(^a)</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.7575980213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(^a)</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>12.690</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.410</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>.015(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coefficientsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.812</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>5.789</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Trust (IIA)</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.168.867</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts with Integrity (IIB)</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.353.725</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Others (IM)</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-1.998.049</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS)</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>-1.575.119</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches; Develops People (IC)</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.798.427</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards Achievement (CR)</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.084.933</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA)</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>2.400.018</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fights Fires (MBEP)</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.540.591</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids Involvement (LF)</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.540.591</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
The data in Tables 21-31 provide a detailed illustration of the analysis of variance of each individual leadership attribute as it related to the individual dependent variable continuance commitment. Tables 21-25 represent individual characteristics of transformational leadership, attributed idealized influence (IIA) (p=.05), individual motivation (IM) (p=.001), intellectual stimulation (IS) (p=.013), and individualized consideration (IC) (p=.034), which all indicated a positive correlation to continuance commitment. Table 27 represents the transactional leadership characteristic active management-by-expectation (MBEA) (p=.047), which indicated a positive correlation to continuance commitment. Table 30 represents transformational leadership, which had a p-value of .021, and the regression model indicated a positive relationship to continuance commitment. The data analysis also indicated that behavioral individualized influence (IIB), contingent reward (CR), passive management-by-exception (MBEP), and laissez-faire (LF) leadership did not demonstrate a relationship to continuance commitment.

Table 21 illustrates the analysis of variance of attributed idealized influence (IIA) (transformational leadership) on continuance commitment, where \( F(1,101)= 3.934 \), and \( p=.05 \). This indicated that there was a 5% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. There was statistical significance between attributed idealized influence (IIA) and continuance commitment. However, the \( R \) value was .195, the \( R^2 \) was .038, and the adjusted \( R \) square was .028, which did not represent a strong correlation between the variables.
Table 21

ANOVA of Idealized Influence (Attributed) on Continuous Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>3.934</td>
<td>.050b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.015</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Builds Trust (IIA)

Table 22 illustrates the analysis of variance of behavioral idealized influence (IIB) (transformational leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.736$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than a 5% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis were false. The null hypothesis was rejected, which indicates the regression model did not predict continuance commitment.

Table 22

ANOVA of Idealized Influence (Behavioral) on Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>.056b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Acts with Integrity (IIB)
Table 23 illustrates the analysis of variance of inspirational motivation (IM) (transformational leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 11.910$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 0.1% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. Additionally, the $R$ value was .326 and the $R^2$ was .106, and the correlation demonstrated a positive but weak strength between inspirational motivation (IM) and continuance commitment.

Table 23

ANOVA of Inspirational Motivation on Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.970</td>
<td>11.910</td>
<td>.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>58.523</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 24 illustrates the analysis of variance of intellectual stimulation (IS) (transformational leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 6.428$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 1.3% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. However, the $R$ value was .246, the $R^2$ was .060, and the adjusted $R$ square was .051, and the correlation results indicate there was not a strong linear relationship between the variables.
Table 24

ANOVA of Intellectual Stimulation on Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.955</td>
<td>6.428</td>
<td>.013b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61.538</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS)

Table 25 illustrates the analysis of variance of individual consideration (IC) (transformational leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 4.626$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 3.4% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. However, the $R$ value was .210, the $R^2$ was .044, and the adjusted $R$ square was .035, and the correlations results indicate there is not a strong linear relationship between the variables.

Table 25

ANOVA of Individual Consideration on Continuance Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.896</td>
<td>4.626</td>
<td>.034b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>65.598</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches & Develops People (IC)
Table 26 illustrates the analysis of variance of contingent reward (CR) (transactional leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101) = 2.407$, and $p > .05$. This indicated that there was less than 12.4% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict continuance commitment.

Table 26

**ANOVA of Contingent Reward on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>.124b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.954</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Table 27 illustrates the analysis of variance of active management-by-exception (MBEA) (transactional leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101) = 4.030$, and $p < .05$. This indicated that there was less than 4.7% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. Although there was predictability, the $R$ value was .179, the $R^2$ was .032, and the adjusted $R$ square was .022, which did not represent a strong linear relationship.
Table 27

**ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Active) on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.537</td>
<td>4.030</td>
<td>.047b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>62.956</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA)

Table 28 illustrates the analysis of variance of passive management-by-exception (MBEP) (transactional leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.110$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 8.1% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict continuance commitment.

Table 28

**ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Passive) on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.975</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>.081b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.518</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP)
Table 29 illustrates the analysis of variance of laisse-faire (LF) (passive-avoidant leadership) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.821$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 5.3% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict continuance commitment.

Table 29

**Summary ANOVA of Laissez-Faire Leadership on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>3.821</td>
<td>.053b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63.083</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF)

Table 30 illustrates the analysis of variance for all transformational leadership characteristics (idealized influence (attributed (IIA) and behavioral (IIB)), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 2.806$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 2.1% chance that a $F$ statistics this small would happen if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. Additionally, the $R$ value was .357, the $R^2$ was .127, and the adjusted $R$ square was .082. which represents a weak linear relationship.
Table 30

**Summary ANOVA of Transformational Leadership on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8.350</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>.021b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>57.143</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches; Develops People (IC), Builds Trust (IIA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 31 illustrates the analysis of variance of all for transactional leadership characteristics (contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception (active (MBEA) and passive (MBEP)) on continuance commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.536$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 1.8% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true, therefore, the regression model did predict continuance commitment. Additionally, the $R$ value was .313, the $R^2$ was .098, and the adjusted $R$ square was .070, which represents a weak linear relationship.

Table 31

**Summary ANOVA of Transactional Leadership on Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.398</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>.018b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>59.096</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.493</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Table 32 provides a summary of simple regression analysis of each leadership style on normative commitment. The results indicated that the highest variation was accounted for by passive management-by-exception (MBEP), \( R^2 = .38 \), an independent variable representing the transactional leadership style. Table 32 also provides \( R \) values and adjusted \( R^2 \) values of the broad leadership styles, and the relationship to normative commitment. In analyzing the \( R^2 \) value for each individual characteristic, and the three broad leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire), the regression model showed a weak relationship. However, the most impactful relationship between leadership and normative commitment was transformational leadership. The cumulative \( R^2 \) value of .144, which was lower than the \( R^2 \) for affective commitment, but higher than the \( R^2 \) for continuance commitment. The least impactful relationship was inspirational motivation (IM), which had a \( R^2 \) value of .001, indicating there is almost no predictability. This was followed closely by attributed idealized influence (IIA) and contingent reward (CR),

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed (IIA)</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.8457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral (IIB)</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.8374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.8475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.8349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 33 provides a multiple regression analysis of each leadership style and the relationship to normative commitment. The results indicated that the highest variations were accounted for by encourages innovative thinking (IS), an independent variable representing the transformational leadership style. Intellectual stimulation (IS) represented 2.5% of the variation relative to normative commitment. Considering the outcome of the multiple regression analysis of all components of leadership and normative commitment, the results indicated, expect for inspirational stimulation (IS) and behavioral idealized influence (IIB), both characteristics of transformational leadership, leadership styles did not account for variations in normative commitment. There was little evidence that normative commitment was influenced by any leadership style.

An analysis on collinearity was conducted and the variance information factor (VIF) for all leadership styles and normative commitment indicated there was no collinearity between the variables. The highest collinearity was inspirational motivation (IM) which had a value of 2.453; however, this was low and did not explain variability in the data. This was also consistent with the multiple regression results for affective and continuance commitment.
Table 33

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis and Collinearity Statistics of Leadership Style and Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF), Rewards Achievement (CR), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Fights Fires (MBEP), Builds Trust (IIA), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Coaches; Develops People (IC), Encourages Others (IM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Trust (IIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts with Integrity (IIB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Others (IM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Tables 34-42 provide a detailed illustration of the analysis of variance of each individual leadership attribute as it relates to the dependent variable normative commitment. Passive management-by-exception (MBEP), an individual leadership attribute of transactional leadership, had $p$-values significant at an $\alpha=.05$ and did predict normative commitment. No other leadership attributed demonstrated predictability with normative commitment.

Table 34 illustrates the analysis of variance of attributed idealized influence (IIA) (transformational leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= .527$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than a 46.9% chance that an F-ratio this small
would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 34

ANOVA of Idealized Influence (Attributed) on Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.469b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>50.535</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.026</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Builds Trust (IIA)

Table 35 illustrates the analysis of variance of behavioral idealized influence (IIB) (transformational leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)=2.541$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than an 11.4% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 35

ANOVA of Idealized Influence (Behavioral) on Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td>.114b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>70.126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Acts with Integrity (IIB)
Table 36 illustrates the analysis of variance of inspirational motivation (IM) (transformational leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= .097$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 75.6% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.756b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>71.838</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 37 illustrates the analysis of variance of intellectual stimulation (IS) (transformational leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.143$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 7.9% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.
Table 37  
*ANOVA of Intellectual Stimulation on Normative Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>.079b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>47.209</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.026</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS)

Table 38 illustrates the analysis of variance of individual consideration (IC) (transformational leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= 1.919$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 16.9% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 38  
*ANOVA of Individual Consideration on Normative Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>.169b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>70.554</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches & Develops People (IC)
Table 39 illustrates the analysis of variance of contingent reward (CR) (transactional leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)=.979$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 32.5% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false, therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 39

**ANOVA of Contingent Reward on Normative Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.325b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>71.211</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Table 40 illustrates the analysis of variance of active management-by-exception (MBEA) (transactional leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)=3.300$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 7.2% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.
Table 40

ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Active) on Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>.072b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>69.611</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Monitors Deviations; Mistakes (MBEA)

Table 41 illustrates the analysis of variance of passive management-by-exception (MBEP) (transactional leadership) on normative commitment, where \( F(1,101)= 3.964 \), and \( p<.05 \). This indicated that there was less than 4.9% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict normative commitment. However, the \( R \) value was .195, the \( R^2 \) was .038, and the adjusted \( R \) square was .029, and this did not represent a strong linear relationship.

Table 41

ANOVA of Management-by-Exception (Passive) on Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>3.964</td>
<td>.049b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>49.179</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.026</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP)
Table 42 illustrates the analysis of variance of laissez-faire (LF) (passive-avoidant leadership) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= 1.464$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 22.9% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 42

**ANOVA of Laissez-Faire Leadership on Normative Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>.229b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>70.870</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Avoids Involvement (LF)

Table 43 illustrates the analysis of variance of all for transformational leadership characteristics (idealized influence (attributed (IIA) and behavioral (IIB)), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individual consideration (IC) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= 3.231$, and $p<.05$. This indicated that there was less than 1% chance that an F-ratio this large would happen if the null hypothesis was true; therefore, the regression model did predict normative commitment. This represented a weak linear as the $R$ value was .380, the $R^2$ was .144, and the adjusted $R$ square was .099.
Table 43

**Summary ANOVA of Transformational Leadership on Normative Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>10.358</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td>.010b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61.550</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Coaches & Develops People (IC), Builds Trust (IIA), Encourages Innovative Thinking (IS), Acts with Integrity (IIB), Encourages Others (IM)

Table 44 illustrates the analysis of variance of all for transactional leadership characteristics (contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception (active (MBEA) and passive (MBEP)) on normative commitment, where $F(1,101)= 2.279$, and $p>.05$. This indicated that there was less than 8.4% chance that an F-ratio this small would happen if the null hypothesis was false; therefore, the regression model did not predict normative commitment.

Table 44

**Summary ANOVA of Transactional Leadership on Normative Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.690</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>2.279</td>
<td>.084b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>67.218</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.908</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment Scale
b. Predictors: (Constant), Fights Fires (MBEP), Monitors Deviations & Mistakes (MBEA), Rewards Achievement (CR)

Three individual transformational characteristics, attributed idealized influence (IIA) (Table 8), behavioral idealized influence (IIB) (Table 9), and inspirational motivation (IM) (Table 10), demonstrated that the regression models did predict affective commitment, however only inspirational motivation (IM) demonstrated a weak strength. One individual transactional characteristic, contingent reward (CR) (Table 13) demonstrated that the regression model predicted affective commitment. However, the correlational results did not demonstrate a linear relationship. Moreover, transformational leadership (Table 17) predicted affective commitment, and demonstrated a weak association to affective commitment.

Four individual transformational characteristics, attributed idealized influence (IIA) (Table 21), inspirational motivation (IM) (Table 23), intellectual stimulation (IS) (Table 24), and individual consideration (IC) (Table 25), demonstrated that the regression models did predict continuance commitment. One individual transactional characteristic, active management-by-exception (MBEA) (Table 27), demonstrated that the regression model did predict continuance commitment. However, there was no strength between the variables. Moreover, transformational leadership (Table 30) and transactional leadership (Table 31) predicted continuance commitment. There was also a weak association between transformational leadership and continuance commitment. One individual transactional leadership style passive management-by-exception (MBEP) (Table 41), demonstrated that the regression model did predict normative commitment. However,
this did not represent a strong linear relationship. Moreover, transformational leadership (Table 43) predicted normative commitment and demonstrated a weak strength.

In summary, the correlation analysis demonstrated a weak association between inspirational motivation (IM) and affective and normative commitment. The regression analysis demonstrated that transformational leadership predicted all commitment types (affective, continuance, and normative). There were sub variables of leadership style which demonstrated some predictability towards commitment. Few leadership styles demonstrated statistical significance. Overall, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Applications to Professional Practice

Regardless of industry, leadership is important and impacts organizational commitment (Suriyamurthi, Velavan, & Radhiga, 2013). The research related directly to leadership and considered various leadership theories and the influence on organizational commitment. Leadership is very complex term and considers a broad range of topics (personality, individual characteristics, behavior, styles) as well as influences from and individuals position, responsibility, or sphere of influence (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2007). Leadership is influential in increasing efficiency, and commitment is an attitude that influences employee behavior (Suriyamurthi, Velavan, & Radhiga, 2013). Committed employees allocate effort within the organization (Suriyamurthi, Velavan, & Radhiga, 2013). Organizations, especially functional areas such as human resource, play a key role in employee commitment (Suriyamurthi, Velavan, & Radhiga, 2013). Also, team
collaboration influences organizational commitment (Gyensare, Anku-Tsede, Sanda, & Okpoti, 2016).

There is a gap in the literature in research conducted in faith-based organizations and this research provided data on leadership style and organizational commitment across several types of FBOs. The research indicated that there was no relationship between personal perceived leadership style and organizational commitment. This information is one part of understanding influences on organizational commitment of employees whose organizations have a faith-based purpose, and contributions to the body of academic literature on leadership style, organizational commitment, and employees of faith-based organizations.

Faith-based organizations have a unique role in areas of organizational leadership and the implications organizational commitment. Matthew 28:19-20a states, “Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you.” Advancing the gospel of Christ is an important part of the work of faith-based organizations and emphasizes the importance of this research on professional practice.

The concept of commitment is illustrated in the encounter between the rich young ruler and Jesus. Although the ruler demonstrated commitment through keeping the law, he was unwilling to sell all that he had to follow Christ (Mark 10:21). There is an emotional attachment to Christ (affective), an understanding of the benefits to stay committed (continuance), and the feelings of obligation to stay committed (normative).
Peter states, “See, we have left all and followed You” (Mark 10:38). Commitment is influenced by emotion, motivation and circumstance. Application of the Three Component Model (TCM) can assist organizations in developing positive affective commitment and increase employee workplace motivation (Meyer et al., 2012). It is possible to develop affective commitment and reduce the dependence on continuance and normative commitment (Meyer et al., 2012). Meyer et al. (2012) state that employees who have only normative or continuance commitment may experience boredom or a lack of motivation. Additionally, employees that lack affective commitment can impact the overall morale of the group (Meyer et al., 2012). This is detrimental to the cause of Christ and FBOs must work to ensure their employees work to develop a stronger affective commitment.

**Recommendations for Action**

The objective of this research was to examine the relationship between personal perceived leadership style and personal organizational commitment of employees in faith-based organizations. Overall, ANOVA results indicated weak predictability between personal leadership style and employee organizational commitment. There were statistically significant relationships to individual leadership characteristics. Tables 8, 9, 10, 13, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 41, and 43 illustrate these results. There were relationships between transformational leadership characteristics, such as attributed idealized influence (IIA) (Table 8 and 21) and inspirational motivation (IM) (Table 10 and 23), and the regression model predicted affective and continuance commitment. The summary ANOVA of transformational leadership on affective commitment (Table 17),
continuance commitment (Table 30), and normative commitment (Table 43) also demonstrated a predictive relationship. However, overall, there was no statistical significance discovered between the variables.

Commitment and job satisfaction toward an employing organization stimulates employee creativity and leads to innovation (Overall, 2015). This research adds to the understanding of employees of FBOs to better support the organizations faith-based purpose. Although personal leadership style did not impact personal organizational commitment, action should be taken to assess areas of leadership and leadership influence related to organizational commitment within FBOs. Additionally, transformational leadership impacted organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) and demonstrated weak predictability that cannot be ignored.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The objective of this research was to examine the relationship between personal perceived leadership style and personal perceived organization commitment. Academic literature supports a relationship between leadership style and commitment. The current body of literature has focused on organizational commitment as influenced by direct leadership and that a relationship between leader and follower does demonstrate a relationship relative to commitment. Literature also suggested a link between organizational commitment and multiple variables such as leadership style (Garg & Ramjee, 2013). The research suggested a weak predictability between commitment and transformational leadership. It has also been reported that leadership promotes a positive organizational culture and can influence commitment (Gulluce et al., 2016). The
research results indicated various relationships between several of the leadership styles and organizational commitment types. The researcher recommends that further studies be conducted in faith-based organizations on leader/follower relationships and effects on organizational commitment.

**Reflections**

The researcher had experience in both the public and private business sector as well as in the not-for-profit sector, specifically in three faith-based organizations. The researcher worked alongside multiple faith-based organizations of diverse sizes and purposes. In many faith-based organizations, especially smaller businesses, there tends to be a lack of leadership development and awareness of leadership practice. Having worked in and with several large faith-based organizations, the researcher was intrigued to understand if there was any relationship between an individual’s personal leadership style and levels of organizational commitment. Personal biased was eliminated due to the use of established survey instruments and the limitation of participant responses.

During the process, the researcher experienced several circumstances that influenced thoughts on organizational commitment. Although the researcher can be described as a transformational leader, with strong affective commitment, recent workplace circumstances (influenced by emotion, identification, and involvement), made it apparent that from a personal perspective, leadership style did not influence the researcher’s level of workplace commitment. Significant work-related challenges experienced during this research provided further insight on the understanding that personal perceived leadership had no significant relationship to organizational
commitment. However, transformational leadership weakly impacted organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) and this was a reminder that leaders need to find opportunities to increase affective and normative commitment for themselves as well as their followers.

There are multiple examples of leadership styles in the Bible. Transformational leaders, such as Moses, Abraham, and David, demonstrate the ability to inspire and influence followers and stirred emotions and achievement among followers (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Salahuddin, 2011). These leaders stimulated their followers to take risks and to achieve higher performance (Bacha & Walker, 2012; Leong & Rischer, 2011; Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Each of these leaders cultivated a trust with their followers (Giltinane, 2013). Each of these leaders demonstrated a strong affective and normative commitment when it came to following God.

Transactional leaders, such as Saul, Pharaoh, and Potiphar used a system of rewards and punishment to motivate their followers. Saul demonstrated such poor leadership and disobedience that God said, “I greatly regret that I have set up Saul as king, for he has turned back from following Me, and has not performed My commandments” (1 Samuel 15:10). Pharaoh used punishment to motivate the Israelites (Exodus 1:11). Joseph found favor in Potiphar sight and was promoted, and then was placed in prison (Genesis 39:4, 20).

Laissez-faire leaders such as Belshazzar allow complete freedom and provide no guidance (Daniel 5; Bhatti et al., 2012). Belshazzar required little of his followers and exhibited a hands-off leadership (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Jonah also exhibited
laissez-faire leadership and he demonstrates an absence of leadership and wanted no involvement with potential followers of Nineveh (Jonah 3). Jonah demonstrated a lack of commitment to the cause of Christ. The Bible provides excellent examples of all broad leadership styles and offers believers instances where individuals in positions of leadership have succeeded in using God’s blessings and resources to honor Him. Likewise, there are examples where leaders failed, for a variety of reasons, and God provides examples of consequences when leaders abuse authority.

**Summary and Study Conclusions**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational research was to test Bass and Avolio’s (1992) broad leadership theory types and Meyer and Allen’s (1993) theory of organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations. The research was conducted in seven faith-based organizations and included a cross representation of organizational type, employee job function, tenure, and level of responsibility. Participants were from two large mega-churches, a K-12 Christian school, a Christian University, two small ministries, and a national Christian certification agency. These organizations had a faith-based purpose, were registered as a 501©(3) Public Charity, and had annual gross receipts exceeding $25,000.

The researcher used Bass and Avolio’s (1992) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) which measures leadership types ranging from passive leadership to transformational leadership and is a validated research instrument that measures human behavior and personality. Additionally, the researcher used the TCM Employee Commitment Survey, developed by Meyer and Allen (1997), which defines
organizational commitment using three associated factors: affective, continuance, and normative and indicates a relationship between behavior and the organizational commitment of employees.

Although academic literature is available on leadership styles and workplace commitment, there is a lack of research in faith-based organizations (Longman & Lafreniere, 2012). The research approach was to determine if there is a relationship between personal perceived leadership style and personal organizational commitment. The transformational characteristics did predict affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Two transformational leadership characteristics did predict more than one commitment type. Attributed (IIA) and inspirational motivation (IM) predicted affective and continuance commitment. The research results indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and organizational commitment in employees of faith-based organizations. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.
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Appendix A: Sample of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Questions

Mind Garden, Inc. provided a letter of permission specifying the number of sample items allowed for inclusion in a dissertation appendix and a copyright statement (Appendix B). The authors of the MLQ only provide permission to list sample questions. The following sample of questions were selected from the MLQ (Form 5X) for inclusion in this research.

1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts.
2. I spend time teaching and coaching.
3. I display a sense of power and confidence.
4. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements.
5. I lead a group that is effective.
Appendix B: Permission to Use MLQ Appendix C: Questionnaire of Workplace
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Appendix C: Questionnaire of Workplace Commitment

Affective Commitment Scale

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization (Reverse Scored).
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization (Reverse Scored).
5. I do not feel like a "part of the family" at my organization (Reverse Scored).
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment Scale

1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

6. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

Normative Commitment Scale

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer (Reverse Scored).

2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.

3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.

4. This organization deserves my loyalty.

5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.

6. I owe a great deal to my organization
Appendix D: Permission to Use Questionnaire of Workplace Commitment

October 14, 2016
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### Appendix E: Instruments and Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Instrument</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sub variables</th>
<th>Sub variables</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td>46-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>52-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>58-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,18,21,25,6,14,23,34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,13,26,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,8,30,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,19,29,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,11,16,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management-by-exception (Active)</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,22,24,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management-by-exception (Passive)</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,12,17,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7,28,33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G: Demographic Data Frequencies and Percentages for Demographic Categorical Variables (N= 102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Cohort</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith-Based Organization Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation/Certification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4 (f) Data Retention Limitation. Mind Garden is not obligated to keep data or honor unused or unrequested assessments beyond a period of one year from the creation of the data or assessment unless the customer contacts Mind Garden via email prior to the end of that year with a request to retain it longer. Mind Garden may choose to grant or reject the request in its sole discretion.