

# “INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON EMPLOYEES' ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT”.

## Case of a large, semi-public company

**ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc Tiana**

*PhD in Cognitive Science and Applications  
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

**RANDRIANASOLO Jean de Dieu**

*Doctorate in Human Resources Management.  
Prenslake Intercontinental University, Hungary*

**ANDRIANONY Victorien**

*Master of the conferences  
University of Mahajanga, Madagascar*

**RANDRIANIRIANA Anjarasoa Mamilalaina**

*Master of the conferences  
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar*

### ABSTRACT

Human resource management is seen as one of the essential foundations for the development and performance of any professional organization. For some years now, the commitment of a company's employees has increasingly been the focus of HR departments. The commitment of employees to their job determines the performance of the company. The dilemma for any manager, then, is to know how to use these resources and apply the aspects that will enhance their commitment. The latter can result from many factors. These connections lead to an investigation into the possibility of a relationship between the two variables. Using a sample of 154 employees and employing tools such as exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and hierarchical regressions, this study shows the influence of leadership style on organizational commitment. The results show that organizational commitment has, on the one hand, four different dimensions: affective, normative, continuity through lack of alternative and sacrifice. On the other hand, that leadership style has an impact on each dimension of organisational commitment

**Keywords:** *executive, organizational commitment, company, human resource management, leadership style*

---

### INTRODUCTION

In a changing world, many companies are focused on how to generate more revenue while reducing expenses. One of the most effective ways to improve profitability over time is to focus on the value-added resources of the workforce. Employee engagement occupies an important place in the workplace. It has become one of the top priorities of management. In fact, employees are becoming less engaged and companies are struggling to make sense of their mission.

The concept of commitment is the psychological and attitudinal link between a person and the organization to which he or she belongs. If at the beginning of its conception it reflected only the affective side of the relationship between the two actors, in the course of research other dimensions were further developed by the

authors. In this context, **Meyer and Allen** summarized the related work in **1990** and concluded that the concept actually contains three main components: the affective dimension, which refers to the individual's affective sense of belonging to his organization; the normative dimension, which describes his moral obligation to remain a member of the organization; and the calculated dimension, which encourages him to continue working in order to avoid the costs associated with his eventual departure from the organization. Since then, the concept of organizational commitment has interested many researchers who want to know more about its different facets. At the same time, the style with which leaders manage their employees seems to be crucial in generating their full motivation and commitment (**Tremblay et al., 2005**)<sup>1</sup>. Without playing an exclusive role, these leaders nevertheless occupy an essential position in employee engagement. Given the different leadership approaches outlined, one particular style is often cited by authors as the most significant: transformational leadership (**DeGroot et al., 2000; cited in Tremblay et al., 2005**).

In order to align the goals of the organization and the interests of the employees, **Lawler (1994)** advocates the idea that only participative management can turn all actors into partners. The time when the manager decided alone is definitely over. The nature of leadership has changed and the accepted models of leadership are less and less relevant. Leadership must therefore be reinvented. According to this logic, employees become more effective when they have access to information, when they have the opportunity to influence the company's important decisions and when they receive positive feedback after their efforts. Despite all these theories, many companies still seem to have difficulties in grasping and benefiting from these interactions. So the question arises to what extent the organizational commitment of employees can be influenced by the manager's leadership style.

The aim is to investigate the role that leadership style may have on employees' organizational commitment. Based on the hypothesis that leadership style has an impact on each dimension of organizational commitment, this research mobilizes an approach based on a quantitative methodology and a questionnaire survey of a randomly selected sample of 154 employees of a large Malagasy parasternal.

## THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Organizational commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the bond between an individual and their organization (**Meyer & Allen, 1991**). It was originally seen as an emotional bond (**Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982**) and a moral obligation. Based on this work, **Meyer and Allen (1991)** identified three components of commitment: affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment, and this three-dimensional conceptualization became the reference model. Affective commitment means an emotional attachment through which individuals identify with the values and goals of the organization. Two key elements distinguish affective commitment from other forms of commitment: Identification with and attachment to the organisation and internalization of its values. Identification and attachment catalyse the desire to belong and give individuals a sense of pride in being a member of the organisation. Internalisation involves both acceptance and adoption of the organisation's values. Individuals with affective commitment choose to stay in the organisation because they want to. Normative commitment represents a sense of loyalty to the organisation derived from a sense of moral obligation to it. In other words, it creates a sense of moral obligation for the individual. Employees who are committed on this basis remain members of their organisation, either out of obligation to other members or to the organisation itself (**Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001**). As for continuity commitment, it has a rather optimistic aspect that values personal interests despite the collective and/or organisational interest. It is based on the individual's realisation of the "costs" (or comparative advantages) that would be associated with a possible breach of contract with the organisation. This commitment is therefore based on a calculation of the costs and risk that leaving would entail for the employee. The employee cannot afford to leave the employment relationship because the costs and significant losses that would be associated with leaving would be too high and the employee would have too much to lose. This component reflects the employee's need to stay in the company. In this context, the process of economic exchange represents the basis of the continuity commitment. However, research has shown that there are two forms of opportunistic behaviour, one related to the cost of leaving and the other related to the lack of alternatives outside the organisation. **Meyer and Allen (1997)** define

<sup>1</sup> **Michel Tremblay, Denis Chênevert, Gilles Simard, Marie-Ève Lapalme and Olivier Doucet, "Agir sur les leviers organisationnels pour mobiliser le personnel : le rôle de la vision, du leadership, des pratiques de GRH et de l'organisation du travail", 2005.**

continuance commitment as the perception of the cost of leaving the organisation as well as the perception of the lack of alternatives to leaving the organisation.

However, there are several criticisms of the definition of organisational commitment proposed by Meyer and Allen. For **Klein (2012)** and colleagues, a new conceptualisation proposed was that commitment "(...) is a voluntary psychological attachment that reflects dedication and responsibility to a goal"; thus, commitment is voluntary and not forced. It is a psychological state that lies on a continuum from the lowest investment (consent, instrumental) to the highest (commitment, identification). Ultimately, commitment is to be understood in a broad sense, as it can relate to goals as diverse as the organisation, the task, the workplace or the supervisor.

Leadership is a relationship between the one who strives to lead and the one who chooses to follow. If one follows the derivations of **Barry Posner** and **James M. Kouzes**, one of the most important qualities is personal credibility, because it is the foundation of leadership. It consists of defining goals, organising and communicating, measuring, training people and training oneself. Among other things, it is the ability to lead people to achieve goals. There is no one way to choose a leadership or management style. Leadership style is always exercised depending on the situation. Situations in organisations are diverse. The most important factors that determine the choice of leadership style are: the people to whom it applies, the nature of the tasks, the situation itself. Not all team leaders approach the task of team building in the same way. There are many different leadership styles, and there is no one, defined leadership style. The choice of leadership style is always case-specific, depending on the situation in the company and the personality of the leader.

The main assumption of this approach is that somehow certain personal characteristics or specific behaviours of the leader have a great influence on the results of the group or organisation. Personality trait approaches reveal the leader's priority, they illustrate how determined the leader is to achieve their goals and what kind of strategy they are willing to use to achieve the goal. In this perspective, many styles can be evoked, namely the autocratic style described by **Blake** and **Mouton** as the style where the leader is authoritarian and imposes his will and values. **Max Weber's** charismatic style, which reflects the leader's benevolence towards his subordinates and treats them individually. Among the approaches with personality traits, we can also see the collegial style, a style that is a compromise and could be suitable in all situations; the laissez-faire style, where the leader tends to relax the atmosphere. Disciplines and internal rules are not optimally emphasised; the democratic style, which is characterised by group work, every decision is discussed before it is put to a vote.

In addition to these specific styles identified by **Blake** and **Mouton**, two other approaches stand out. The first is the directive approach, formulated by **Lewin**, which assumes that the leader acts as boss, with a "paternalistic legitimacy". The second approach is the participative approach, which places great importance on the interaction between the members of the organisation, as this concept is the basis for learning in the unit.

Transformational leadership can be defined as a transformation on three levels: that of the leader, that of the follower and that of the organisation. In this style, the leader transcends his or her own interests for the benefit of the group (**Kanungo, 2001**). It is about first bringing about personal change before convincing those around you to make that change as well. This approach is about helping team members to look beyond their self-interest to the good of the group, organisation or society, to think about their long-term development needs rather than their immediate needs, and to become more aware of what really matters. The importance attached to this concept has aroused great curiosity among researchers. Following several studies by different researchers, **including Bass (1985), Howell and Avolio (1993), Bycio, Hackett and Allen (1995) or Bass, Avolio and Jung (1997)**, four main components of transformational leadership could be extracted: idealised influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration

Using a sample of 154 employees, an opinion survey was planned to analyse the influence of leaders' leadership style on employees' organisational commitment. The sample included men, women, managers and non-managers to ensure diversity and to take into account everyone's opinions without making a difference. Three variables are used to conduct this research: the independent or explanatory variable is leadership style; the dependent or explained variable is organisational commitment; the control variables are: Gender, age, degree, seniority in position, seniority in organisation and socio-professional category. In-depth statistical analysis and econometric modelling were used to test the association and influence relationships between the different variables of interest in the study.

---

## RESULTS

Validation of the items was a necessity to ensure the relevance of the results. For this purpose, we conducted preliminary tests: the AFE and the reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha.

### Organisational commitment

The KMO index of 0.867 greater than 0.5 and the p-value or significance of 0.000 less than 0.05 of Bartlett's test show us that it is possible to perform a factorial analysis.

**Table 1: KMO index and Bartlett test of EO**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index for measuring sample quality.		,867
Bartlett's Sphericity Test	Chi-square approx.	1228,976
	Ddl	120
	Meaning	,000

Source : Authors, 2021

By conducting a factor analysis considering all items of the dimensions of commitment, it was derived that commitment can be grouped into 4 groups or four factorial axes, which are shown in the table below. This model represents the baseline score as 68.82%. This is a relevant result as it is higher than 65%.

**Table 2: Explained total variance for organisational commitment**

Component	Initial eigenvalues			Sums extracted from the load square			Sums of rotation of the load square		
	Total	the variance	Cumulative	Total	the variance	Cumulative	Total	the variance	Cumulative
1	6,300	39,374	39,374	6,300	39,374	39,374	3,552	22,201	22,201
2	2,265	14,159	53,532	2,265	14,159	53,532	2,830	17,688	39,889
3	1,419	8,869	62,401	1,419	8,869	62,401	2,532	15,822	55,711
4	1,028	6,422	68,824	1,028	6,422	68,824	2,098	13,112	68,824

Source: Authors, 2020

So, according to the analysis of the results, organisational commitment includes 4 dimensions<sup>2</sup>: the first includes items related to normative commitment, the second concerns items related to affective commitment, the third and fourth include items related to continuity commitment, which is divided into two sub-dimensions: continuity commitment through lack of alternatives. And the continuity commitment through sacrifice.

After grouping, an item reliability analysis was deemed necessary for all 4 dimensions.

**Table 3: Summary of the reliability analysis**

Size of the EO	Cronbach's alpha	Initial number of articles	Number of selected elements
Affective	,829	6	4
Continuity - Sacrifice	,759	3	3
Continuity - lack of alternatives	,843	3	3
Normative	,876	6	6

Source: Authors, 2020

We can see in this table that all values of Cronbach's alpha are consistently greater than 0.5, which justifies the reliability of the items. However, these values were obtained thanks to the removal of some items that were considered doubtful, especially for the affective commitment item. In fact, of the six items used for affective commitment, four were retained. The items mobilised for the other dimensions, among others, were all retained as reliable.

The correlation analysis between the organisational commitment variables shows that almost all dimensions of organisational commitment are correlated with each other at the 1% level. Furthermore, the correlations in question are all positive.

**Table 7: Correlation between organisational commitment variables**

		EOA	EOC_S	EOC_MA	EON
EOA	Pearson correlation	1	,428**	,147	,404**
	Sig. (bilateral)		,000	,070	,000
	N	154	154	154	154
EOC_S	Pearson correlation	,428**	1	,471**	,525**
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000		,000	,000
	N	154	154	154	154

<sup>2</sup> See appendix

EOC_MA	Pearson correlation	,147	,471**	1	,515**
	Sig. (bilateral)	,070	,000		,000
	N	154	154	154	154
EON	Pearson correlation	,404**	,525**	,515**	1
	Sig. (bilateral)	,000	,000	,000	
	N	154	154	154	154

Source: Authors, 2020

Affective commitment correlates highly significantly with calculated sacrifice commitment ( $r = .428$ ;  $p$ -value = .000) and normative commitment ( $r = .404$ ;  $p$ -value = .000). The committed employee not only sees his or her possible departure from the company as a genuine sacrifice, but also feels morally committed to the company. The two sub-dimensions of continuity commitment are highly significantly correlated ( $r = .471$ ;  $p$ -value = .000). The normative commitment shows a highly significant correlation with the calculated commitment to sacrifice ( $r = 0.525$ ;  $p$ -value= 0.000) and another highly significant correlation with the calculated commitment to no alternative ( $r = 0.515$ ;  $p$ -value= 0.000). The employee's lack of work choice further increases his moral gratitude towards the current organisation that employs him.

The analyses revealed four different dimensions. The exploratory factor analysis of the variable "organisational commitment" revealed that the calculated dimension contains two sub-dimensions: one referring to the sacrifice the person would have to make if they left their job and another referring to the lack of job alternatives.

So, both outside and inside Madagascar, these different dimensions of engagement are observed and well and truly experienced by the agents. However, the trends in the responses show that the engagement that is somewhat more emphasised by the agents interviewed is affective engagement. One of the main reasons why employees stay in an organisation is that they seem to really enjoy working in the organisation. These results thus show that organisational commitment is based on four different but complementary dimensions.

### Leadership style

Leadership style is generally defined as the type of personal influence that leads a person or group to accomplish a task or activity that the leader intends.

**Table 4: KMO index and Bartlett leadership style test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index for measuring sample quality.	,914	
Bartlett's Sphericity Test	Chi-square approx.	1377,120
	Ddl	36
	Meaning	,000

Source : Authors, 2021

With an approximate chi-square of 1377.120 and a degree of freedom of 36, the  $p$ -value (0.000) is significant as it is less than 0.5. The data are therefore factorisable.

**Table 5: Explained total variance for leadership style**

Component	Initial eigenvalues			Sums extracted from the load square		
	Total	the variance	Cumulative	Total	the variance	Cumulative
1	6,528	72,531	72,531	6,528	72,531	72,531

Source: Authors, 2020

The analysis of the KMO index justified the possibility of factorising the data. Based on the 9 items introduced in the PCA, the output data is 72.53% represented on a single factor. This means that the single factor obtained by factoring explained 72.53 % of the model, which is a relevant result as it far exceeds the threshold of 65 %.

Only one component was extracted from the matrix<sup>3</sup> so that the transformational leadership items are grouped under a single dimension. The extraction values of the items are greater than 0.5, which again underlines their relevance. It is this one dimension that will be addressed in the following analyses.

**Table 6: Leadership style reliability statistics**

Cronbach's alpha	Number of elements
,952	9

Source: Authors, 2020

<sup>3</sup> See annexe

With a very large Cronbach's alpha of 0.952, which is well above the norm of 0.7, this dimension of transformational leadership, which combines the 9 items, is reliable.

**Influence of leadership style on affective commitment**

The regression selecting affective commitment as the dependent variable and the control variables as well as the identified dimension of leadership style as dependent variables shows the following results.

**Table 8: Summary of the Leadership Style and AE Model**

Model	R	R-two	R-two set	Standard error of the estimate	Edit statistics				
					Variation of R-two	Variation of F	ddl1	ddl2	Sig. Variation of F
1	,186a	,035	-,005	3,36329	,035	,876	6	147	,514
2	,411b	,169	,129	3,13130	,134	23,589	1	146	,000

Source: Authors, 2020

The explanatory power of the first model with the control variables is only 3.5 %. It has a p-value of 0.514 > 0.05 and is thus not significant.

By introducing the leadership style variable, the explanatory power of the 2<sup>nd</sup> model is 16.9 %. The introduction of this explanatory variable improved the model by 13.4 %. This variation is statistically significant (p-value = 0.000 < 0.005).

**Tableau 9 : Tableau des coefficients des variables de style de leadership avec engagement affectif**

Variables	Model 1				Model 2			
	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Standard error			B	Standard error		
(Constant)	24,916	2,443	10,199	,000	19,393	2,543	7,626	,000
CSP	,110	,241	,457	,648	,031	,225	,138	,891
Age_2	-,222	,460	-,483	,630	-,212	,429	-,494	,622
Diplome_2	-,308	,244	-1,265	,208	-,125	,230	-,545	,587
GENRE_2	,560	,588	,953	,342	,153	,554	,275	,783
ANC_POSTE_2	-,189	,350	-,539	,591	-,011	,328	-,035	,972
ANC_STE_2	,327	,604	,542	,588	,304	,562	,541	,589
LEAD_TRANSF					,115	,024	4,857	,000

Source: Authors, 2020

Based on these results, leadership style is the only variable that has a significant impact on affective commitment.

**Influence of leadership style on commitment, calculated through sacrifice**

The regression, which treated Sacrifice Commitment as the dependent variable and leadership style and respondent characteristics as independent variables, yielded the following results.

**Table 10: ANOVA on leadership style and commitment calculated by sacrifice**

Modèle	Sum of squares	ddl	Medium square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	371,245	6	61,874	5,547	,000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	1639,820	147	11,155		
Total	2011,065	153			

2Regression	448,569	7	64,081	5,988	,000 <sup>c</sup>
Residual	1562,496	146	10,702		
Total	2011,065	153			

Source: Authors, 2020

Both models have a p-value of less than 0.05 and are significant. The null hypothesis is rejected. The calculated willingness of employees to sacrifice can be predicted from the leadership style of the managers.

**Table 11: Summary of leadership style and commitment models calculated by sacrifice**

Model	R	R-two	R-two adjusted	Standard error of the estimate	Edit statistics				
					Variation of R-two	Variation of F	ddl1	ddl2	Sig. Variation of F
1	,430 <sup>a</sup>	,185	,151	3,33995	,185	5,547	6	147	,000
2	,472 <sup>b</sup>	,223	,186	3,27139	,038	7,225	1	146	,008

Source: Author 2020

The explanatory power of the <sup>first</sup> model is 18.5 % and is significant.

By introducing the leadership style variable, the explanatory power of the <sup>2nd</sup> model is 22.3%. The table shows that the introduction of this explanatory variable improves the model by 3.8%, which is a statistically significant change (p-value = 0.008 < 0.05).

**Table 12: Table of coefficients for leadership style variables with calculated commitment sacrifice**

Variables	Model 1				Model 2			
	Non-standardized coefficients		Sig.	t	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Standard error			B	Standard error		
(Constante)	15,466	2,426	6,375	,000	12,272	2,657	4,619	,000
CSP	,668	,240	2,785	,006	,622	,235	2,641	,009
Age_2	-,809	,457	-1,769	,079	-,802	,448	-1,792	,075
Diplome_2	-,546	,242	-2,257	,025	-,440	,240	-1,833	,069
GENRE_2	-,459	,584	-,787	,433	-,695	,579	-1,202	,231
ANC_POSTE_2	-,205	,348	-,589	,557	-,103	,343	-,299	,765
ANC_STE_2	<b>1,701</b>	,599	2,839	<b>,005</b>	<b>1,688</b>	,587	2,875	<b>,005</b>
LEAD_TRANSF					<b>,066</b>	,025	2,688	<b>,008</b>

Source: Authors, 2020

In the first model, the variables that have a significant influence are socio-professional category, degree and seniority in the company.

In the second model, the variables with a significant influence are socio-professional category, seniority in the company and leadership style. 62.2% of the variation in commitment is explained by socio-professional category and 168.8% by seniority in the company. Similarly, the leadership style adopted by the supervisor explains 6.6% of the variation in this dimension of continuity commitment

**Effect of leadership style on commitment, calculated from lack of alternatives**

The regression, which treated commitment calculated by the lack of alternatives as the dependent variable and leadership style and respondent characteristics as independent variables, yielded the following results.

The models have p-values smaller than 0.05 and appear to be significant.

**Table 13: Summary of leadership style models and CE by lack of alternative**

Model	R	R-two	R-two adjusted	Standard error of the estimate	Edit statistics				
					Variation of R-two	Variation of F	ddl1	ddl2	Sig. Variation of F
1	,473 <sup>a</sup>	,224	,192	4,60535	,224	7,063	6	147	,000
2	,486 <sup>b</sup>	,236	,200	4,58336	,013	2,414	1	146	,122

Source: Authors, 2020

While the first model including only the control variables was significant, the second model introducing the leadership style as another explanatory variable of the commitment calculated by lack of alternatives displays a p-value of 0.122 > 0.05 and is therefore not significant. This variable is not a good predictor of this commitment.

**Table 14: Coefficient table of leadership style variables with commitment lack of alternative**

Variables	Model 1				Model 2			
	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Standard error			B	Standard error		
(Constante)	9,397	3,345	2,809	,006	6,811	3,722	1,830	,069
CSP	,681	,330	2,061	,041	,644	,330	1,953	,053
Age_2	,543	,630	,862	,390	,548	,627	,874	,383
Diplome_2	-,987	,334	-2,959	,004	-,902	,337	-2,679	,008
GENRE_2	-,232	,805	-,289	,773	-,423	,811	-,522	,602
ANC_POSTE_2	-,223	,480	-,464	,643	-,140	,481	-,291	,771
ANC_STE_2	1,457	,826	1,763	,080	1,446	,823	1,758	,081
LEAD_TRANSF					,054	,035	1,554	,122

Source: Authors, 2020

In the first model, the variables with a significant influence are socio-professional category and degree. 68.1% of the variation in the commitment calculated by lack of alternatives is explained by the socio-professional category. In addition, the degree negatively explains 98.7% of the variation in this commitment.

In the second model, the only variable that has a significant influence is the degree. It explains negatively 90.2% of the EOC\_MA. As for the value of the beta relative to the explanatory variable, it is not significant. This table confirms once again that leadership style is not a good predictor of this commitment.

**Impact of leadership style on normative commitment**

The results below are obtained by selecting normative commitment as the dependent variable. The p-values of both models are significant, allowing the null hypothesis to be rejected. The normative commitment of the company's employees depends in part on the style that the leader adopts.

**Table 15: Summary of leadership style and normative commitment models**

Model	R	R-two	R-two adjusted	Standard error of the estimate	Edit statistics				
					Variation of R-two	Variation of F	ddl1	ddl2	Sig. Variation of F
1	,384 <sup>a</sup>	,148	,113	7,93173	,148	4,241	6	147	,001
2	,481 <sup>b</sup>	,231	,194	7,55848	,084	15,876	1	146	,000

Source: Authors, 2020

The first model has an explanatory power of 14.8% and is significant.

By introducing the leadership style variable, the explanatory power of the 2nd model is 23.1%. The introduction of this explanatory variable improves the model by 8.4%, which represents a statistically significant variation ( $p$ -value = 0.000 < 0.05).

**Table 16: Coefficient table for leadership style variables with normative commitment**

Variables	Model 1				Model 2			
	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.	Non-standardized coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Standard error			B	Standard error		
(Constante)	15,099	5,762	2,621	<b>,010</b>	4,161	6,139	,678	,499
CSP	<b>1,625</b>	,569	2,855	<b>,005</b>	<b>1,468</b>	,544	2,699	<b>,008</b>
Age_2	-,649	1,085	-,598	,551	-,627	1,034	-,607	,545
Diplome_2	-,240	,575	-,418	,677	,122	,555	,221	,826
GENRE_2	2,126	1,387	1,533	,127	1,318	1,337	,986	,326
ANC_POSTE_2	,526	,827	,637	,525	,877	,793	1,107	,270
ANC_STE_2	<b>3,442</b>	1,423	2,418	<b>,017</b>	<b>3,396</b>	1,357	2,503	<b>,013</b>
LEAD_TRANSF					<b>,228</b>	,057	3,985	<b>,000</b>

Source: Authors, 2020

In the first model, the variables that have a significant influence are socio-professional category and seniority in the company. 162.5% of the variation in normative commitment is explained by socio-professional category and 344.2% by seniority in the company.

In the second model, the variables that have a significant influence are socio-professional category, seniority in the company and leadership style. 146.8% of the variation in the EON is explained by the socio-professional category and 339.6% by the seniority in the company. As for the explanatory variable, it explains 22.8% of the variation in the commitment in question.

With all these results extracted, it is now possible to discuss all the influences of the variables, and even of each dimension

According to these results, we can confirm that the leadership style has an influence on each dimension of organizational commitment.

The analyses testify to the major influence that the leader's style can have on the employee's organizational commitment. The affective, normative and calculated levels are all affected by the perception of this variable. Only the "calculated for lack of alternatives" dimension remains unaffected.

## CONCLUSION

Human resources represent a competitive advantage in the sense that they can lead to better organisational productivity; and this consequence is only partly due to good working conditions. Therefore, an organisation that wants to work for the long term has a great interest in promoting aspects that support the organisational commitment of its employees.

At the end of the analyses, the results showed that the supervisor's leadership style has a strong influence on the employee's organisational commitment, not reflecting such a high level of certainty. The supervisor's leadership style has a significant influence on several levels of the employee's organisational commitment, apart from the commitment calculated for lack of alternatives, to which he is insensitive. This means that the research hypothesis has been partially verified.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bédard Renée**, "What is my leadership type", Gestion, March, Vol 33, 2008.  
**Bernard M. Bass and Ronald E. Riggio**, "Transformational Leadership", second edition, 2014.  
**Bradley, J. P. and Charbonneau**, "Transformational Leadership: At the Crossroads of the Old and the New", Royal Military College of Canada, Toronto, 2004.

**Chloé Fortin Bergeron**, "The Impact of Leadership on Union Worker Engagement: The Role of Workplace Relationship Climate", 2011.

**Estelle M. Morin**, "*Psychology at Work*", Canada, 1996.

**Isabelle Lapierre**, "Organizational Commitment: The Influence of Teamwork Behaviour", 2008

**James McGregor Burns**, "*Leadership*", New York, Harper & Row, 1978.

**Judge, T. A. and Piccolo, R. F.**, "*Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity*", Journal of applied psychology, University of Florida, 2004.

**Levinson, H.**, "*Power, leadership, and the management of stress*", Professional psychology, 1980.

**Max Weber**, "*The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*", 1904.

**Michel Tremblay, Denis Chênevert, Gilles Simard, Marie-Ève Lapalme and Olivier Doucet**, "*Agir sur les leviers organisationnels pour mobiliser le personnel : le rôle de la vision, du leadership, des pratiques de GRH et de l'organisation du travail*", 2005.

**Vilatte, J.C.** "*Méthodologie de l'enquête par questionnaire*", Laboratoire Culture & Communication Université d'Avignon, 2007.

## ANNEX

### Quality of representation and rotation of the component matrices of organizational commitment

	Extraction	Composante			
		1	2	3	4
Item26 - I am proud to belong to my organization	,718	,189	,792	,054	,228
Item27 - I really feel that the problems of my organization are my own	,550	,020	,717	,012	,188
Item28 - I really feel a sense of belonging to my organization	,720	,197	,824	,017	,043
Item31 - My organization means a lot to me	,717	,182	,819	,056	,101
Item 32 - I would not want to leave my current organization because I would have a lot to lose	,678	,200	,263	,210	,725
Item33 - For me personally, leaving my current organization would bring more disadvantages than advantages	,732	,340	,221	,000	,754
Item34 - I continue to work for this organization because I don't think I could get the same benefits elsewhere	,717	,072	,106	,427	,720
Item35 - I have no choice but to stay in my current organization	,715	,223	,078	,805	,108
Item36 - I stay in my current organization because I don't see where else I can go	,810	,265	-,077	,853	,080
Item37 - I feel my options are too limited to consider leaving my current organization	,741	,202	,079	,786	,278
Item38 - It would not be morally right to leave my current organization	,652	,696	,167	,192	,321
Item39 - It would not be right to leave my current organization now, even if it were advantageous for me	,670	,724	,228	,009	,305
Item40 - I feel I would be guilty if I left my current organization now	,704	,761	,193	,280	,097
Item41 - I would be betraying the trust I have been given if I left my current organization now	,749	,812	,165	,245	-,047
Item42 - If I were offered a position in another organization, I would not consider it right to leave my current organization	,617	,761	-,007	,150	,123

Item43 - I would not leave my organization now because I feel I have an obligation to some of the people who work there	,521	,545	,213	,330	,262
---	------	------	------	------	------

Source: Authors, 2020

**Matrix of leadership style components**

	Extraction	Composante
		1
Item17 - I find that my superior sets an example	,731	,855
Item18 - My superior is a model to follow	,825	,908
Item19 - My superior sets an example rather than dictating what to do	,819	,905
Item20 - My superior offers an inspiring vision	,760	,872
Item21 - My superior knows clearly where we are going	,692	,832
Item22 - My superior presents an interesting picture of the future	,751	,866
Item23 - My superior considers my personal feelings before acting	,645	,803
Item24 - My superior is concerned about my needs as an individual	,560	,748
Item25 - My superior ensures that the interests of the members are considered	,745	,863

Source: Authors, 2020

