### ABSTRACT

This paper examines the effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among the academic staff in the College of Leadership Development Studies and College of Business and Social Sciences, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. A quantitative methodology was adopted for this study. A structured Multi-facctor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1997) and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) were the major instruments used for data collection. Simple linear regression was used for testing the hypothesis. The results indicated that there was no significant positive effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among the academic staff of the Nigerian private university studied. This finding is antithetical to the common submission in literature that transformational leadership style has a significant effect on organizational commitment. It was therefore recommended that there is need for further enquiry to be done in identifying the factors responsible for the high proportion of organizational commitment as against the leadership (transformational) style adopted by the leaders (Head of Departments, Sub-Deans, Deans and the Management of the University).

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership has become an industry in contemporary global studies. Several billions of dollars have been invested in improving the quality of leadership in all sectors since the 20th Century (Kellerman, 2013). The transition from the industrial era, noted for control and monitoring by managers, to the knowledge era, noted for information conduit, and the post-knowledge era, noted for getting things done by creating emotional energy and connectivity, has finally led to emergence of leadership discourses in replacement of management discourses. Dykes & Silvester (2005: 8-9) succinctly put it thus:

> In many ways ‘leadership’ has become the Holy Grail of the 21st Century. Whole libraries of books and articles have been written about what it takes to be a ‘leader’. A multi-million pound industry now exists dedicated to identifying leadership potential, providing leadership development, and recruiting leaders who (it is hoped) will transform organizations into world leaders.

In the same vein, several leadership literature have been devoted to the studies of educational leadership or leadership in the educational sector (Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2003; Brown, 2004; Harris & Muijs, 2004; Sternberg, 2005; Harris, 2008;

Studies have been carried out on the impact of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment with results indicating that there is a relationship between transformational leadership style and the level of engagement of the workers (Lee, 2005; Lo, Ramayah, & Min, 2009; Raja & Palanichamy, 2011; Rehman, Shareef, Mahmood & Ishaque, 2012; Aghashahi, Davarpanah, Omar & Sarti, 2013; Mclaggan, Bezuidenhout & Botha, 2013). However, there is scanty research done on the relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational commitment in the context of the educational sector in Nigeria. The closest that has been done was by Othman, Mohammed & D'Silva (2013) where about 151 Nigerian public university lecturers undergoing post-graduate studies in selected Malaysian universities were sampled. It is this problem of paucity of empirical data on effect of transformational leadership on organizational commitment in the Nigerian Education sector particularly the university system that informed this study. The main objective of this study is to assess the impact of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among private university employees in Nigeria.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Concept of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment

Transformational leadership was popularised by Burns in 1978, but was subsequently associated with Bass (1985) and other scholars (Avolio & Yammarino, 2002; Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003). According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is a style of leadership that is characterized by leaders going beyond just directing their subordinates but encouraging and motivating their subordinates to go the extra mile beyond self-interests to build commitment for the organizational mission and objectives, which will ultimately translate to organisations fulfilling the very essence for which they were established. Another feature of transformational leaders are their willingness to sacrifice their own interest over the collective goals and values of the organization, arouse subordinates intellectually, inspire them to think outside the box and promote the vision of the organisation (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Buhler, 1995).

There are five components of transformational leadership as defined by Bass (1985) and further stated by other scholars (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999; Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003) who aligned with the foregoing; which is usually termed the 5I’s of transformational leadership style. What this means is that an individual or leader is said to practice transformational leadership style when these 5I’s are found:

- **Idealized Attributes** - This has to do with the leaders’ attitude that followers want to identify and emulate. Such attributes go beyond rewards and punishment for either the performance or the non-performance of task.

- **Idealized Behavior** - This component emphasizes the attitude of leaders that followers want to identify and emulate. Transformational leaders going beyond just directing their subordinates to go the extra mile beyond self-interests to build commitment for the organizational mission and objectives, which will ultimately translate to organisations fulfilling the very essence for which they were established. Another feature of transformational leaders are their willingness to sacrifice their own interest over the collective goals and values of the organization, arouse subordinates intellectually, inspire them to think outside the box and promote the vision of the organisation (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Buhler, 1995).

- **Intellectual Stimulation** - This is the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions or the status quo, exhibits the characteristics of risk taking and seeks followers' ideas or opinions.

- **Inspirational Motivation** - This is the extent to which the leader challenges their followers by their ability to articulate the vision that has to be shared among them.

- **Individualized Consideration** - This feature has to do with the leaders' ability to relate with followers on a one on one basis, thereby serving as a mentor and coach to them with the view of paying attention to each follower's need for advancement.

On the other hand, organizational commitment refers to the extent to which employees are emotionally attached to, identify and willing to involve themselves with the organization (Boehman, 2006). Similarly, Muchinsky (2006) sees organizational commitment as the extent to which an employee shows a sense of loyalty to his or her organization. This implies that an employee is committed when they exhibit the characteristics of identifying with, and participating in organizational activities enthusiastically and desires to remain in the organization (Porter, Steer, Mowday & Boulian, 1974; Wu., Tsai, Fey & Wu, 2006). Organizational commitment is further classified into three categories: affective commitment, continuity commitment and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). They
further explained that Affective Commitment shows the extent to which employees are emotionally attached with the organization while Continuance Commitment is simply based on the costs level of leaving the organization due to how long the length of service and the effort the employee has invested in the organization, with the believe that their skills may not be transferable. Normative Commitment is the employee's obligatory perception of remaining with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Ferreira, Basson & Coetzee, 2010).

2. Impact of Transformational Leadership Style on Organizational Commitment: A Review

It is apparent that studies on transformational leadership style and its impact on organizational commitment are not new and have attracted considerable attention in the field of human resource management and organizational behavior, as the case may be (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1993; Yammarino, Spangler & Bass, 1993; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio, 1999; Howell & Hail-Merenda, 1999; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003; Avolio et al., 2004; Barbuto, 2005; Walumbwa, Lawler, Avolio, & Wang, 2005). However, these studies revealed that the leadership style is related to organizational commitment and has an impact on employee's commitment from different organizational settings and cultures.

According to Lee (2005) there is a relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment. He further stated that transformational leadership will help to increase trust, commitment and team efficacy in an organization. While in a similar vein, Rehman, Shareef, Mahmood & Ishaque (2012) examined employees' perceptions about their leaders' managerial style and organizational commitment in Pakistan educational sector. Their study found out that both transformational and transactional leadership have a positive relationship with the organization's commitment. They also buttressed the point that the five components of transformational leadership, inspirational motivation and individual consideration impacted more on the employees which brought about organizational commitment. Similar conclusion was also reached in a study by Lo, Ramayah & Min (2009). The study revealed that several dimensions of transactional and transformational leadership have positive relationship with organizational commitment. They also added that transformational leaders are more able to influence commitment in employees than transactional leaders.

Furthermore, Aghashahi, Davaranah, Omar & Sarli (2013) investigated the relationship between different leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and the three components of organizational commitment as espoused by Meyer & Allen (1997), namely affective, continuance, and normative in a contact center setting in Malaysia. Their studies were not far from the aforementioned findings that there was a positive effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment, and in this case, the affective and normative commitment sub-variables of organizational commitment. Mcgagan, Bezuidenhout & Botha (2013) discovered that there is a statistically significant relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment. Their study aimed at determining the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and organizational commitment in the coal mining industry in South Africa. Raja & Palanichamy (2011) also studied the most preferred leadership behaviors that will impact on organizational commitment in an electrical company in India. Their study show that the leadership style at the company was more transformational than transactional and that transformational leadership style was related with employees' organizational commitment than transactional leadership.

In the same manner, Othman, Mohammed & D'Silva (2013) conducted a study in Nigeria to examine the influence of leadership on organizational commitment among Nigerian public university lecturers. Their study revealed that both transformational and transactional leadership styles have a positive relationship with employee organizational commitment among Nigerian public university lecturers. They further stated that there are certain factors responsible for the variation of Nigerian public university lecturers, as it pertains to their commitment to stay and continue to work in Nigerian public Universities.
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The factors mentioned are enthusiasm, recognizing accomplishments, providing direction and encouraging creativity provided by the leadership behavior among Nigerian public universities. In contrast, Fasola, Adeyemi & Olowe (2013) study disclosed a different outcome as opposed to other studies reviewed. Their study revealed that even though transformational and transactional leadership have a positive relationship with organizational commitment of banking employees in Nigeria, the impact of transactional leadership styles on the commitment of banking employees in Nigeria was more effective than transformational leadership style. Despite the positive relationship that exists between transformational leadership with the employee’s commitment, the relationship was insignificant. This implies that transformational leadership style was not significantly inducing the banking employees’ commitment. However, the results of the study showed that the impact of transactional leadership styles on the commitment of banking employees in Nigeria is more effective than transformational style. The hypothesis put forward is thus: “Transformational leadership style has no significant impact on organizational commitment of academic staff in Covenant University.”

3. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

The study area for this study was Covenant University. The University is located at km. 19 Idróko, Canaan Land, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. The University received her operational license in February 2002. While the first set of students and staff resumed for operational service on October 21, 2002 at her permanent site (Obayan, Awonuga and Ekeanyanwu, 2012). The University is a growing, dynamic, vision-birthed and vision driven university founded on Christian mission ethos, life transforming values and committed to pioneering excellence at the cutting edge of research and learning.

The vision of the university is to be a leading World Class Christian Mission University, committed to rising a new generation of leaders in all fields of human endeavour. While the Mission statement is targeted at creating knowledge and restoring the dignity of the black man via Human Development and a Total Man Concept driven curriculum employed to enhance innovative, leading edge teaching and learning methods, research and professional services that promote integrated, life-applicable, life-transforming education relevant to the context of science, technology and human capacity building.

The University’s core values are: Spirituality, Possibility Mentality, Capacity Building, Integrity, Responsibility, Diligence and Sacrifice. The motto of the University is “Raising a new generation of leaders.” The University houses four colleges: College of Business and Social Sciences; College of Leadership Development Studies (Departments of Languages and General Studies, Psychology, Political Science and International Relations); College of Science and Technology and College of Engineering.

The focus of this study is on the College of Leadership Development Studies and College of Business and Social Sciences. There is one hundred and twenty one (121) academic staff in these two Colleges presently.

4. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The cross sectional survey design was used to assess the impact of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among one hundred and twenty one (121) Covenant University academic staff within the College of Leadership Development Studies and College of Business and Social Studies which served as the population of the study. Consequently, the administration of questionnaire was the primary source for data collection, complemented by secondary sources like journals, texts and the internet. The random and purposive sampling techniques were adopted to select the sample for this study.

The sample for this study was restricted to the one hundred and one (101) academic staff within the College mentioned above. This was determined using the Godden (2004) sample size formula (Refer to the appendix to see calculation).

Out of the one hundred and one (101) copies of questionnaire administered to the academic staff within the Colleges mentioned above, seventy three (73) were retrieved from which seventy (70) were usable. This implies 60.3 % response rate. For the Descriptive Statistics of Respondents refer to Table 1 in the Appendix.
The two instruments used to measure transformational leadership style and organizational commitment were the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass & Avolio (1997) and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Allen & Meyer (1997). Expert scrutiny of the instruments served to ascertain their content validity. The simple descriptive statistics (frequency counts and percentages) and simple linear regression were applied for data analysis.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The core hypothesis tested in this study states that: 'Transformational leadership style does not have a significant effect on organizational commitment.' For details of the analysis outputs (refer to Tables 2 and 3 in the appendix). The tables show the result of the test of hypothesis raised for this study. Based on the analysis done, R square value obtained was 0.029. This implies that transformational leadership, as measured in this study, could only account for 2.9% of the organizational commitment reported. The implication of this is that the organizational commitment level of the employees observed could not be accounted for by the transformational leadership style adopted in the institution.

The result is in line with findings from Fasola, Adeyemi & Olowe (2013) who found that though there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and organizational commitment, the relationship was not significant. However, the finding contradicts submissions by Mclaggan, Bezuidenhout & Botha (2013) as earlier discussed. What this implies is that there can be a positive effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among employees but that may not necessarily account for the level of commitment in the organization as shown in this study.

More insight was gained from the results displayed in Tables 4 and 5 in the appendix. The inference drawn from Tables 4 and 5 is that though lower proportion [36%] of the respondents rated their leaders high on the Transformational leadership scale, majority of them [61%] rated themselves as average in organizational commitment. This is apparently the reason for the low regression value obtained. A lot of factors could account for this contradiction. This calls for further study.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is not free from limitations, one of such limitations rest in the fact that the study focused on academic staff within the College of Leadership Development Studies and College of Business and Social Studies, Covenant University which served as the population of the study. Based on the foregoing, the generalizability of the result is limited because of having to deal with fewer respondents. Additionally the study relied solely on questionnaire as its main instrument of study without complementing it with interviews or focus group discussion to substantiate or cross-validate the findings of the study.

7. CONCLUSION

The paper focused mainly on assessing the effect of transformational leadership style on organizational commitment among academic staff within the College of Leadership Development Studies and College of Business and Social Studies, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State Nigeria. The common finding from literature revealed that transformational leadership style has significant impact on organizational commitment (Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir, 2002; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003; Avolio et al., 2004; Barbuto, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2005; Lee, 2005; Ramayah, MIN, 2009; Rehman, Shareef, Mahmood & Ishaque 2012; Lo, Aghashahi, Darvarpanah, Omar & Sarli, 2012; Mclaggan, Bezuidenhout & Botha, 2013; Raja & Palanichamy, 2013; Othman, Mohammed & D'Silva, 2013; Fasola, Adeyemi & Olowe, 2013). However, the current study tends to reveal a different trend. The fact that majority of the respondents who rated themselves as having average commitment also rated their leaders as having high transformational leadership style is a form of contradiction. It is on the basis of the above findings that we advance the following recommendations:

(i) Leaders in the university must of necessity re-examine the leadership style employed so as to ensure that organisational commitment level becomes a function of the leadership style adopted.

(ii) Attention should be given to ascertaining the sub-variables of transformational...
leadership style that has accounted for and have been downplayed that was responsible for the level of organisational commitment among academic staff in the university. When this is done, leaders will be able to adopt appropriate components of transformational leadership style that will engender appreciable commitment level among the academic staff.

(iii) The Management of the University should organize training sessions for their leaders, in this case the Heads of Departments, Sub-Deans and Deans of the Colleges on the essence of adopting and applying effective leadership skills in their daily operations. Because ideally the level of organisational commitment among the academic staff within the College ought to be traceable to the leadership style adopted by such leaders, among other things. When the contrary is the case, high employee turnover sets in.

(iv) There is need for further enquiry to be done in identifying the factors responsible for the academic staff high proportion of organizational commitment as against the leadership style adopted by the leaders (Heads of Departments, Sub-Deans, Deans and the Management of the University).
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APPENDIX

GODDEN (2004) SAMPL E SIZE DETERMINATION

According to him, the Sample Size formula where the population is greater than 50,000 is

\[ SS = \frac{Z^2 \times (P) \times (1 - P)}{C^2} \]

Where SS = Sample Size
Z = Z-value (e.g., 1.96 for a 95% confidence level)
P = Percentage of population picking a choice, expressed as decimal
C = Confidence interval, expressed as decimal (e.g., .04 = +/- 4 percentage points)

While the Sample Size formula where the population is lesser than 50,000 is

\[ \text{New } SS = \frac{SS}{1 + (SS - 1)} \]

Where Pop = Population

Note: Calculate the sample size using the infinite population formula first. Then use the sample size derived from that calculation to calculate a sample size for a finite population.

\[ SS = 1.96^2 \times 0.5 \times 0.5 \]
\[ SS = 3.8416 \times 0.5 \times 0.5 \]
\[ SS = 55 \]

Sample size for finite population (where population is less than 50,000)

\[ \text{New } SS = \frac{SS}{1 + (SS - 1)} \]

\[ \text{Pop } = \text{Population } = 121 \]
\[ \text{New SS } = \frac{600}{1 + (600 - 1)} \]
\[ \text{New SS } = 101 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY (N=70)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years or below</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 49 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years and above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSLC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OND</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2015