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Abstract

A large number of studies have examined the antecedents of organizational commitment in the western countries. Research in the area of leadership behavior, organizational commitment and employees’ job satisfaction is noticeably absent in Pakistan. The objective of this thesis is to examine the effect of leadership behavior, participation of employees in the organizational decision making, and their effect on organizational commitment. Job satisfaction and morale is also observed as an outcome. The subject used in this study is faculty members of different private and public universities of Pakistan.

A survey was conducted and then complemented by some semi structured interviews. A total of 300 questionnaires were distributed to faculty in eighteen public and private sector universities, from which 237 usable completed questionnaires were returned (79% response rate). Correlation and regression were performed to investigate the relationship between faculty’s commitment to their universities and the other variables measured in the study. A model of commitment was developed using a multiple regression analysis in which a link of the role of leadership behavior and employees’ participation in decision making with organizational commitment was explored.

It is observed that organizational leadership and participatory decision-making exert a significant impact on commitment. The two leadership behaviors - task oriented behavior and participative style of management - have a positive effect on commitment while the laissez-faire style had a negative effect on commitment.

The results of this study are in agreement with the model proposed by Bass & Avolio (1995) in which relation-oriented behavior is more significant. As compared to Steers model, the continuance commitment shows higher significance than affective commitment in this study. The results of this study also reveal that job satisfaction has a strong association with faculty’s organizational commitment and also that the faculty’s morale is affected by university leadership’s behavior.

Keywords: Leadership, Participatory Decision Making, Commitment, Faculty, Job Satisfaction, Morale, Pakistan
Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to investigate the influence of leadership behavior and participatory decision making on faculty member’s commitment to their respective Universities in Pakistan. Measures of leadership behavior, job satisfaction, participation in decision making, commitment to their organization and morale were the variables studied. Age, experience, and length of service with their respective universities were few of the personal and demographic characteristics included in the study.

Pakistan inherited a colonial education system (Tariq, 2009). In this system the best students preferred to join the bureaucracy, while teaching was the second and third preferred profession for many. Currently, the situation is very different and the higher education system in Pakistan is facing some serious issues. The decision of the overseeing public authority, the Higher Education Commission (HEC), to start universities, is facing criticism from academia. Bukhari (2009) pointed out that, “we do not need new universities at all; instead we need to rescue and standardize our current academia”. Some burning issues however, are University autonomy, HEC’s introduction of Model University Act and selection of Vice Chancellors. According to Hoodbhoy (2009) “No one doubts the desperate need for reforms of Pakistan’s education sector”. World Bank also, in its report in 1992, pointed towards the most pressing issues of higher education in Pakistan including, among others, a flawed institutional framework, inefficiency and ineffectiveness, problematic nature of design and delivery of service, irrelevance and wastage of equipment, under-funding and low productivity in research.
To understand the issues of academia in Pakistan one has to look at the history of a key institution, namely the university.

The first university established on the European model in Subcontinent was the University of Calcutta. It started functioning in 1858. The Vice-Chancellor, who was the chief executive officer (CEO) of the university, was a functionary of the state. He was a judge. The Viceroy (executive head of subcontinent appointed by Queen of England) was the Chancellor of the university. The syndicate of the university was the most powerful decision making body and was dominated by the functionaries of the state.

The model of the modern university in India was a new model, the Colonial Model (Rehman, 2006). In this model the faculty was entrusted with limited decision making at best. Major decision making was done by the functionaries of the state. Thus, the model of the modern, autonomous Universities in India was not similar to University of Oxford and Cambridge or even London.

The Punjab University Lahore is the oldest university in Pakistan. After independence, in 1947, many other universities came into existence, through Acts of the National Assembly or Provincial Assemblies (Virk & Isani 2004). Universities are incorporated, more or less on a uniform basis in accordance with a “Model Act” which provides common features of university governance and management. Basically, other universities copied the Punjab University Act, 1882. This Act was drawn up on the pattern of the University of London, amended from time to time.

Typically a Chancellor, who is the Governor in the case of a provincial university and the President in the case of a federal university, heads the university in Pakistan. The Vice-Chancellor is the academic leader and the principal executive of the university. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor is chosen from the senior professors of the university, and is
appointed by the Chancellor to assist the Vice-Chancellor. Other administrative heads are the Registrar, the Treasurer, the Controller of Examination, the Resident Auditor and the Librarian. The authorities, which control the universities, are generally the Senate, the Syndicate, the Academic Council, the Board of Faculties and Studies, the Selection Board, the Finance and Planning Committee etc. The Senate is considered to be the supreme authority of the university. It is a large body and comprises university officers, professors, members of syndicate, deans, principals of colleges, eminent persons and in some cases representative of the students. It is responsible for the academic and financial aspects of the university.

The Acts of most of the public sector universities in Pakistan were revised in 1973 to democratize various authorities to include teachers through elections. With the passage of time a number of problems emerged due to certain provisions or lack of provisions in the Acts. The composition of the Senate, Syndicate, the Academic Council, the Finance and Planning Committee, therefore did not meet the academic and administrative requirements of the Universities.

On the international front the situation is different. The Carnegie Foundation sponsored a study in 14 countries in 2002, through which different scholars offered useful insights about the reforms in their academic systems. Mora (2002), while discussing the academic conditions in Spain, states that because of restrictive legal reforms enforced by the government, an extremely dynamic educational era in Spain came to an end and the legal reforms have stopped the growth of the higher education system. These reforms have also restricted the freedom of the faculty.

Askling (2002), while studying the Swedish educational system states that the reforms of the regulative framework have addressed some problematic issues relating to
their academic system. Altbach (2002) points out that the academic freedom in many countries is threatened. He further highlights the importance of academic freedom and says that this freedom is not only essential to teaching and research, but should also be the very mission of the university. Other academicians have argued that a fully developed higher education system could not exist without academic freedom.

Virk and Isani (2004) have pointed out that the higher education in Pakistan was in urgent need of reforms. They argue that Pakistani universities in their present form are neither ready to create new knowledge, nor their graduate programmes equate the international standards. Many top appointments in academics are made purely on political bases; as a result, those who are responsible for leading and funding higher education are either concerned with finance and management issues or making new appointments to satisfy their voters. These practices negate academic freedom and hence the universities are neither achieving their potential, nor contributing fully to the emerging knowledge-based society. The other important fact ignored is that the professors are at heart of the academic enterprise and regulative environment affects their commitment. A university can not be successful without a committed faculty and effective teaching and learning can not take place in the absence of commitment. Industrially developed societies are giving higher education a central position in the technological scene of the 21st century. But the academic profession still finds itself under increasing pressure. Working conditions in the universities, especially for faculty, have deteriorated and the traditional autonomy has decreased. Altbach, (2002) says that even though the enrollments into universities have increased, yet it is not accompanied by commensurate growth in faculty appointments, pays and perquisites.
Many researchers have warned about the efforts made by administration to regulate faculty’s work. Researchers have worked upon many topics in the area of leadership and participative management, but most of this work has been done in the western countries. In Pakistan hardly any significant research has been done in the area of leadership and commitment up till now. One can only find a few articles in magazines and other press publications through which authors have normally addressed the issues relating to the deteriorating working conditions and management of public sector universities.

Hoodbhoy (2009) points out that Higher Education Commission and its authorities do not involve academicians’ decision making in universities. Thus, the consequences of one man decision making, haunt us, as expensive research equipment has been purchased throughout the country, and university vice chancellors cannot pay salaries for faculty and staff.

Other authors point out reasons for this situation, as low funding, lack of infrastructure, lack of investment on research and non-academic leadership of the universities. Researchers (Virk & Isani, 2004) point out that currently the higher education in Pakistan is not contributing to the economic growth of the country. Enrollment in the education sector has been growing at the rate of 6% per year, (Dushka, 2005). The problem is that Pakistan spends 2.7% of GNP on education; literacy is increasing at 1% per year while population is increasing at the rate of 2.8% per year, (Virk, Isani 2004). Under these circumstances it is the private sector that is investing in universities, Rehman (2006). Compared to public sector universities, such as Punjab University Lahore and University of Sindh Jamshoro, private universities such as Institute of Business Administration (IBA) Karachi, and Lahore University of
Management Sciences (LUMS) rank first and second on the list of Higher Education Commission. (HEC Report 2006).

Despite the fact that fees are three times higher in private universities, institutions like LUMS and the Agha Khan University have become preferred choice for students in certain disciplines. These and some other private institutions have attracted faculty on very high pay scales as compared to those of public sector universities. The commitment and democratic style of management too, have played a significant role in the success of these institutions.

Research studies have indicated that the salaries, benefits, physical facilities and roles in the universities decision-making affect faculty’s morale, commitment and job satisfaction (Altbach 2002). Even though public sector universities carry pension and other benefits after retirement, yet a trend of shifting jobs from public to private universities has been visibly observed in Pakistan.

Madron, Craig and Mendel (1976), recommended that when faculty has low morale, the behavior of departmental heads must come under scrutiny. Austin, Rice and Splete; (1991), reported that faculty gets affected by the senior administrations management style, and the degree to which they perceived that they participated in the institution’s higher level decision-making processes. In Pakistan, authors like Dushka (2005), Rahman (2006), Virk and Isani (2004), Hoodbhoy (2009), Bukhari (2009), have written about faculty’s job satisfaction, working conditions, universities’ overall management system and Higher Education Commission’s inability to implement its own selection criteria for appointments of Vice Chancellors.
1.2 Rationale for the Thesis

The study of leadership behavior has gained importance in the literature of management and organizational behavior in the last two decades. However very recently the concept of organizational commitment has grown in popularity and is receiving a great deal of attention from researchers. Numerous studies conducted in the western industrialized societies by Alvi & Ahmed (1987), DeCotiis & Summers (1987), Meyer & Allen (1997), Wasti (2004) and White (2006) have investigated many possible antecedents of organizational commitment.

An important aspect of the current study is an investigation of University Leadership, such as Vice Chancellors and Senior Administration and their task and relationship oriented behavior and how it influences faculty and their job satisfaction. The morale of faculty and their job satisfaction are investigated, besides finding out how far the administration is willing to empower and include the faculty in institutional decision making process.

An investigation by the researcher found very little literature relating to Pakistani universities. Virk and Isani have written a book (2004) on the overall conditions of Higher Education in Pakistan. In 1980s a paper was written on assessment of organizational commitment of male and female employees towards their organizations in Pakistan by Alvi and Ahmed. Lack of previous research on this important area in Pakistan has necessitated this imperative research study. This research will be a significant contribution to the body of knowledge by providing evidence to the literature and theory from Pakistan on a subject which is very popular for many decades.

Different researchers have used different terms to describe leadership behavior. Bass (1990), gave an overview of the terms used by researchers. For example, while
describing relationship-oriented leadership behaviors Hemphill (1950), included concern for people as expressed by Blake and Mouton (1964), interaction-oriented behavior emphasized by Bass (1967), people centered behavior emphasized by Anderson (1974), leadership upon which Zaleznik (1977) stressed. Participatory decision making was thought of by Ouchi (1981) as significant while Misumi (1985) thought building mutual trust was important and being democratic was Misumi’s (1985) contribution.

Earlier researchers studied leadership style as transformational and transactional and later on Hersey & Blanchard and Bass, (1990) focused on leadership behavior as task-oriented and relation-oriented. The researchers have described these two types of behaviors under different terms, i.e., person related behavior and goal focused behavior. Even though different terms and names have been used by different researchers yet the researchers have pointed out repeatedly, that leadership style and behaviors have significant effects upon employee’s response to his or her work and organization. Some researchers have also pointed out that management practices have effects beyond an employee’s response to work. Burton, (2005) in her study indicated that management practices can make employees sick. Among academics, researchers like Baldwin and Blackburn (1983) have indicated that whatever threatens the health of the faculty threatens the well being of higher education institutions (HEIs). Another researcher states that the effectiveness of such institutions is dependent upon the quality, morale and conviction of its faculty, (Hagedorn, 1994).

Even though a large number of studies have investigated numerous possible antecedents of organizational commitment (DeCoits and Summers 1987, Iverson and Roy 1994,), the influence of leadership behavior and decision making style of management in education sector has received very little attention. For example, the
*Meta Analysis by Monge and Miller (1999) on the organizational commitment did not include any reference to faculty or employee’s morale and organizational commitment. Similarly, Cohen did a Meta analysis in 1993 and again examined the models of Randel, Cotes (1991), and Morrow (1993) in 1999, but there was no mention of organizational commitment and behavior of leaders as far as education sector was concerned.

The popular Pakistani press has been reporting on the issues arising from the management styles of those vice chancellors who have been appointed against the rules set up by Higher Education Commission. Some of these Vice Chancellors consisted of retired government officers, and bureaucrats. The arguments put forth for appointing these retired army officers as vice chancellors was that they have substantial training in administration. The presumption was that they could administer universities better than academicians who, presumably, spent most of their time in archives, libraries, laboratories or the classroom. This argument has not been substantiated or proven, nor has anyone presented data to prove it (Rahman, 2006). The focus of these administrators was on regulating the faculty’s conduct which proved to be problematic. Moreover, according to Rahman (2006) the university faculty does not respect these administrators as they are not known in the academic world.

*A meta-analysis combines the results of several studies that address a set of related research hypotheses.*
Researchers like Olswang & Lee (1984) have pointed out that autonomy and freedom contribute most to faculty satisfaction; therefore, the trend toward greater regulation of faculty conduct seriously affects the faculty’s job satisfaction and eventually their commitment. It is possible for a person to report greater job satisfaction but no institutional commitment (Hunter, Ventimiglia and Crow; 1980).

In Pakistan, private universities are making a reasonably good contribution to academia and the job market, as they are able to pay higher salaries and attract faculty of good quality. According to Hagedon (1994), job satisfaction is dependent on a number of factors and a good predictor of satisfaction in academia consists of satisfaction with salary. Nienhuis (1994) reported that “collegiality” as a factor increases a sense of commitment and leads to increased job satisfaction. According to Hort & Oxley (1992), job-related stress could be a contributor to faculty’s dissatisfaction and this dissatisfaction, according to Moore & Gardner (1992), may move a faculty member to disassociate himself from the organization. Increased regulation of faculty conduct and poor administrator-faculty relationships can also cause dissatisfaction and low commitment (Hort & Oxley, 1992).

Halford (1994) highlighted the crucial role of leadership style in determining faculty morale in HEIs. It is the participatory leadership style that builds a supportive institutional environment which is perceived favorably by faculty (Madron & Craig 1976).

It has been reported that wages, job security, promotion, union affiliation, tenure and type of organization are some of the variables, which exert considerable influence on commitment in industrialized societies. Steers (1977) points out that in western countries, cross-validational studies, whereby hypotheses or models are tested and then
replicated in a different higher education environments are rarely done. However, many studies have been done in Israel, India, China and Iran. In Pakistan there is a paucity of jobs and job opportunities. Thus it would be interesting and useful to know if there are some potential and significant differences in organizational commitment that exists in Pakistan.

All three types of organizational commitments propagated by Meyer & Allen (1993), were statistically significant in the Pakistani universities, namely, affective, normative and affirmative commitments. Alvi & Ahmed (1987) suggested that, gender has a negative relationship with organizational commitment. Thus female employees are more likely to leave their university workplace than their male counterparts (Marsh & Mannari, 1977). This may not hold good in Pakistan due to high unemployment and low horizontal mobility for people and its male-dominated work environment (Alvi & Ahmed, 1987). Age restrictions exist for eligibility to the large pool of government jobs, so that even if people want to further their education, they loose their benefits if they do so. On the other hand, in developed countries such as the USA, Canada; and UK the discrimination based on age, gender and ethnicity is prohibited. In this study respondents data was separated into two groups based on gender, and organizational commitment of male and female was also examined.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

An important aspect of the study of commitment, participation and faculty’s job satisfaction is an investigation of the factors that impact either positively or negatively on them. In this regard considerations, like what causes job stress and its ultimate impact on the physical and emotional health of faculty members in higher education, is very relevant. So is the senior administrators’ leadership style, particularly the degree to
which administrators are perceived to be willing to empower faculty and include them in institutional decision-making processes.

The term higher education institutions evoke a whole array of widely differing establishments. Thus Kerr (1994), says that, “The rule of the game, the layouts and conditions of the playing fields, the composition of the teams and the methods of keeping score, all vary enormously from one segment of higher education to another.

This study strives to provide a greater understanding of the influence of leadership behavior on commitment. Specifically, it provides information about the relationship between relation-oriented and task oriented behaviors, participative decision-making and different types of organizational commitments. It explores universities’ leaderships’ behavior and its influence on faculty’s commitment, job satisfaction and morale. It assumes how and to what extent organizational commitment is related to participatory decision-making, job satisfaction and morale in Pakistani universities.

Such insights into the determinants of faculty commitment, efficacy of various leadership styles in university administrations and efficacy of faculty’s involvement in decision making will contribute to the management paradigm of the Pakistani University. There findings are important in determining where to make effective change management strategies in the universities. The findings of this research are also aimed to facilitate policy makers to develop policies that are targeted to improve working conditions of University faculty and thus improve the effectiveness and vitality of higher education institutions.
Problem Setting

1.4 Issues of Leadership Behavior, Faculty’s Commitment and Job Satisfaction in Pakistan

The state of HEIs in terms of job satisfaction, commitment and turn over, necessitates that a study be done in the area. Under the current administrative structure, there are reports that faculty turn over in some universities is on a higher side. This study examines faculty’s commitment to Universities. As noted by Mahmood (1999), if teachers have a voice in matters affecting them, they would be more likely to internalize the decisions and implement them.

The salary difference in private and public sector institutions is significantly different. Their organizational structures also differ. The question of higher education governance is linked with the administrator’s leadership styles and faculty’s participation in decision-making. A study conducted by Carnegie Foundation in different countries found that there was high level of faculty dissatisfaction with the current level of administrative and governance arrangements (Altbach & Lewis, 1995). Faculty was unhappy about the hierarchical and rigid governance structures of their institutions. A large number of faculty members reported dissatisfaction and doubts about the quality of leadership provided by their top-level administrators. The majority of faculty members in eight different countries reported that their senior administrators were autocratic and a majority of respondents in six countries agreed that lack of faculty involvement in governance was a problem.

1.5 Conditions of Higher Education in Pakistan

Over the years, many writers have reported on the conditions of higher education in Pakistan. Articles appearing in popular press in Pakistan have been repeatedly urging
about provision of facilities, working conditions of faculty, governance practices and the leadership style of administrators. A recent survey done by Ghuman (2005) showed that more than one dozen universities are headed by non PhD retired government officers, with titles such as Vice Chancellor, Rector or Director General. These writings have also pointed out that due to limited number of PhDs and experienced faculty, there has been a trend for faculty to switch between the universities after every few years. The salaries are not good in the public sector, while the contract-based employment is the problem in private sector. This situation is in stark contrast to that in most developed countries. Schuster (1986), Miller (1992), and Middle Hurst (1993) found that in higher educational institutes in America, Australia and United Kingdom, faculty was satisfied with their jobs. In all three countries research reflected their strong commitment to their institutions.

1.6 Our Universities Working Environment

The work of Weber (1948) has provided a valuable insight into the workings of complex organizations. Universities are generally large organizations, which are mostly bureaucratically structured, fairly rigid, increasingly complex, and resistant to change. The characteristics of a bureaucracy suggested by Weber (1948), include hierarchy, continuity as in career structure of salaried professional, impersonality as in rules and regulations, and expertise with officials being selected according to merit (Beetham 1987). The other element of this type of organizations includes control, order, efficiency and stability. If these elements are taken as positive then there are certainly some negativities attached with them too, and that is they are reluctant to change, employees are dissatisfied, they lack innovation, there is lot of red taping, lot of procedural paper work and a power seeking behavior exhibited by the administrators.
Bureaucracies emphasize authority and often managers within such organizations are reluctant to relinquish any of their powers and authorities. That being a reality, it is not surprising to find that our public sector universities fit into a well-established bureaucratic culture. Although the size and complexity of many public universities and the increasing specializations and new degree programs have made it difficult to restructure the universities, in anyway, other than bureaucratically. Professionals, such as senior faculty and PhD’s, who normally work in public sector universities, are naturally subjected to the bureaucratic nature of the universities. On the other hand professionals working in private universities are subjected to the different value systems and practices of the universities. The socialization processes of professors in different types of universities also determine how well these professors fit into these organizations, that is, the cultural fit of these professors in their working environment. Professors working in a professional bureaucracy, like a university, may accept the broad organizational culture in which they work, but may disagree with the managerial strategies applied in the organization. This is an example of mismatch or gap between the expectations of employees and management strategies. Such a mismatch would have considerable influence on employee’s commitment to the organization. Another reality in Pakistani universities, as pointed out by deans in their interviews and by the Federation of All Pakistan Universities Academic Staff Association (FAPUASA), is that retired government officers with no academic, administration or teaching experience run some of the major and oldest universities in the country.

An interesting fact as revealed by the HEC chairman is that the commission cannot stop the Provincial Governors (Chancellors) from appointing theses people as Vice Chancellors in nation’s public sector universities. Based on interviews and survey
results, it is clear that faculty’s job satisfaction and morale has suffered in most of the universities headed by retired government officers with no academic institutions administration experience.

History shows that academic freedom is not only a fundamental pre-requisite for an effective university, but a core value for academia. Academic freedom must be at the top of the agenda for everyone concerned with higher education. This new breed of leadership in nation’s universities stresses more on regulating the faculty. They should be doing all in their power to improve faculty job satisfaction and morale and some of the public sector universities seriously need more traditional faculty autonomy, such intrinsic factors as autonomy and freedom contribute optimum to faculty satisfaction, but if that autonomy is challenged or restricted, the environment becomes less enjoyable as a work place and increased regulation of faculty conduct does serious damage to faculty job satisfaction and morale (Olswang & Lee: 1984). This further substantiates previous studies, which show the leadership style of senior administrators to be a most significant factor influencing faculty in terms of job satisfaction and morale. There are other factors explained in chapter 4 of this study, but it appears that the way faculty perceives its administrator’s leadership style is a factor, which relates to the job satisfaction and commitment. When faculty finds the leadership style to be supportive, its job satisfaction enhances.

There are two strong dimensions of university autonomy: One is academic dimension and the other is administrative dimension. There is a need to look into to the area of responsibilities regarding programming actions, setting standards, policies, degree requirements, restructuring the departments and responding to accountability requirements. The other dimension reflects campus flexibility regarding managing
revenues, setting tuition fees, appointing personnel, budgeting and expending funds.

The other important aspect is who should be running the universities, both in public and private sectors?

### Table 1.1 Existing Framework of University Management in the Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Main Functions</th>
<th>Usual Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies</td>
<td>Academic matters at the departmental level</td>
<td>*Senior faculty members of the department concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Eminent professionals of the field concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by the chairman of the department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of faculty</td>
<td>All academic matters at the faculty level</td>
<td>*Senior faculty members of the concerned faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by the dean of faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic council</td>
<td>All academic matters at the university level, affiliated colleges and institutions.</td>
<td>*Deans, Professors, Chairmen of teaching departments, Nominees of the chancellor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals of affiliated colleges, Librarian, Representative/Secretary of Provincial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Department, Experts of the fields pertinent to the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by the Vice-Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndicate</td>
<td>*Main executive body, *Manage university funds and properties</td>
<td>*Members of the provincial assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Affiliate, Disaffiliate colleges</td>
<td>*Members of university senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Inspect affiliated institutions</td>
<td>*Chief Justice of the concerned High Court (or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Appoint officers and teachers</td>
<td>a judge of the High Court nominated by him)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Oversee service matters of all the officers concerned</td>
<td>*Secretary of the Provincial Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Nominee of Higher Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Representatives of University professors/teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Nominees of the chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Principals of affiliated colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by the Vice-Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>*Statutes</td>
<td>*Members of Syndicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Review annual performance of the university</td>
<td>*Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Appoint members to various bodies</td>
<td>*University teacher’s representative (other than professors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Budgets and finance overlays</td>
<td>*Principals of affiliated colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Students representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Alumni’s representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Vice-chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaired by the chancellor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 The Issue of University Ranking and Higher Education Commission

Universities in Pakistan do not share one basic philosophy and mission, and do not operate under similar educational policies.

The HEC oversees the quality of university education in Pakistan. It replaced the University Grants Commission (UGC) in 2002. HEC has taken key initiatives to overhaul the conditions of universities in many ways. It started a program to increase the number of PhDs in the universities by offering scholarships for studies abroad and encouraged research programs within the country. It also introduced a model university ordinance besides publishing a ranking of universities in Pakistan.

HEC stated that the primary purpose of the ranking exercise was to share comprehensive data with the general public on the key issues that determine the state of higher education in a particular institution. The rankings are published according to broad institutional subject areas (HEC Report 2006). These subject areas consist of Agriculture, Veterinary Sciences, Art and Design, Business and Information Technology, Engineering, General and Health Sciences. *The report has generated a debate within the academia in Pakistan. HEC also announced that this ranking is to be used simply as one kind of reference to assist parents and potential students to choose the most suitable institution to study. HEC based its ranking on data collected on certain key issues which were given certain weights. Students were given a weight of 17 %, facilities 15 %, finances 15%, faculty 27%, and research 26%. HEC collected data from 2001 to 2004 from Universities through a questionnaire.

*HEC while issuing this list also warned people that, “University rankings are inherently controversial, and no ranking is satisfying to all”. All readers should be cautious while reading these rankings, and should not completely rely on the ranking list as definitive.
According to this information 58 Universities, both public sector and private sector were included in the list of ranking. As many as 56 Universities, 20 public and 36 private Universities were not considered for ranking, since they were granted their charters after 2001.

In the area of faculty excellence there are 4 universities scoring higher than 20 points. The top ranking Universities were private including Agha Khan University, Karachi and Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS).

The report also clearly states the conditions and minimum requirements for faculty selection and appointments. To be eligible for the position of a lecturer in a university one must have Master’s Degree (First Class) in the relevant field with no third division in one’s academic career. No publication or experience is required. For the position of assistant professor, the HEC eligibility criteria is a PhD degree and no prior teaching experience but very few PhDs are available. Thus, if one has a master’s degree from a foreign country or an *M.Phil (two years degree after masters) from Pakistan, one is eligible for the post of assistant professor. The positions of associate professors and full professors also require PhD degrees with 10 to 15 years of teaching experience together with 10 to 15 research publications. As there are very few faculty members who fulfill this criterion, relaxation was given for faculty to fulfill the publication requirements by July 31, 2009. HEC had asked the management of the universities to improve themselves in all areas included in the ranking and had extended the date from 2007 until 2009.

*The Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) is a postgraduate research degree requiring the completion of a thesis. It is a lesser degree than the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) but greater than (or sometimes equal to) the Bachelor of Philosophy (BPhil), and is of greater scope than the Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees. It is generally thesis only, and is regarded as a senior or second master’s degree. In some instances the degree may be awarded to graduate students after completing several years of original research, but before the defense of a dissertation, or as a substitute for a Ph.D. thesis that is a marginal fail. In some cases it can serve as a provisional enrollment for the PhD.
There are faculty related problems such as faculty may not meet required qualifications for appointment and promotion to the next position etc. HEC exceedingly stresses that research should be conducted in the universities, but unfortunately very little research has been carried out in universities. The quality of students is poor and faculty is not well qualified or experienced even up to the national standards, not to speak of international standards. HEC plans to appoint leading foreign professors at key positions for 10 years in the upcoming 6 new engineering universities, to rectify the situation (HEC, 2006). Those who disagree with HEC’s ranking criteria argue that the best way to evaluate the performance of universities and other higher institutions of educational learning is through self assessment (Haque & Ahmed, 2006). They contend that, the ranking of universities simply passes judgment and reinforces the public perception of the concerned universities. By and large, new private universities, less than a decade old, have overtaken many established professional public sector universities in a number of specialized disciplines.

The Agha Khan University, Karachi and Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS) are ranked amongst the first two Universities by HEC, which indicates that the private sector is progressing very fast in the field of higher education. The problems within public sector universities are very much deeper than they appear (Virk & Isani, 2005).
### Table 1.2 Faculty Profile of Engineering Universities (Public Sector), 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Total number of teachers</th>
<th>Teachers with PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National University of Sciences and Technology, Rawalpindi</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehran University of Engineering and Technology, Jamshoro</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan Institute of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Islamabad</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaid-i-Awam University of Engineering Sciences and Technology, Nawabshah</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Engineering and Technology, Taxila</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchistan University of Engineering and Technology, Khuzdar</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,407</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 1.3 Faculty Profiles of Agricultural Universities, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Total number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of PhDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Agriculture, Faisalabad</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP Agricultural University, Peshawar</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>951</strong></td>
<td><strong>462</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Definition of Terms and Concepts

The thesis involves concept and terms, which are defined in the preceding pages.

Leadership Style

Leadership style has been defined as a behavior that leaders use to influence a group towards the achievement of goals. Stogdill, (1974) defines leadership to be a process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement. Different leadership styles and models, such as Bass and Avolio’s (1990), leadership model, Vroom and Yetton’s (1989), autocratic and participative model, Hershey & Blanchard’s (1977), model of concern for task or people, the task and relation oriented behavior model of Fielder’s (1967) have been studied extensively.

Organizational Commitment

The term commitment refers to an outcome in which a person agrees with a decision or request and makes personal efforts to carry out the request or implement the decision effectively. Meyer and Herscovitch (2002), define commitment as “a force that guides a course of action towards one or more targets”. Meyer and Allen (1997), also presented a “three-component model of commitment”, which refers to three forms of commitment as affective, continuance and normative commitment. (Meyer, 2001; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002) suggest that operationalized measures of the three-component commitment model have been shown to predict many important outcomes, such as task performance, and job satisfaction.

Types of Organizational Commitment

The three types of organizational commitment are described below. Affective commitment refers to employee’s emotional attachment, identification with, and
involvement in the organization. Employees with strong affective commitments stay with the organization because they want to. (Brown, 2003)

Continuance commitment refers to employees’ assessment of whether the costs of leaving the organization are greater than the cost of staying. Employees who perceive that the cost of leaving the organization is greater than the cost of staying, remain with the organization because they need to (Brown, 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997)

Meyer & Allen (1997), define normative commitment as feeling of obligation which employees have, to the organization. Employees with high level of normative commitments stay with the organization because they feel they ought to.

**Job Satisfaction**

The term job satisfaction refers to, an attitude which individuals have about their jobs. It results from perception of their jobs and the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organization (Ivancevich, 1997). Job satisfaction has received a great deal of attention in the last few decades. Furthermore, job satisfaction seems to have to do more with a single individual than a group. Locke (1976) has defined job satisfaction as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of ones job or job experience”.

**Personal and Demographic Characteristics**

The variables of age, tenure, education and gender have been suggested in previous studies as having significant influence on organizational commitment (Steers, 1977) and were included in this study. Other demographic variables, such as length of time in the current position and years of teaching experience were also included because of their “importance in the higher education context” (Battersby, 1990).
Morale

The concept of faculty morale is a complex one which is closely related to other concepts including job satisfaction and commitment. Morale is taken as the state of mind which predisposes a group or individual at a particular time, to view the leader or leaders, organization and its policies as contributing to, or thwarting, their need satisfaction (Pestonjee, 1973).

Faculty

Faculty, in this thesis refers to the academic staff of a public or private university. It includes not only those whose current primary purpose in a university or college is teaching and research, but also personnel in the senior administration of higher education who have arrived at that capacity having spent some time as academic staff members.

Public and Private University

This is a term that, in the education sector, takes in all post secondary-level educational institutions including degree granting universities and institutes. Public Universities are those that receive funding from the federal or provincial governments and follow uniform rules regarding faculty hiring, job tenure etc. Private Universities are those that are either run by a trust, a board or a single owner, which do not receive provincial or federal government funding. However, they are given a degree granting authority and charter by the province or federal government. Their rules and regulations pertaining to faculty hiring, job tenure etc may also vary from one university to another.

Administration

While this term often differs from institution to institution, administration is used to refer to a group of higher management academic executives at the apex of the 18
Universities involved in this study. This group of senior administrators comprises the president, vice chancellor, or rector and or director, or chairman of an institute or university and includes the deans, heads of departments involved in the day-to-day management and governance of the institution. It does not refer to the wider administrative staff of office workers etc.

**Institutional Autonomy**

In matters of governance and administration, institutional autonomy describes the relative freedom from constraints imposed by the relationship between the university and society, particularly the government and other bodies that provide higher education with its main source of funding.

**Academic Freedom**

This term refers to the degree of autonomy of the individual to pursue learning “free of externally imposed dictates” (Brubacher 1977).

**University Grants Commission (UGC) and Higher Education Commission (HEC)**

The Federal Government had designated the University Grants Commission to be the authority for enforcing the provisions of UGC Act of 1974, according to which the UGC was authorized to supervise the curricula, textbook and standards of education at the University level. In 2002 the Higher Education Commission replaced the UGC. The HEC was primarily set up for the improvement of the quality of academic programmes in both, public and private sector Universities.

**1.9 Significance of the Study**

The attitude and relationship which teachers have towards their universities is important to all stakeholders involved in education. The Universities are interested in
employee retention (Mobley, Griffeth, & Magelino, 1979). It has also been suggested by researchers that employees who exhibit high organizational commitment should be least likely to leave the organization and employees with low levels of commitment should be the most likely to leave the organization, voluntarily (Huselid & Day 1991). Managers are making efforts to enhance their employee’s commitment because they believe that commitment has become a prerequisite for effective and well performing organizations. In academics, commitment is considered an important factor which increases the effectiveness of the educational enterprise. The leadership style of Vice Chancellors of Higher Education Institutions has gained importance due to the recent implies by HEC for conducting research in the Universities. Researchers have also tried to find out which style of leadership is suitable for higher management of educational institutions because the effectiveness of HEIs depends on the quality, morale and conviction of its faculty (Lok, 1999).

1.10 Problem Statement

While these studies have shown that leadership behavior affects employees’ commitment towards the organization, but the literature does not offer guidance on how relation-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviors affect different types of organizational commitment. In Pakistani universities, we do not know how faculty is affected by their Vice-Chancellors relation-oriented and task-oriented behaviors and what effect this has upon the organizational commitment of its faculty. Secondly, we also do not know if participative decision making has any favorable effect on employees’ commitment to the organization. Finally, we do not know how the relation-oriented and task-oriented leadership behavior is related to the organizational commitment of the faculty. We also do not know whether task-oriented behavior has a more significant
effect than relationship oriented behavior on organizational commitment. Studies conducted by Meyer and Allen (1997) and Steers (1977) have shown affective commitment to be dominant in their settings of studies. This study has compared the findings of above authors with its own findings in Pakistan.

1.11 Research Questions:

The researcher’s interest in the construct of commitment and leadership behavior raised a number of issues. The basic research questions that have provided direction for the present study, and which needed answers are,

1. Is faculty’s commitment influenced by behavior of university leadership and does it affect male and female faculty members differently?

2. Among the three types of leadership behavior which one contributes more towards faculty’s intention to stay with its university?

3. If faculty is consulted in the university’s decision making process, would it have positive influence on its loyalty towards university and what would be its affect on their satisfaction from their job, organization and profession?

4. What kind of relation exists between organizational commitments, Job satisfaction and morale of faculty?

Chapter one of this study deals with the structure of the thesis, rationale and the significance of the research conducted. A review of literature on organizational commitment, decision-making types, leadership styles and job satisfaction is presented in chapter 2. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the thesis. Chapter 4 presents the empirical results. Chapter 5 provides the discussion and conclusion of the thesis.
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CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many contributions in the literature pertaining to leadership behavior. One important contribution has been the use of relation-oriented and task-oriented terms to explain different types of leadership behaviors (Brown, 2003). Bass and Avolio, Hersey & Blanchard, Meyer and Allen, Lok, Marrow, Randal and Cote, and Steers are the most renowned researchers in this area of study. A survey of literature by this researcher revealed that although these researchers are from industrialized countries, yet their proposed models have been tested in diverse countries, such as Israel, Australia, United Arab Emirates, and Turkey. Cohen (1991, 1999) from university of Haifa Israel tested the organizational commitment model of Marrow, Randal and Cote. In 1999 he conducted a Meta analysis of research done on organizational commitment. Lok (1999, 2003) tested different models of job satisfaction and morale in Australia. Yousuf (2004) and Wasti (2003) did research on organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Middle East and Turkey. They found that leadership behavior, organizational commitment, participatory decision-making, morale and job satisfaction were closely inter-related.

An examination of the literature revealed that EBSCO (Elton B. Stephens Company) had added 136 published articles on leadership to its website from January 1970 to December 1971. By 2002 there were 10,062 published articles which consisted of 419 per month on an average each month. The US corporate sector spent $45 billion on leadership and management development in 1997. Currently 900 programs are run in colleges and universities on the topic of leadership alone. This is evidence, that investment in leadership development has increased significantly (Vicere & Fulmer 1998; Fulmer 1997).
2.1 Leadership

It is important to examine the concept of leadership as well as relevant theories pertaining to leadership in the academic sector. Prior to the 1980, “Leadership and Management” were used synonymously. They were regarded as being the same or as extensively overlapping. When leadership was taught or studied, it was regarded as a small sub-set of management and the focus was on influencing the small groups. Then in the 1980’s there was a paradigm shift and the mood shifted substantially. Researchers started to identify the link between leadership behavior and performance of employees. The message was that transformation was required and that this required a new type of leader. The leaders who could, “encourage the development of positive identification with the organization and create a degree of personal commitment” (Bass & Avolio 1995). Researchers like Angle and Perry (1983) concluded that the extent of employee commitment may rest largely in management’s hands”. Since then, research studies have consistently confirmed a positive relationship between leadership and commitment.

Leadership in Academics

Madron, Craig and Mendel (1976) identified leadership performance as one of three variables that affect faculty in higher education. They pointed out administrative behavior as the best predictor of commitment. University heads, which were participatory in their leadership style, were thought as being considerate, and the commitment level of faculty members in such a university was high. In another study Hunter (1982) found that leadership style made a real difference to faculty’s morale.

Tagai (1999) suggested that leadership style in academics fall into two categories, and the style, which is compatible with academics values, is McGregor’s (1960) Theory X
of human nature. And the style, which is incompatible with academic values, falls under Theory Y. In McGregor’s (1960) Theory X and Theory Y model, Theory X is labeled as being negative and the managers, who practice this theory, assume that employees dislike work and will avoid it if possible. Based on this type of assumptions, the practitioners of this theory would have a behavior of coercing employees. They would like to control employees through tasks, activities, and would like to direct their behavior. The other theory is labeled as Theory Y. The managers who believe on practicing this theory assume that if employees are given right conditions and trusted, they would look at work and responsibility very positively. Managers who believe on Theory Y would like to provide employees with encouragement, positive reinforcement, and rewards.

Another theory is known as Heresy and Blanchard’s (1977) situational leadership theory. They claim that leadership behaviors have two areas of concern: one is that leaders concern for task and the other is concern for relations. They suggest that leaders with this behavior are mainly concerned with delegation, participation, selling, and telling. When the leader believe that the employees have become mature and are grown in capacity, ability, education, experience, and motivation, the need for socio-emotional support increases. They also believe that employees continue to grow and become mature and at certain stage they don’t need any type of orientation. And the management should stop selling and telling and should involve them in decision making process.

Olswang and Lee (1984) warned that increased regulation of faculty conduct could have a serious impact on faculty’s job satisfaction and morale. Hurst (1993) suggested that it is the leadership behavior that makes faculty feels important. Millet (1978)
referred the bureaucratic type leadership behavior as rigid and as incompatible with academic scholarship. He further suggested that the faculty members should resist the threat of bureaucratization in higher education. Kerr, (1994) expected that presidents, vice-chancellors and others in administration of universities, should be people who would allow greater involvement of faculty in decision making than exercising their authority.

Bess (1988) argued that faculty members conditionally accept directives from the leaders such as where academics are involved in the process of decision-making.

**Theories of Leadership**

For many years, the focus of leadership studies has been derived from organizational psychology concerns to understand the impact of leader style on small group behavior and outcomes. Moreover, the focus was further directed to just two main dimensions, “task focus” versus “people focus” and there were various reworking of this theme (for example Blake and Mouton 1964; Vroom and Yetton 1988).

In the 1980’s attention shifted dramatically to the elaboration and promotion of the concept of transformational, charismatic, visionary and inspirational leadership. This school was labeled the “New Leadership” theories (Brymen, 1992). This new approach has shifted attention to leadership of entire organizations, rather than the leadership of small groups. In the leadership literature a debate also started on the issue of role of leader and manager. Leaders think about goals, they are active rather than reactive, shaping ideas rather than responding to them. Managers on the other hand, aim to shift balance of power towards solutions acceptable as compromises. Managers would try to minimize the choices and leaders would encourage employee to develop new ideas and fresh approaches. Evidently the controversy about the essential differences between
leadership and management will continue for some time. But the more practice-oriented agenda is still evolving e.g., one significant development has been the linking of the idea of leadership with that of strategic management (Westley & Mintzberg, 1989).

Preferred leadership styles evidently vary across time and place. On the time dimension, there may even be varying degrees of reaction to previously experienced approaches. Leadership style is thus path dependent. Leadership effectiveness therefore depends upon the following two factors:

1) The extent to which people follow and give legitimacy

2) The extent to which the organization succeeds and survives.

Table 2.1 gives a short list of leadership theories, which have been developed over time. One very important theory has been leader-style theory.

**Leader-Style Theory**

Vroom and Yetton presented their famous decision making model in 1973. This model suggests different ways leaders can make decisions. This model also helps leaders to determine when and how much input they can seek from employees in decision making process. This model was expanded and is known as the, “Vroom, Yetton, Jago Model”. This model, first time presented methods for determining the appropriateness of leader style. This model suggests that organizational decisions should be of the highest quality and when employees participate in this process they should accept and remain committed.

**2.2 Research and Findings about Leadership Behavior**

While a review of leadership theory based on the chronological development of the literature can be useful, it also has a number of limitations. The main problem is that the evolutionary accounts tend to imply that previous theory has been refuted and
superseded. In reality, questions concerning leadership qualities and characteristics, appropriate style, contingent conditions and transactional, as well as transformational, continue to perplex and prompt debate.

Bass (1990) suggested some characteristics of leadership behavior and according to him; the inspirational appeal of relation-oriented leaders can provide followers with challenges and meaning for engaging in shared goals. This appeal primarily focuses on the best qualities of the people. Qualities like harmony, charity and team work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trait theory; innate qualities; ‘great man theory</td>
<td>Bernard (1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral theories; task related and relationship</td>
<td>Ohio State University studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related; style theory (autocratic vs. democratic)</td>
<td>Michigan (Katz and Kahn 1978) (Likert 1961; Blake &amp; Mouton 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational and contingency theory;</td>
<td>Fiedler (1967); Vroom and Yetton (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertoire of style; expectancy theory</td>
<td>Vroom (1964); Yukl (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership within Learning Organizations</td>
<td>Senge (1990); Selmet (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership as a creative and collective process</td>
<td>Brown and Gioia (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed leadership</td>
<td>Tichy (1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from R.N. Lussier, “Leadership, theory, application, skill development” Thompson, South-Western 2004

The inspirational appeal of the pseudo-transformational leaders tends to focus on the worst in people. It focuses on weaknesses, it tends to conspire, and it would show unreal dangers. This type of leaders would not solve problems instead would make excuses, and scare employees with threat of insecurities. This type of managers tends to mislead, and deceive their subordinates. Sankowsky (1995), narrates that this type of leaders can
be subtle and speak with forked tongue, for instance they would offer followers empowerment, but would continue to treat them as dependent children. They talk about empowerment but actually continue to seek control (Conger & Kaunungo, 1998).

Kanungo and Medonca (1996) have linked this to an empowerment process. For them, empowerment is more than broadening the scope of participation by followers. It is motivational and enabling, highlighting a new realization and transformation of the person. The intellectual stimulation of relation-oriented leadership behavior incorporates a more open dynamic into vision formulation and patterns of implementation. Such openness has a spiritual dimension and this helps followers to reject assumptions and generate more creative solutions to problems. It is especially suited to the normative side of ethics, where human probing of the ground of being is both fathomless and endless. To the point, this dynamic breaks the bond of organizational and leadership cultures that ignores fundamental questions such as altruism (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). Avolio and Bass, (2002), Bass and Avolio, 1994) explain in their study that the transformational leadership has a charismatic element known as ideal influence, in which leaders become role models and followers tend to admire and respect them. Jung and Avolio, (2000), describe this as a positive outcome in which followers show lot of trust in such leaders. Idealized influence in leadership also involves integrity in the form of ethical and moral conduct (Tracey and Hinkin, 1998).

Jung and Avolio, (2000), stressed that the role of relation-oriented leader is to develop a shared vision, which is an integral component of idealized influence. Followers are inspired and they would align personal values and interests to the collective interests of the group’s purposes (Avolio and Bass, 2002, Bass, 2000)
Researchers suggest that “relation-oriented leaders are also willing to take and share risks with followers” (Avolio and Bass, 2002). Leaders are able to assess individual needs of follower’s, and are quick to disburse personal attention for follower’s achievements and growth (Avolio and Bass, 2002). Leaders should act as a coach, developing followers in a supportive climate to “higher levels of potential” (Bass, 1998).

This potential is developed by delegating tasks and then by monitoring those tasks and giving additional support and direction when needed. Behling and McFillen, (1996), suggest that the net effect of relation-oriented leadership behaviors is empowerment of followers and this type of leaders can develop a very powerful influence over followers. Several other research studies have documented the power of relation-oriented leadership in establishing value and trust (Jung and Avolio, 2000).

Yukl (2002), summarize relation-oriented leaders actions as very appealing, having a clear vision, would empower employees to achieve the vision, they don’t just delegate task but explain how to attain it. They show confidence in the followers, emphasize values with symbolic actions and these leaders would lead by example. If followers perform in accordance with contracts and put extra effort the leader provides them with rewards.

Bass in 1985 presented a model of relation-oriented and task-oriented leadership style. These styles according to Bass compliment each other. In his views relation-oriented leaders are those who encourage followers to achieve goals and task-oriented are those that ask for commitment to achieve those goals and offer a reward. Bass (1985) also suggest that a leader could exhibit both styles. The model Bass presented in 1985 represents the recent descriptions of task and relation-oriented behaviors. In 1990 Bass presented a theory and concept and tried to link relation and task behaviors to all other
types of leadership. In his theory he suggests that transformational leadership occurs when a leader changes his followers in ways that together result in trusting the leader, performing behaviors that contribute to the achievement of organizational goals, and being motivated to perform at a high level.

2.3 Evolution of Relationship Oriented and Task Oriented Leadership

Behaviors

There are several distinct theoretical bases for leadership. At first, leaders were felt to be born, not made. These early theories of leadership mainly focused on the characteristics of great men and authors presented “the great men” theory. The great men theory was mainly concerned with the power, intelligence, energy, and influence of the great leaders. Inspired by the great men theory, it was Bass in 1990, who said that “Without Churchill the British would have given up in 1940”

According to Yukl, (2004), the great men theory of leadership insisted that traits of leadership cannot be learned and leaders are born not made. These traits allowed the leaders to lead others. Later on more emphasis was made on the qualities and of leaders and also the traits, which separated the leaders from the followers. According to Bass (1990), these situations lead to the emergence of trait theory. The trait approach is concerned mainly with identifying the personality traits of the leader.

Dissatisfied with this approach, and stimulated by research such as Ohio State Theory, researchers switched their emphasis from the individual leader to the group being led. In the group approach, leaders were viewed more in terms of their behavior and how this behavior is affected by the group of followers. Trait theory was followed by behavioral theory (Yukl, 2004), and then Fiedler’s contingency theory emerged.
This theory suggests that leadership styles must fit or match the situation in order to be effective.

Leadership behavior was then, separated into two types, person oriented and task oriented. Following the original Ohio State Studies and the grid approach, Hersey and Blanchard’s (1993) approach identified two major behaviors namely task and relationship-oriented behaviors. In task behavior the leader organizes and defines roles for members of the work group; the leader explains the task that members have to do and when, where, and how they have to do it. This type of behavior is primarily concerned with accomplishing the task, utilizing personnel and resources efficiently, and maintaining orderly, reliable operations. Some examples of leaders with task oriented behaviors include organizing work activities to improve efficiency, planning short-term operations, assigning work to groups or individuals, clarifying role expectations and task objectives, explaining rules, policies, and standard operating procedures, monitoring operations and performance, resolving immediate problems that would disrupt the work, emphasizing the importance of efficiency, productivity, and quality, and setting high standards for unit performance.

In relationship behavior the leader has close, personal relationships with the members of the group, and there is open communication and psychological and emotional support. This type of behavior is primarily concerned with improving relationships and helping people, increasing cooperation and team work, increasing the job satisfaction of subordinates, and building identification with the organization. Some attributes of leaders with task oriented behaviors are given next. They provide support and encouragement. They express confidence that people can attain challenging objectives. They socialize
with people to build relationships. They recognize contributions and accomplishments. They provide coaching and mentoring.

They consult with people on decisions affecting them. They keep people informed about actions affecting them. They use symbols, ceremonies, rituals, and stories to build team identity. They lead by example and model exemplary behavior.

2.4 Research on Task and Relation Oriented Leadership Behavior

Early studies of leadership behavior were mainly concerned with making comparison of the behaviors of different types of leaders: with a manager, the born or made leader, the autocratic leaders versus the participative leader, and McGregor’s (1960) Theory X with Theory Y. Generally there were efforts to show which style and behavior was more effective, for example Blake and Mouton (1964) reported that relationship oriented leaders encourage followers to participate in decision making, while for task oriented leaders, nothing was more important than to accomplish the task or goal. Similarly Meyer (1968) investigated the effect of leadership perception about Theory X and Theory Y. And his findings revealed that as opposed to workers who were exposed to theory X, workers who were exposed to Theory Y style of leadership behavior were more positive in their attitude and were feeling greater responsibility in achieving the factory goals. Based on the work of psychologists, organizational theorists, and human relations specialists in the 1960s and 1970s, two distinct assumptions, called Theory X and Theory Y, evolved about why and how people work for others. Theory X posits that people do not like to work and will avoid doing so if the opportunity presents itself. Because of this, most people need to be coerced into completing their required job duties and punished if they don't complete the quantity of work assigned at the level of quality required. Again, because of their dislike for work, most people do
not want responsibility, prefer to be directed by others, and have little ambition; all they want is job security.

With an almost completely opposite perspective, Theory Y posits that people like to work and see it as a natural event in their lives. Therefore, punishment and threats are not the only means of motivating them to complete work assignments. People are willing to work hard for an organization; indeed, they will use self-direction and control to work toward goals that are understandable and communicated clearly. In this theory of human behavior and motivation, people are seen as seekers of learning and responsibility that are capable of and willing to be engaged with creative problem-solving activities that will help the organization reach its goals. According to Theory Y, leaders need to develop ways to expand the capabilities of their workers so that the organization can benefit from this significant potential resource. Although Theory Y has much to offer and is widely followed, many organizations still use a variety of policies and practices that are based on Theory X principles.

In the area of management practice (Blake and Mouton, 1964) reported that managers displaying both task and relation oriented behavior moved faster in their career than those with other style of leadership.

Studies done by (Bowers & Seashore, 1966; Likert, 1961, 1967; Sorenson, 2000) also show that when relation-oriented leaders are concerned about relationships, it tends to increase teamwork, collaboration and cooperation, and followers start to associate them with team and identify them with the organization. This type of leadership builds an effective interpersonal relationships and help subordinates deal with job stress, which can help to reduce job conflicts (Amason, 1996). In addition subordinates sometime try to imitate their leaders’ supportive behaviors (Weiss, 1977) which in turn further
support positive interaction and working relationships, very likely leading to innovative collaboration (Haskins et al., 1998).

Studies show that task-oriented leaders put lot of effort on task-oriented functions, which could include planning, work scheduling, providing equipment, supplies, coordinating follower’s activities, and providing technical assistance when needed. These types of leaders usually define and structure their own roles and the roles of their subordinates, and then they closely monitor and supervise subordinates (Likert, 1961, 1967). This practice helps to reduce job and task conflicts among subordinates. Findings of earlier research also suggest that the task-oriented leader’s actions do not contribute in confidence building among the employees since they tend to coordinate the activities of their subordinates. Subordinate do not coordinate among themselves due to their leader’s behavior. Task-oriented leaders do not design the work in such a way which allows their subordinates to collaborate and interact among each other, thus resulting in minimal synergy within their group.

Hersey and Blanchard (1993) identified task-oriented behavior as the extent to which a leader engages in one sided communication by directing what each follower is to do when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished. They defined relation-oriented behavior as the extent to which a leader engages in two-way communication by facilitating behavior, providing emotional support and encouraging new ideas to accomplish task. The research has provided evidence that some people are strong in one area and ignore the other, some are well balanced and there are some who tend to overlook both leadership dimensions.

Lewin & Lippitt, (1938) found that task-oriented behavior is more dictatorial and it involves a focus on goals and tasks to be accomplished. It tends to deny others
involvement in the decision-making process, while relation-oriented is more similar to democratic behavior which includes the invitation to participate, praise and encourage.

Research done on these two types of behavior have produced findings that both task and relation oriented behaviors can be effective in different situations while the combination of both styles is also effective. The focus of these studies has been to find out which style of leadership behavior was most effective, task oriented, relation oriented or combination of both.

**Participatory leadership**

Participatory leadership involves the use of different methods and procedures that allow and invite other people to have some input and influence over leader’s decisions. There are other terms used to refer to aspects of participative leadership, which include consultation, collective decision-making, sharing power, delegating, and democratic management.

Yukl, (1971), defined participative leadership as a distinct type of behavior, although it may be used in conjunction with specific task-oriented and relation-oriented behaviors. For example consulting with employees about the design of a flextime system may simultaneously involve planning better work schedules, and showing concern for employees needs. Participative leadership can take many forms.

A variety of different decision procedures may be used to involve other people in making decisions. A number of leadership theorists have proposed different taxonomies of decision procedures or the best way to define them, (Yukal, 1969; Vroom & Yetton, 1973).
Laissez-Faire Leadership (non task-oriented behavior and non relations-oriented)

Researchers have reported the laissez-faire behavior as the least effective style of leadership (Bass, 1990). This leadership behavior has very little sense of accomplishment, little clarity, no vision, and no sense of group unity. Such behaviors include staying away from employees in isolated offices, avoidance to supervisory duties, not taking any action until issues become crisis. One study that validates non effectiveness of this type of behavior comes from Bass and Hater (1988) who found a negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership behavior and employees’ performance. This behavior should not be mixed with participative or delegative leadership behavior or management by exception. Participative leadership increases interpersonal interaction, and encourages different ideas and opinions. A leader who invites followers to the domain of decision authority will encourage team members to invite their domain of work to other members and resulting in making the entire group work more closely and holistically. The delegative leader’s main concern then is to follow up and make sure that the task has been successfully completed. Laissez-Faire leadership behavior represents a “do nothing” approach (Bass, 1990). Researchers have repeatedly reported this behavior as a less effective style of leadership (Bass, 1990).

2.5 Research on Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been the subject of several researches in the past and recent years (Griffin & Bateman 1986; Morrow, Porter, & Steers 1982; Reichers 1985; Salancik 1977; Scholl 1981; Staw 1977, Cohen, 1999, William 2004). Among the issues of major concern in these studies and findings has been the lack of consensus in constructing the definition of commitment. This problem has been compounded by the use of measures of commitment that do not always correspond to the definition being
applied (Morrow 1983; Meyer & Allen 1984). As a result, it is difficult to synthesize the results of research done on commitment. A number of theoretical perspectives have been used to study commitment and its determinants. Studies on the determinants of organizational commitment may broadly be classified into three categories, affective, normative and continuance commitment.

The study conducted by Alvi and Ahmed in 1987 in Pakistan examined commitment of male and female employees to their organizations. It used a blend of “Exchange” and “Role” theories as its basic framework. Result of this study indicated that both groups of workers are highly committed to their organizations (Alvi, & Ahmed 1987). Unlike the results of most previous studies involving industrialized societies, the degree of female commitment in Pakistan appears to be much higher than that of male workers, and age seems inversely related with commitment. Also the psychological and role-related factors seem to exert greater influence on commitment than the exchange-based and personal factors. It is widely accepted that degree of organizational commitment and job performance are positively correlated (Mowday, Porter, & Dubbin, 1974), even though tardiness, absenteeism (Steers, 1977), and turnover (Hom, Kateberg, & Hulin, 1979) are inversely related, employees organizational commitment is still an important predictor of organizational effectiveness and worker’s attitudes and beliefs (Salancik, 1977; Steers, 1977).

In view of its importance, researchers have directed a great deal of effort to identifying and analyzing meaningful determinants of employees’ commitment to their work organizations.
2.6 Research on Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment

Research on employee’s organizational commitment was further carried out into three sub-scales. Common to all commitment components is that they serve to bind an employee to an organization; otherwise, “it is clear that the nature of the psychological states differ” (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Researchers have been trying to link organization commitment to measures of effectiveness which are very similar to those found when investigating the outcomes of leadership behaviors. One such researcher was Loui, (1995), who found that commitment was significantly related to trust, job involvement, and ones satisfaction from his/her job. Angle and Perry (1981) found a relationship between commitment and intentions to leave. According to them, committed employees would be less inclined to leave the organizations they work for.

Jermier & Berkes (1979) found that employees who participated in decision-making had high levels of commitment towards the organization. Other two researchers Wiener and Verdi (1980) found a positive relationship between commitment and job performance. Their findings suggest that committed employees perform better than non-committed employees. DeCotiis & Summers (1987) reported that employees showed greater levels of commitment when treated with consideration. Bycio & Hackett & Allen (1995) found positive correlations between the leadership behaviors and affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Findings and research done on organizational commitment provides a broad measure of the effectiveness of leadership behaviors and shows a significant relationship among the two variables. This relationship demands that further exploration should be done in the subject of leadership and commitment.
Affective commitment is thought to develop through a social exchange mechanism (Meyer & Allen, 1997), whereby commitment to the organization develops in return for workplace experience such as job quality (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Of the three components, affective commitment has been researched the most. Affective commitment have shown to be correlated with reduced turnover, increased job satisfaction, increased job performance, and increased organizational citizenship behaviors (Meyers & Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

The development of continuance commitment is usually viewed through the lens of side-bet theory (Becker, 1960). Becker proposed that through the accumulation of “side-bets” such as seniority and pension plans, the employee becomes committed to the organization. Employees must be aware of the accumulation of side-bets; if employees are not aware of the loss they might incur by switching organizations, they will not feel committed to the organization. Research has shown continuance commitment to be negatively correlated with outcomes such a job performance and job satisfaction (Meyer, 2002).

Normative commitment is thought to develop through the processes described in social learning theory (i.e., internalization of cultural or familial norms) and reciprocity norms (i.e., a felt debt as a result of investments made by the organization in the individual) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The higher levels of normative commitment do not improve job-related outcomes for the highly committed group (Arzu Wasti, 2004). Job satisfaction has been shown to have correlations with normative commitment lesser in strength than, the correlations seen with affective commitment. Overall, however, research on normative commitment has been relatively rare.
Angle and Perry (1986), traced the development of research studies that examined
the tensions between organizational and professional commitment. Earlier studies of the
role conflict suggested that organizations often place individuals into two simultaneous
roles with incompatible demands, which indicates an inherent conflict between the two
commitment orientations (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn and Snodek, 1964; Rizzo et al., 1970).
Reichers (1985) also studied the role conflicts that arise when individuals are involved
with the groups, which pursue different goals. Also, concept of cosmopolitans and locals
lead some writers to focus on, “the dilemma facing professionals whose values and
loyalty to organization and profession sometimes collides” (Angle & Perry, 1986).

Gouldner (1957) implied that an individual couldn’t have a strong attachment to
both dimensions of commitment. Wallace (1993) summarized the early literature on
commitment as commonly assuming “an inherent conflict between professional and
organizational goals”.

Other researchers, however, have refuted the necessity of an either-or choice and
have rather advocated the potential for compatibility between the two orientations

2.7 Meyer and Allen’s Model of Commitment

Meyer and Allen in 1984 proposed two sub scales of commitment namely affective
and continuance commitment, and later in 1990 suggested a third component called
normative commitment. Figure 2 on page 58 presents’ hypothesized links between the
three components of commitment proposed by Meyer and Allen and variables
considered in their study as antecedents, and consequences.

On the right side of the figure are variables named by the authors as consequences
of commitment. The argument given by the authors for the development of the model
was the belief that, although all three forms of commitment relate negatively to turnover, yet they relate differently to measures of other work-relevant behaviors such as attendance, organizational citizenship behavior and on the job performance.

As the research progressed over time in other countries more and more variables have been included. Figure 2 also includes variables that, according to Mathieu and Zajac (1990), “we considered correlates of commitment because there is no consensus concerning causal ordering”. The model also shows correlates of commitment as job satisfaction, job involvement and occupational commitment. These correlates have also been frequently studied and tested by different researchers.

Moreover, Mathieu and Zajac (1990), while commenting on Meyer and Allen’s model noted that researchers were now beginning to identify other forms of commitment. They concluded that new findings are generally supporting the model. Since 1990, when Meyer and Allen added another form of commitment, to their model, many more studies have been conducted. Allen and Meyer in 1996 noted that the all three sub scales of commitment were being used outside North America and more validation were appearing on the commitment literature. Since 1996, there has been an increase in the use of these sub scales, correlates and antecedents in countries around the world. No one so far have pointed out the issues concerning the generalizability of the model in other cultures.
2.8 Steers Model of Commitment

Richard M. Steers (1977) did a study of hospital employees, scientists, and engineers in USA and introduced a model of commitment. This study suggested that for all samples personal characteristics, job characteristics, and work experiences influenced commitment. And, commitment was found to be strongly related to the desire to remain with current organizations for both samples and was moderately related to attendance and turnover for one sample. Performance was generally unrelated to commitment.
Earlier Koch, Steers, and Porter, (1974) suggested that employee commitment was important for several reasons, because it is a better predictor of turnover than job satisfaction. Steers & Schein, (1970) in another study suggested that commitment represents one useful indicator of the effectiveness of an organization. Steers (1977), model has two parts: (1) antecedents of commitment; and (2) outcomes of commitment. This model as well as Meyer and Allens (1997) model provide bases for organizational commitment as part of this study.

**Figure 3: Steers Model of Commitment**

![Steers Model of Commitment Diagram]

2.9 Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has usually been defined as the extent to which an employee has a positive affective attitude towards his job, either in general or towards particular facets of it (Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 1969). Most models of turnover assume that greater job satisfaction leads to greater organizational commitment (Mobley, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981). The primary reason for this causal order appears to be that job satisfaction is a more immediate affective response to one’s work which is established more quickly.
after joining an organization, whereas commitment is slower to develop since it is based not only on the job but on other aspects of working for the organization such as its goals and values (Porter et al., 1974).

The explanation given by researchers that job satisfaction affects organizational commitment confirms that job satisfaction is less stable than organizational commitment (Porter et al., 1974). Porter (1974) studied the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians and concluded that organizational commitment discriminated better between stayers and leavers than did the various component of job satisfaction. Mowday et al. (1979) concluded that commitment focuses on loyalty to the organization, which also include its goals and values while satisfaction emphasizes the task environment where an employee performed his duties. The study done by Steers (1977) showed that having expectations or needs met led to satisfaction, which resulted in greater commitment among employees. Steers (1977), study also found that commitment and job satisfaction were equally predictive of voluntary turnover.

Decotis and Summers (1987) did not agree and argued that job satisfaction only acted as a mediator between organizational commitment and the antecedents of climate, process, structure and personal and situational characteristics. They suggested that these were predictive of organizational commitment. An important study Bateman & Strasser (1984) suggested that commitment is an antecedent to job satisfaction.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) did a meta-analysis of variables related to commitment, classified job satisfaction as a correlate, rather than an antecedent or consequence, of commitment. The unresolved issue still is whether job satisfaction is an antecedent to commitment or there is a correlation between them. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) used the
term correlate to suggest that the evidence so far on the causal ordering of job satisfaction and commitment is inconclusive.

The general finding has been that organizational commitment has a stronger relation with turnover than job satisfaction. And this study is not focusing on the issue of turnover rather the aim of this research is to explore the nature of relationship between faculty’s job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2.10 Decision Making

Decision-making has been the topic of many studies in the last many decades. Currently a lot of researchers are paying attention to its relation or influence on organizational performance and employee’s commitment towards the organizations. One similar study done by Steers and Porter (1975) proposed that participation in goal setting affects employee attitudes including commitment. They found that levels of participation in the decision process affect both the perceptions, which individuals have of organization and their subsequence response to the organization. The research conducted by Welsch and LaVan (1981) asserted that there is a positive relationship between commitment and employee perceptions of the organizational climate being one of participative decision-making.

Managers and administrators besides other activities are involved in planning, sometimes solving employees problems and at other times solving technical problems, making and implementing decisions, selecting and training subordinates, deciding pay increases, assigning jobs, and so forth. Participative leadership involves efforts by a leader to encourage and facilitate participation by others in making important decisions. (Gary, Yukl, 2002). Decision-making generally has four distinct types.
2.11 The Types of Decisions

a) Autocratic Decision. The manager makes a decision in isolation without asking for the opinion from subordinates or involving their suggestions. Since subordinates have no participation, hence they have no direct influence on the decision.

b) Consultation. The manager makes the decision alone. He asks subordinates for their opinions and ideas, and then after seriously considering their suggestions and concerns.

c) Joint Decision. The manager meets with subordinates to discuss the issue on hand and jointly a decision is made. The manager and participants have equal say and influence on the final decision.

d) Delegation. The manager assigns an individual or groups the responsibility authority and for making a decision. The manager also specifies limits within which the final choice must fall. For this type of decisions a prior approval may or may not be required before the decision is implemented.

2.12 Participation Oriented Decision Making.

This type of behavior is primarily concerned with improving strategic decision making; adopting to change in environment; increasing flexibility and innovation; making major changes in process, product, or services; and gaining commitment to change, (McCormick and Meiners, 1997). Some benefits of this type of decision making are given below:-

* Study of competitors and outsiders to get ideas for organizational improvement.
* Encourage people to view problems or opportunities in a different way.
* Encourage and facilitate innovation and entrepreneurship by others.
* Encourage and facilitate learning by individuals and teams.
* Experiment with new approaches.
* Build a coalition of employees to improve work quality and work environment.
* Empower people to implement new strategies.

Although participation has been defined conceptually and operationally in many different ways (Cotton, 1988; Dachler & Wilpert, 1978), participation is generally defined as a process in which individuals, who are otherwise hierarchically unequal, share the influence among themselves (Locke & Schweiger, 1979; Wagner, 1994). Participatory management balances the involvement of managers and their subordinates in decision making, and problem-solving processes (Wagner, 1994).

Historically, management theories presented by (Hertzberg, 1966, Liker, 1967; Maslow, 1954) has emphasized the significance of coordinating the human and organizational relationship so that productivity is enhanced and human capital is developed. Although some researchers have supported these efforts because of their purported benefits to the organization, others have supported participation as a moral imperative, viewing the quality of life movement as a means to improve employees’ motivation which in turn helps employees to feel good about their work (Spreitzer, Kizilos, & Nason, 1977). Employee participation programs have gained considerable positive appeal among managers, employees, and scholars alike.

Participative management practices have been commonly perceived to have positive effects on employee performance (Bush & Spangler, 1990), satisfaction at work, lower levels of absenteeism and turnover, and organizational effectiveness, (Lawler, 1986; Macy, Peterson, & Norton, 1989). Empirical evidence has provided moderate support for these claims. For example, in a Meta analysis and survey of previous reviews of the literature on participation, Wagner (1994) found that research “has
produced reliable evidence of statistically significant changes in performance and satisfaction that are positive in direction but limited in size”.

These studies, however, have tended to operationalize a direct relationship between participation and job satisfaction. In contrast, Daniels and Bailey (1999) argued that the evidence regarding the impact of employee participation on job satisfaction has not been consistent. And Cotton (1993) and (1995), suggested that the individual and situational variables could affect relationship between participation and job satisfaction.

Since there is lot of emphasis on performance and result-oriented government services, researchers in public administration and government services have stressed effective Human Resources Management strategies such as empowerment and participative management (Kim, 2002; Ting, 1996). These strategies maximize the utilization of the organization’s human resources and have a direct effect on organizational performance. Reduction of cost is an indirect effect associated with these resources.

Several researchers (Freeman, Rush, & Lance, 1999) have argued that fair treatment and enhancement of individuals’ empowerment may produce affective reactions towards work and, ultimately, reduce rates of absenteeism and turnover. Studies have also demonstrated that participative decision making can be beneficial to workers mental health and satisfaction they get from their job (Cotton, Vollrath, 1988; Miller& Monge, 1986). Locke, (1976), defined it as the, “positive emotional state which from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience”. Job satisfaction represents an interaction between employees and their work environment by measuring the congruence between what employees want and what employees feel they receive from their jobs.
Although job satisfaction has long been expected to have important implications for organizational productivity, a review of empirical evidence fails to support the assertion that job satisfaction directly affects productivity (Kahn & Katz, 1978; Vroom, 1964; Wechsler, Kahane, & Tannenbaum, 1952). One study suggests that replacement costs are about 50% to 60% of an employee’s annual salary (Wysocki, 1997). Other costs may be even more important for government agencies. Understaffing because of excessive turnover among jail officers, for example, may be linked to prison escapes (Blasé, 2001). High turnover of university professors may cause a decline in the teaching quality.

Given the significant cost incurred from employees’ turnover and absenteeism for organizational performance, scholars must clearly identify variables related to quality of work life that affect employees job satisfaction in government sector organizations, such as participative management, job characteristics, and supervisor support (Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Rainey, 1997).

Robins (2004) points out that, “Work specialization contributes to higher employee productivity but it reduces job satisfaction. Participative decision making in decentralized organizations is positively related to job satisfaction”.

Democratic societies uphold the right of people to influence decisions that will affect them in important ways. Involving others in making decisions is often necessary part of political process for getting decisions approved and implemented in organizations. Delegation is a power sharing process that occurs when a manager gives subordinates the responsibility and authority for making some decisions which were formerly made by a manager. Empowerment involves the perception by members of an organization that they have the opportunity to determine their work roles, accomplish meaningful work, and influence important events.
2.13 Faculty Participation and other Perspective

While there are numerous papers and arguments in favor of faculty’s participation in university’s governance, a recent (2005) paper is by William O, Brown in which he examined the relationship between faculty participation in decision-making and their performance. His findings suggest that, participation of faculty does have an effect on performance and the overall impact can be determined by looking at the decisions in which faculty participate. He concludes that the costs associated with collective decision making are higher than the benefits which faculty gets in the shape of control.

McCormick and Meiners (1988) find that if faculty has more control in decision making it would lower the institutional performance. Brown, (2005) argues that good or bad effects vary by the type of decisions in which faculty participate.

The existing literature suggests that employee control over certain types of decisions lead to improved organizational performance. McCormick and Meiners (1988) have other views regarding faculty’s involvement in the university decision making. In their views, “university performance suffers as the faculty’s control over decision-making increases”. The reason is that the team formation in university set up is a difficult task and this fact makes active faculty participation in university governance ineffective.

The predictions are that faculty participation in those decisions, where faculty may have better information and incentives, will lead to improved job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Hansmann, (1996) argues that there are advantages and disadvantages of employees’ participation in governance decisions. The advantage is that employees generally have a non-recoverable investment in the success of the organization. There information about the quality and success of many decisions would be better than the
owners. The disadvantage of employees’ participation in decisions is that they may favor decisions that are detrimental to the enterprise if the gains for employee benefits exceed the losses of the owners.

While some researchers suggest there are no true owners in the university, Brown (1997), argues that the nature of academic employment contracts makes faculty members responsible for the success of the institution. As a result, “the wealth of individual faculty members will be tied to the success of the institution but faculty members have an incentive to enrich themselves at the expense of the institution’s success”.

White and Gallie (1993), conducted a study for policy institute London and they suggest that, “the most salient aspect we had identified in our study was concerning employees skills, training, development, and participation”. They further narrate that they are all linked to the preference which individuals give to the work task, and to their attachment (commitment) to the organization. The most important reason why the majority of employees take paid employment is the need to maintain a basic standard of living. The criteria they use between specific jobs include, an acceptable level of pay, work they like doing, job security, good relations with their supervisors and the opportunity to make use of their abilities.

2.14 Development of Participant’s Skills

Management must not look at only the benefits of participatory decision-making but also try to develop the skills needed for better decision-making, especially in the university setting. According to Cooper (1964), one of the greatest obstacles to deciding is fear of the consequences of a wrong decision. This can be overcome only in a climate of tolerance, which recognizes the fallibility of people. The management must instill within decision makers a feeling that their personal security and advancement do not
depend upon the outcome of each decision. Employees should have the feeling that they will be judged mainly by the pattern of results rather than by how individual decision turns out.

A climate for initiative encourages the free expression of opinions, even though they may not seem to accord with those of others in authority. In case of university a faculty member should feel free to argue, in good taste until the decision has been made. The leader should do all in his power to effectuate it, although it may not be what he preferred. This implies, also that there be techniques for resolving differences of opinion without loss of face or without a feeling of defeat upon the part of any of the participants. The faculty members should feel that their administration is actually trying to help them make decisions. They should feel a sense of identification with organizational goals so that thereby they will generate within themselves the enthusiasm, which is a prerequisite to virile decision-making. As a corollary, they should feel that there are rewards for such initiative.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides information and explanation regarding the type of study conducted as well as its assumptions followed by the theoretical framework. The conceptual relationships underlying the theoretical framework are also given. Then the empirical model and equations are presented. Furthermore, there are details of sample, means of data collection, data analysis, instruments of measurement and the variables, which are examined. In conducting this study, information about task-oriented leadership behavior, relation-oriented leadership behavior and levels of organizational commitment was collected from faculty members. First, the relationship between the faculty’s organizational commitment and four types of leadership behavior is examined. Then, the relationship between participatory decision making and faculty’s organizational commitment, and job satisfaction and morale is examined. Various demographic attributes of the respondents such as age, education level, years of experience, and gender were also collected. The research questions also refer to the university as the workplace and the time spent by faculty working under the supervision of Vice Chancellors or Rectors and Directors. This was done due to the findings of previous researchers that employees tend to associate themselves with the part of organization they work in, rather than the organization as a whole (Brown, 1996).

The researcher was surveying both private and public universities. In private universities in some cases owners have adopted the designation of Chairman, Project Director or President. This choice of terminology allowed greater flexibility to cover all
the categories of leadership encountered within the survey and also by acknowledging the diversity of the different participant organizations.

3.2 Type of Study

This was an explanatory study and it focused on testing of hypothesis based on a theoretical framework and establishing relationship between variables.

3.3 Assumptions

The scope and depth of the current research and investigation are given by a set of assumptions. These assumptions were defined by a review of the related literature as well from logical considerations. They consisted of the following:

1- Teaching is a unique profession and may be examined through research and literature concerning professional commitment.

2- University faculty is expected to work daily within two significant areas of responsibility, the first area consist of the overall professional enterprise of education which includes the realm of curriculum and instructions. The second area consists of academic administration.

3- Owing to the unique nature of the job, professional association has grown to become a major psychological contribution in the life of a faculty member. Professional association in turn has a distinct impact on organizational professional relationship in terms of emotional attachment and professional demands.

4- University faculty is able to provide valid and reliable data for research purposes.
5- While survey questionnaires taken from other sources for the measurement of variables are not completely relevant to the present study; they have been adapted to this study so that the theoretical model and variables can be analyzed.

3.4 Theoretical Framework and Variables

The study analyses the relationship of variables in the conceptual model given below. The dependent variable is employees’ organizational commitment because it is the primary variable of interest to the researcher. Leadership behavior and participatory decision-making are independent variables because these variables determine the dependent variable. Job satisfaction and morale are also measured in the study as outcomes. The theoretical framework is conceptualized based upon the literature review which gives previous research done in the area of leadership behavior in section 2.7.

Figure 4: Theoretical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented leadership behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation-Oriented leadership behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Empirical Model

The theoretical framework was estimated by means of three equations. In equation A, the dependent variable was organizational commitment. There were four independent variables, namely task-oriented leadership behavior, and relationship oriented behavior, Laissez-faire behavior and participatory decision making.

Equation, A  
\[ \text{EOC}_1 = \alpha + \beta_1 \chi_1 + \beta_2 \chi_2 + \beta_3 \chi_3 + \beta_4 \chi_4 + \epsilon \]
\[ \chi_1 = \text{Relationship-Oriented Behavior} \]
\[ \chi_2 = \text{Task-oriented Behavior} \]
\[ \chi_3 = \text{Lassiz-Faire Behavior} \]
\[ \chi_4 = \text{Participatory Decision Making} \]
\[ \beta_1 = \text{Coefficient of } \chi_1 \]
\[ \beta_2 = \text{Coefficient of } \chi_2 \]
\[ \beta_3 = \text{Coefficient of } \chi_3 \]
\[ \beta_4 = \text{Coefficient of } \chi_4 \]
\[ \alpha = \text{intercept} \]
\[ \epsilon = \text{error} \]

In equation B, there were only two variables, namely job satisfaction which was the dependent variable and organizational commitment which was the independent variable. In equation C, organizational commitment was the independent variable and morale was the dependent variable.

\[ \text{B - EQ (B1) = Job Satisfaction } = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon \]
\[ \text{C - EQ (B2) = Morale } = \alpha + \beta_2 X_2 + \epsilon \]

Independent Variable = Employees Organizational Commitment
Dependent Variables = Job Satisfaction and Morale
3.6 Commitment and University Faculty

Faculty commitment in this study is directed towards the university. A university provides resources, infrastructures, and necessary training to their employees to enable them to accomplish its goals. It is important that its employees share the vision of their university and be committed to its mission and goals. Since commitment is an attitudinal construct, there are certain conditions that are necessary for its development. The leadership behavior of the Principal or Vice Chancellor is taken to be the major influence on the level of faculty commitment to a university (Campisano, 1992). Initially the researchers examined the work of Lok, (1999) who found a negative correlation (R = - 0.34) between commitment and teaching rank, suggesting, that as a faculty member moves up the teaching ranks from lecturer to assistant professor, to professor, his or her other commitments moves in the opposite direction. Why might this be? Possibly because as one rises up the ranks as a teacher, in the university system, one not only gets to know more of how the system works, but also acquires new knowledge regarding universities and higher education. Such knowledge and skills may make one question the way many things are currently done in the University. If these skills and ideas, for whatever reason are not taken onboard by the University Administration and the teacher feels he or she is not consulted, his or her commitment decreases.

3.7 Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Leadership Behavior

Researchers have found a strong relationship between commitment and relationship and task-oriented types of leadership behavior. Reichers undertook a study in 1986 in United States and her study showed a significant correlation between organizational commitment and senior management’s goals and values. Lok (1997) conducted a study
and his findings reveal that a positive managerial strategy (represented by leadership style) would lead to greater employee commitment. Agarwal, DeCarlo and Vyas, (1999) undertook a study on leadership behavior and employees organizational commitment. This study involved a comparative analysis of American and Indian salespersons. The study included 628 American salespersons and 181 Indian salespersons. The results from both samples indicated a strong positive relationship between consideration and organizational commitment. Their findings also suggest that American and Indian salespersons exhibit very similar responses towards leadership behavior. Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995) did a study of 1,376 nurses. Their findings suggested that relationship-oriented leadership behavior was a better predictor of commitment as compared to task-oriented behavior. Meyer & Allen (1997) noted that when researchers are measuring commitment to the organization, they are misdiagnosing at and are actually measuring employees’ commitment to top management.

3.8 Job Satisfaction of University Faculty

Job satisfaction refers to: “the attitude that individuals have regarding their jobs. It results from their perception of their jobs and the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organization” (Ivancevich 1997). Job satisfaction is a well studied subject in organizational behavior. A common belief is that people who are satisfied with their jobs will show a high level of productivity. When dealing with the job satisfaction of the university faculty, it is important to note that university teaching requires a great deal of effort and preparation. It requires many years of education, research and teaching experience and publications. University faculty finds a number of issues pertaining to their jobs both satisfying and unsatisfying. Locke (1984) conducted an exploratory study of the job satisfaction of faculty at a university in USA. His results
showed that faculty wants similar outcomes from their jobs as employees in other organizations, mainly a sense of achievement for their work, good working conditions, fair pay and promotion, leaders and co-workers who facilitate effective work. The faculty was most satisfied with their own work achievements and the behavior of their department heads, and their fellow faculty members. They were satisfied with the higher level academic and the level of pay and promotions. Kinicki (2002) showed that there was a negative relationship between resigning and job satisfaction. One way of determining what contributes to job satisfactions for faculty is to examine why faculty members decide to stay at their current position or move either to a new university or to the private sector. Chugtai & Zafar’s (2006), findings suggest that in Pakistan where people struggle to make ends meet, satisfaction with personal outcomes, such as a high pay raise, may be more important for faculty than the fairness of procedures. Employee’s level of job satisfaction is higher if a job contains such characteristics as skill variety and autonomy. Employees are less satisfied with jobs that show a greater degree of role conflict and role ambiguity.

3.9 Participative Decision Making and University Faculty

The 1970 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) survey of faculty governance used by McCormick and Meiners (1989) provides the only comprehensive measure of faculty participation in governance and decision making available. Measuring faculty participation in university governance is a challenging task. According to McCormick and Meiners (1989), a decision made in the area of faculty control is defined as an instance where a decision is reported as being made by the faculty or jointly by the faculty and the academic administration. Generally faculty
members play a greater role in decisions concerning curriculum and student enrollment in the courses which they teach.

Authors such as Blair, (1995) and Milgrom and Roberts (1992) have argued that employees have the incentive and right to participate in organizational decision making. The existing literature concerning agency problems and academics production suggests that faculty control certain types of academic decisions may lead to improved performance. McPherson and Schapiro (1999) provide an overview of this literature and a useful discussion of authority delegation within the university. While centralized decision making by administrators avoids the problems associated with collective decision making, it also creates the potential for abuse by administrators.

Within the university there are several important stakeholder groups, namely trustees, administrators, faculty, and students that have competing interests. The difference is that the trustees, faculty members, and students are expected to have some degree of participation within some of the broad range of decisions made within the university.

There is a growing literature that focuses on the role of employees in organizational governance. Hansmann (1996) points out that both the biggest advantage and the biggest disadvantage of employee ownership springs from employee’s participation in governance decisions. The advantage is that employees generally have a non-recoverable investment in the success of the firm and better information about the quality of many decisions than would other owners.

While there are no true owners in the university, Brown (2005), argue that the nature of academics employment contracts makes faculty members partial residual claimants to the success of the institution. As a result, the wealth of the individual faculty members
will be tied to the success of the institution but faculty member have an incentive to enrich themselves at the expense of the institution’s success. In addition, faculty members provide an inexpensive source of information concerning the performance of the university and administrators. One expects that university governance decisions are structured so that the faculty members will participate more heavily in those activities where their informational advantages and expertise outweigh any malincentive effects.

Faculty members are likely to have better information for decisions concerning curriculum, the creation of new academic programs and general faculty governance decisions than do board of governors.

While faculty members have better information concerning curriculum decisions, they may not always have the proper incentives for making these decisions at the individual level. The monitoring of administrators by faculty members necessarily creates conflicts. If administrators retain the right to hire/fire and otherwise determine faculty rewards, then faculty members are unlikely to actively criticize administrative decisions. In addition, faculty members and administrators may value different types of output. Faculty members are likely to place more weight on outcomes including research, professional recognition and departmental service. Administrators may be more likely to reward administrative staff, e.g. car leasing, parking space, building, nice office and other benefits.

The one area where the interest of majority of the faculty is likely to diverge from the interests of the institution is in the case of budgetary decisions. In these decisions it is more likely that the faculty as a whole can reach agreements to enrich themselves at the expense of the university. Diverting financial resources to their personal use (i.e. supporting smaller class sizes, reduced teaching loads, salaries, large offices, or nice
faculty clubs) is almost always in the best interest of faculty. Existing faculty members also have an incentive to favor current uses of funds over future uses. In addition, the average faculty member has considerably less expertise than trustees in these areas. As a result, faculty members are not expected to participate in or be the primary monitors of financial decisions.

The extent to which faculty members participate in administrative decisions is likely to be related to the type of decisions. For example, decisions concerning admission, student aid, buildings and grounds are best handled by specialized administrators with expertise in these areas. The size of academic departments and resource allocation decisions among departments are also likely to be left to administrators. This helps to reduce political infighting and coalition building that might otherwise develop among faculty groups.

### 3.10 Morale of Faculty

Morale has been defined as a feeling, a state of mind, a mental attitude, and an emotional attitude (Tagai 2002). When a healthy environment exists faculty’s morale is high. This creates an environment that is more conducive to learning. Work environment, top management's style of leadership, stress and other factors has been highlighted by scholars for being reasons for low and high faculty morale at universities. High level of morale level makes teaching more pleasant for teachers and low levels of satisfaction and morale can lead to decreased teacher productivity and burnout, which is associated with "a loss of concern for and detachment from the people with whom one works, decreased quality of teaching, depression, greater use of sick leave, efforts to leave the profession, and a cynical and dehumanized perception of students" (Mendall, 1980).
3.11 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed,

1- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase faculty’s organizational commitment.

In order to see whether male and female faculty members differ the way they see their leaders behave in university settings I divided them into two groups and tried to see if task behavior differs in impacting people based on gender.

a- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase organizational commitment in male faculty members.

b- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase organizational commitment in female faculty members.

2- Relation-oriented behavior increases faculty’s organizational commitment.

3- Laissez-faire behavior has a negative relationship with employees organizational commitment

4- Participative decision making has a positive relationship with faculty’s organizational commitment.

Hypothesis five and six were developed to measure the consequences or outcome of organizational commitment. Researcher’s intention was to examine the relationship of OC with Job satisfaction and morale. Other researchers like Tagai (2002) and Lok (1999) also measured them separately.

5- Organizational commitment has a positive correlation with Job Satisfaction.

6- Organizational commitment has a positive correlation with morale.
3.12 Data Collection

There is very little published material available in the area of organizational commitment in Pakistan. To overcome this difficulty it was decided to collect this information through primary data collection with the help of a survey questionnaire. A sample of private and public Universities was carried out as explained in the next section. Then the researcher contacted the Deans and Heads of universities by telephone to determine if they were interested in participating in the research study He received positive responses from all the universities and then personally visited some universities to interview several Deans and Head of Departments located in the cities of Rawalpindi and Islamabad. Then questionnaires were mailed to the faculty members of these institutions. Potential respondents were asked to return the completed questionnaire in two weeks. A reminder was mailed after three weeks. Questionnaires were mailed to faculty members in the month of May, well before the start of the annual summer vacation. The researcher also visited certain universities to collect the completed questionnaires. A total of 237 questionnaires were returned in response to the 300 questionnaires mailed. There were 105 chartered universities in Pakistan and the intended respondent consisted of 300 faculty members in the selected 18 public and private universities including lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors.

3.13 Sampling Strategy

The unit of observation and analysis consisted of the faculty of selected institutions and universities across Pakistan. The population consisted of faculty members in all of the public and private Universities situated in Pakistan. The sample consisted of 300 faculty members in 18 selected public and private universities. There were 105 chartered
universities in Pakistan in 2005 and number of private universities amounted to 45 (see Appendix H and I). Systematic sampling method was applied to select the sample of universities. Most of the universities selected were geographically located in the central and northern region of Pakistan. Within this area those universities were chosen which were most accessible or most likely to respond, due to their prestige and commitment to education.

3.14 Survey Questionnaire

The construction of the survey questionnaire for this study was primarily based upon and derived from four survey questionnaires used in previous studies. To measure leadership behavior, the “Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire” used by Bass (1995) consisting of 45 questions was chosen. Use of this questionnaire was based on the assumptions that university faculty is able to provide useful data for research. Faculty work in two domains, one is administrative environment and the other is teaching. And based on the questionnaire design it was possible to measure leadership behavior in terms of task and relation. MLQ is considered a benchmark tool for assessing leadership behavior and a variety of studies have shown the MLQ to be effective in settings as diverse as savings banks, community action agencies, the United States army, Chinese state run industry and universities.

In the pilot study the entire questionnaire was used but it was shortened, and modified to suit the Pakistani university, for its use in the wider survey specifically certain questions, which asked participants to evaluate their own leadership style were removed. To measure the faculty’s organizational commitment, Meyer & Allen’s (1997) “Organizational Commitment Questionnaire” (OCQ) was used. Job satisfaction as an outcome was measured by the questionnaire used by Locke (1976). Participatory
management and morale was measured by means of a questionnaire developed by Lok (1999). All of the questionnaires used contained close-ended questions. All variables were measured on a five point Likert scale. The Likert scale is designed to examine how strongly subjects agree or disagree with statements on a 5-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is an interval scale and the difference in the responses between any two points on the scale remains the same.

**3.15 Deriving Final Questionnaire from the Pilot Study**

Two universities were purposely selected for the pilot study of which one was a public University and one was a private one. The researcher mailed 40 questionnaires to faculty members. Both universities were in twin-cities of Rawalpindi and Islamabad. Respondents from the private university were very reluctant to fill the survey forms as they were concerned whether the information would be confidential as it pertained to the University management. To alleviate their fears the researcher explained the purpose of the study to them and that confidentiality would be maintained as they were not to write their name and their organization’s name in the survey. Another problem was that none of the participants had seen this type of questionnaire before. The researcher visited the public sector university and held a meeting with the potential respondents and addressed their concerns. He also explained the objectives of the study and the rationale underlying the questionnaire.

The questionnaire of the pilot study had 90 questions spread over six pages. Pilot study contained the 45 questions of Bass and Avolio’s multifactor leadership questionnaire.
and 15 questions from Meyer and Allen’s Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, 15 questions of job satisfaction and morale questionnaire and 15 questions of participatory decision making questionnaire.

The pilot study was successful in attaining its two main goals. The questions pertaining to Leadership and Organizational Commitment were reduced in number based on whether the questions were redundant. The final questionnaire had 60 questions instead of 90, and numbers of pages were also reduced from six to four. Thus the time to complete the final survey was reduced to less than or equal to fifteen minutes. This modification and reduction of questions did not affect reliability and validity of the items remaining in the questionnaire.

The pilot study also established that the questions pertaining to job satisfaction, morale and decision-making were valid. This study intended to measure the leadership behavior of management and not that of the respondents. Due to this reason, 15 questions from the Leadership Questionnaire and six questions from Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were eliminated. The researcher examined leadership behavior and commitment questionnaires and determined that questions relating to laissez-faire and task and relation oriented behavior were redundant and did not serve any special purpose in the Pakistani University. Participants reported that they were causing them confusion. The deletion of questions from Organizational Commitment Questionnaire helped to focus the direction of the scale specifically on the actual relationship between the faculty and their University.

The pilot study showed the correlation coefficient between normative and continuance commitment to be positively significant at 0.32 (r) and 0.46 (r). Participatory decision making showed positive significant correlation with leadership
behavior to be 0.38 (r) and 0.43 (r). The correlation coefficient between the task and relationship oriented leadership scales was 0.90, which was very high. Bass & Avolio (1995) reported that it could go as high as .86 (r). As explained earlier the redundant questions were taken out of the questionnaire so this correlation in this main study was .86 (r). The alpha value of Job satisfaction and Morale were .60 and .69 respectively. These results indicate that the variables of interest are significantly and positively correlated.

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire**

Several surveys were initially considered for possible measurements of task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership behaviors. A questionnaire developed by Fleishman (1951) and revised by Stogdill (1963) was not considered as this questionnaire did not measure two behaviors separately. Bass’s (1985) multifactor leadership questionnaire was selected as it has been improved and revised by Bass (1990, 1995, and 1997) to measure additional dimensions of leadership including task, relation and lassiz fare behavior. It has been used by many researchers in USA as well as in higher education institutions outside the US. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire survey was used after certain modifications were made to suit the local conditions in Pakistan. This questionnaire distinguished clearly between task and relation-oriented leadership behavior.

**Organizational Commitment Questionnaire**

Porter Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974) developed an Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed to measure employee’s satisfaction and level of involvement in the organization. Alvi and Ahmed’s (1987) questionnaire was not considered as it had a very limited scope. They used it for measuring male and
female OC in Pakistan, while I intended to measure OC’s relationship with leadership behavior and other variables, so this questionnaire did not meet the requirements of this research study. Meyer & Allen’s (1997) updated Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was adopted. This questionnaire has been applied by researchers to other countries especially in South Asian as it is considered to be the best measure of all three types of organizational commitment. Previous researches suggest that commitment is stronger if closely connected to work of individuals, the level of the work group, or the supervisor (Becker, 1992). So the researcher included three specific questions to see that employees may be committed to a number of different foci. The first one was related to the organization, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this university”. The second question was related to the people, “I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it”. And the third one was, “I owe a great deal to my organization”.

**Job Satisfaction and Morale Questionnaire**

There were 13 questions on the questionnaire about job satisfaction and morale. Locke and Schiwigier (1996) developed a questionnaire about job satisfaction. This questionnaire was considered for this research. Also few questions were taken from the questionnaires of Lok (1999) and Tagai (2002). As for other questionnaires this was also tested in the pilot study and interestingly the questions relating to university and students indicated the highest percentage in terms of respondents who answered that they strongly agreed.
### Table 3.2 Questions of leadership Behavior

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He/She spends time coaching and teaching others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>He/She treats others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He/She considers an individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>He/She helps others to develop their strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>He/She talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He/She seeks differing perspectives in solving problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>He/She acts in ways that build others respect for him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>He/She displays a sense of power and confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>He/She instills pride in others for being associated with him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>He/She is effective in meeting others’ job-related needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>He/She considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>He/She emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>He/She is effective in representing others to higher authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>He/She leads a group that is effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>He/She uses methods of leadership that are satisfying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>He/She provides other with assistance in exchange for their efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>He/She expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>He/She focuses attention on irregularities, mistake, exceptions and deviations from standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>He/She keeps track of all my mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He/She directs my attention towards failures to meet standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>He/She fails to interfere until problem become serious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>He/She waits for things to go wrong before taking actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>He/She is absent from office when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>He/She avoids making decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>He/She delays responding to urgent questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3 Questions of Organizational Commitment

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my department right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not feel my obligation to remain with my current employer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I owe a great deal to my organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my department now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this department, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I Would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.4 Questions of Participatory Decision Making

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The administration tells me what needs to be done and how it should be accomplished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The administration in my university tries to eliminate situations that can lead to disagreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Difference in opinions on how work should be done makes our administration angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When changes in rules and procedures must be made, the ideas are gradually introduced so that faculty does not get upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Our administration finds it difficult to understand why faculty resists every change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When I am in supervisory role, I know I must not change my opinion on a significant work situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our management listens carefully to each person in my department group when any significant change is being made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am able to influence decisions that affect my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of faculty representation on the university board of governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of faculty participation in this Institution’s decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enrollment of students in the courses I teach, is mostly my decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I have a significant role in the academic policies of this university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.5 Questions of Job Satisfaction and Morale of University Faculty

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel there is strong connection between my pay and my performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is flexibility of work hours in this university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical working environment at this university is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I see a lot of opportunity for advancement in this university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have been recommended for higher education/seminars and trainings by my university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I frequently communicate with my supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I frequently receive recognition from my supervisor on my performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The administration in my organization effectively leads the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My work in this institution gives me a great sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel a strong sense of direction and purpose provided by the administration of this institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The administration allows the faculty adequate academic freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I am happy with the current system of faculty pay scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The administration of this institution has improved physical conditions for faculty work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.17 Data Analysis

The SPSS Base 11.0 Applications Guide, 2005 was the statistical software program used for analysis. Duly filled in survey questionnaires received were entered into SPSS version 11.0 for Windows. The methods used to conduct data analysis and measure the relationship between leadership behaviors; organizational commitment, job satisfaction and morale were conducted in the following sequence. Initially the researcher used descriptive statistics to examine the responses. They consisted of means, median and mode. Then he conducted additional analysis to determine the statistical significance for affective, continuance, and normative commitment by means of t-tests. Then he estimated the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient for the variables in the structural model followed by regression analysis. Finally he examined the reliability of all the variables in the structural model by estimating the alpha values. In Table 3.6 the alpha values of all the variables are between 0.63 and 0.84. This confirms the reliability of all the variables.

Table 3.6 Internal Consistency Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Estimate of Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation Behavior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassiz-Faire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Decision Making</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation Analysis

To detect the degree of association among each pair of independent and dependent variables the Pearson correlation matrix was estimated.

Multiple Regression Analysis

A major goal of regression analysis is usually to investigate the causal relationship between a dependent variable and several independent variables. In the study, the scores of organizational commitment as well as participatory decision making were regressed on task, relationship–oriented and Laissez-faire behavior. The effect of each independent variable was analyzed. Its statistical significance was assessed by the t test. The overall significance of the regression equation was then assessed by the f test.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

4.1 Result of Questionnaire Survey

A total of 300 questionnaires were mailed of which, 237 (or 79%) completed questionnaires were returned and used for the quantitative analysis. The following results were obtained from these 237 completed questionnaires.

4.2 Characteristics of University Faculty

The researcher collected demographic data on age, gender, qualification, job title, position and time spent by the respondents in their respective universities as shown in table 4.1. Statistics derived from this data revealed that 65% of the respondents were male and 35% females. The average time they worked in their current universities was six years while the average time spent working under their current Vice Chancellors or rectors was 3 years and 4 months. Out of 237 respondents 19% were PhDs, 34% were M Phils, while 41% had a Masters’ degree.

Table 4.1 Characteristics of University Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Bracket</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 and above</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Rank</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification of Respondents</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS/Phil</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Sample Response of Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Return Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punjab University Lahore</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Leadership and Management Lahore</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFT University Gujranwala</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M A Jinnah University Islamabad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQRA University Islamabad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SZABIST Islamabad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air University Islamabad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUST Rawalpindi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomal University D I Khan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Faisalabad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agha Khan University Karachi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluchistan University Quetta</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMSATS Attock</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMSATS Abbotabad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Peshawar</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamdard University Islamabad</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakuram University Gilgit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Sample Responses

The universe of population consists of all universities in Pakistan. Full time faculty members of eighteen public and private universities of Pakistan formed the sample for the study. From the sample of 300, 237 respondents returned the questionnaires, yielding an overall response rate of 79%. Table 4.2 gives details of questionnaires mailed to each university and response received.
Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics of Major Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O C (Affect)</th>
<th>(Cont)</th>
<th>(Norm)</th>
<th>L B (Task))</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>L F</th>
<th>PDM</th>
<th>J S</th>
<th>Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Variance</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 point Likert scale was used for data collection

Table 4.3 shows descriptive statistics for the various variables such as task-oriented, relationship-oriented, participatory decision making, commitment, job satisfaction and morale. The variance and standard deviation for all the variables are low. The suggested score by Bass & Avolio (1997) for most effective leaders include a mean of 3.0 or higher. The mean score derived from the variables in the data ranged from 2.52 to 3.54. The pattern of scores of the variables suggests that some faculty members are dissatisfied to some extent from their administrators. Relationship-oriented leadership behaviors indicate a median of 3.6 but a mean of 2.52. This denotes that most faculty members disagree with relationship oriented behavior. Such a high median also shows that while 50% of faculty likes relationship-oriented leadership, there are many other who have divided opinion on university’s leadership behavior. The mean for task-oriented leadership behavior (3.54) indicates that the faculty was getting the task and goals accomplished to a certain extent. The median value for this variable is also 3.60.
The findings indicate that affective commitment had a mean score of 3.29, followed by continuance commitment with a mean score of 3.07 and normative commitment with a mean score of 3.33. Chuhtai & Zafar (2006) did a study of Pakistani university teachers and studied antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. Their findings suggest that overall mean for organizational commitment was 5.27 on a 7 point scale, which is higher than the results obtained in this research. However their findings suggest that on the average faculty members were satisfied with the actual work undertaken (4.04) and the amount of job security they had (4.03).

4.4 Correlations between Major types of Leadership Behaviors

The researcher examined correlations for both task and relationship behaviors. He entered responses regarding task oriented, relationship-oriented questions and laissez-faire behaviors independently. There was very high positive correlation of 0.86 between the task-oriented and relationship-oriented scales. This statistically significant result was consistent with the findings of other researchers. Bass & Avolio (1997) reported correlation coefficients of \( r = 0.68 \) to \( r = 0.87 \) between the task and relationship-oriented behaviors. Their findings provided preliminary evidence and support for the theory upon which relationship-oriented leadership is based and the theoretical link between relationship-oriented and task-oriented leadership.
Table 4.4 Correlation Matrix of all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Variable and its short form</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>LFB</th>
<th>PDM</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>Morale</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment. (OC)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented Leadership Behavior (TB)</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>-0.463</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation –Oriented Leadership Behavior (RB)</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Behavior (LFB)</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>-0.463</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
<td>-0.413</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Decision Making (PDM)</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (JS)</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>-0.413</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment (AC)</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (CC)</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.141</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment (NC)</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 Correlation Matrix of Major Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>LFB</th>
<th>PDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation-Oriented Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire Behavior</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Decision Making</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JS</th>
<th>MORALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables Acronyms are given below

1. Organizational Commitment (OC)
2. Task-Oriented Leadership Behavior (TB)
3. Relation-Oriented Leadership Behavior (RB)
4. Laissez-faire Behavior (LFB)
5. Participatory Decision Making (PDM)
6. Job Satisfaction (JS)
7. Morale

4.5 Correlations among Organizational Commitment Scales

Organizational commitment had a very high correlation of 0.83 (table 4.4) with continuous commitment. Its correlation with normative commitment was lesser at 0.74, while the correlation coefficient with effective commitment was 0.69. These findings represent overall organizational commitment of affective, normative and continuance well. The researcher also examined correlations between the individual scales of Organizational Commitment (Table 4.4). Between the scales of all three affective, normative and continuance commitment, there was moderately significant and positive correlation. The correlation between normative and continuance commitment was 0.40 and was slightly stronger than between the other two scales at
The findings of Meyer and Allen (1990) and Cohen (1996) also showed positive correlation among the OC scales but their findings suggested a stronger correlation between affective and normative commitment. Thus, the researcher’s findings are somewhat consistent with the results of Meyer and Allen (1990) and Cohen, (1996). Meyer and Allen (1990) suggested that in the case of continuance commitment, individuals remain with the organization because cost of leaving is too high whereas in normative commitment employees feel a sense of obligation towards the organization. As the study done by McFarlane, Shore & Wayne, 1993), suggests employees who have both continuance and normative commitments demonstrate reduced levels of citizenship behaviors and lack the initiative to do tasks beyond their job descriptions or put in extra work effort. A stronger correlation of continuance commitment in my finding also suggests that the faculty feels the cost of leaving is higher than staying, may be because the opportunities in academia are limited to a large extent in Pakistan. Alternatively in Allen and Meyer’s (1990) findings the correlation between normative and effective commitment was statistically significant and high as it was 0.51.

Table 4.6 Commitment Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237
** Correlation is statistically significant with p < .01.
* Correlation is statistically significant with p < .05.
4.6 Correlations between the Task-Oriented, Relationship-Oriented Behavior and the Organizational Commitment Scales

The researcher investigated the correlation between task-oriented behavior and relation-oriented behavior in conjunction with the three separate scales of organizational commitment. The task-oriented scale had positive, statistically significant and fair correlations with affective (0.30) and continuance (0.26) commitment and hardly any relationship with normative commitment. Regardless overall organizational commitment still was 0.30. The relationship-oriented scale had a statistically significant positive correlation with the overall organizational commitment (0.18) derived from the correlations of all the three scales of individual organizational commitment as well as with the overall organizational commitment scale. The relationship-oriented scale was highly correlated with the effective commitment (0.21) then with continuance commitment (0.16) and normative commitment (0.04). This correlation between two types of Leadership behaviors and affective commitment was consistent with earlier researcher’s findings.

Table 4.7 Correlations between Task-oriented, Relation-oriented, and Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment (all Scales together)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task-Oriented</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation-Oriented</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237

**Correlation is statistically significant with p < .01.
* Correlation is statistically significant with p <.05.
These findings suggest that task-oriented leadership behavior of vice chancellors and heads of institutions, which involve trust building, recognizing accomplishments, sharing the same vision, are positively related to some extent, as to how their faculty feels about wanting to stay with the universities they are currently working. However, task-oriented leadership behavior of head of institutions for normative commitment was weakly related to the fact about how faculty felt about staying with their universities. This relationship is confirmed by Meyer and Allen’s (1997) findings, that many of the work experiences that influence affective commitment also influence normative commitment. Findings in this study are not consistent with Bycio, Hackett, & Allen (1995), which suggest that task-oriented behavior is negatively related to three scales of organizational commitment. This indicates that faculty wants their leaders to take action before the problems become serious. It also suggests that positive feedback contributes to the desire of faculty to remain with the current universities.

The findings in the study also suggest a positive but weaker correlation between the relationship-oriented behavior and three scales of organizational commitment. Relationship-Oriented behavior is significantly related to affective commitment but there is a weaker correlation with continuance commitment.

4.7 Correlation between Participatory Decision Making and Organizational Commitment

This study also examined the correlation between participatory decision making and the three scales of organizational commitment (these scales put together), task-oriented leadership behavior, relation-oriented leadership behavior, laissez-faire behavior, job satisfaction and morale of faculty. (See table 4.8). The study had one questionnaire about
participatory decision making and its relationship with organizational commitment. This questionnaire in (Appendix B 4) was designed to find the answers to questions such as the following: What is it that faculty considers being participation in decision making? What kind of decisions does the faculty think they should be part of? Many specific decisional issues were presented to faculty and the members were asked to answer on a scale from one to five in which one denoted strong disagreement while five denoted as strong agreement. Results showed a positive and statistically significant relation between PDM and OC ($r = 0.34$). The correlation between continuance commitment and PDM was 0.32, which is positive and statistically significant.

The researcher tested organizational commitment scales separately with the intent to examine its relationship with Participatory Decision Making. The findings showed Participatory Decision Making to be significantly and positively related to the employee’s perception of leadership behavior, both with relationship-oriented behavior (0.49) and task-oriented behavior (0.46). The findings suggested a fair correlation of PDM with the overall commitment scale.

Table 4.8 Correlation of Participatory Decision Making with Organizational Commitment and other outcomes of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Decision Making (PDM)</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Affect Com</th>
<th>Conti Com</th>
<th>Norm Com</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Job Satisf</th>
<th>Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=size of sample 237  
**Correlation is statistically significant with p < .01.
4.8 Correlation between Participatory Decision Making and Job Satisfaction

The researcher also examined the correlation between Participatory Decision Making and Job Satisfaction. Results showed a statistically significant positive correlation between Participatory Decision Making and Job Satisfaction, (0.493). This is consistent with earlier studies. The findings of Shaw & Kim (2004), suggest that Participatory Decision Making may improve organizational productivity by maximizing the utilization of the organization’s human resources, and also by increasing job satisfaction and reducing turnover and absenteeism. Consequently, employees are not only more likely to succeed in their current positions, but are also more likely to see a long term role in the organization that fulfills their own growth and development needs.

When the researcher asked the question, “I have been recommended by my university management for higher studies and training programs”. Most of the faculty members surveyed (97%) strongly disagreed with the statement. In the answer to another question, “I have a significant role in the academic policies of this university”, most of the respondents said they strongly disagree with the statement (90%). Therefore it is suggested that faculty should be involved in the decision making process and especially in the issues which directly or indirectly affect them. Participation can improve an employee’s understanding of organizational processes and provide them opportunities to develop certain problem solving and communication skills. If faculty is provided the opportunity to take advantage of training programs and then to expand their work role and responsibilities, their job satisfaction is likely to increase and they are more likely to stay with their current organizations.
Thus hypothesis 4 was supported as Participatory Decision Making’s positive relation with job satisfaction and commitment suggests, that faculty members feel valued and their perception about being part of decision making affect their performance also. While lack of training is a setback to satisfaction and commitment, PDM provides faculty members with a survival tool to cope better in an adverse working environment. PDM also has a positive correlation with morale, \( r = 0.58 \) which is highly significant.

4.9 Correlation between Commitment and Job Satisfaction

The researcher’s findings suggest a significant correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, \( (0.21) \) where correlation of job satisfaction with affective commitment is 0.31. The table 4.9 shows that the correlation between other scales of commitment and Job Satisfaction is weakly positive. Comments from one dean of a university are worth noting,

“In spite of all the problems we are having with this
vice chancellor who is a retired government officer,
and less qualified than all the heads of departments,
we continue our mission because we are
committed to our country”.

The dean of a public sector university pointed out:

“That morale was low in his university, and a
lot of foreign qualified and experienced professors
had left”. He thought the faculty was treated like
factory workers but they were dedicated to their
profession.
“We have spent almost a million rupees on full page advertisement in the national newspapers for faculty hiring in the last two years but the response is very disappointing. People are accepted for a job after the interview but they turn down our Vice Challengers offer. For me the commitment and loyalty to Pakistan is very important. I give less time to my own children but I stay here for long hours. I do it for the students and love for my profession and country. This keeps me going. Otherwise I would have opted for immigration to Canada a long time ago”.

Clearly faculty’s commitment to profession is important. It also appears that faculty attributes their high morale to their commitment to students, the profession, and country.

Table: 4.9 Correlations of OC, AC, CC and NC with Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization Commitment (combine)</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237

**Correlation is statistically significant with p < .01.
4.10 Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Morale

Table 4.10 Job Satisfaction and Morale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>MORALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive correlation ($r = 0.71$) between job satisfaction and morale (table 4.10) indicates that there is a significant positive relationship between these two measures. The answer to the question, “The physical environment at this university is appropriate” and “The administration of this institution has improved physical conditions for faculty’s work”. The interesting finding was that 97% faculty members at private universities showed strong satisfaction with these two responses. At the public universities, satisfaction with physical conditions was very low. The morale at five public sector universities headed by retired government officers was very low. However, the higher correlation between job satisfaction and morale and low relation of morale with commitment also suggest that those faculty members who are satisfied with their job are not necessarily committed to their organization. The deans of some universities I interviewed gave several reasons.

“The behavior of our rector is damaging our university and faculty’s morale. I come to this university everyday with commitment to my profession. I attend frequent meetings headed by our rector. I often think of resigning because he spends hours and hours discussing non issues and does not want to discuss faculty development and student focused issues. He
does not understand the business of education. Everything seems discouraging after listening to him. I have spent 29 years in this profession, and I believe Allah will reward me for all the difficulties I faced. I would not leave this place only because; there are 1200 students and the members of the faculty who need me here”.

It is clear that even if faculty is dissatisfied with leadership behavior, they are still committed to their, profession, students and country.
4.11 Results of Regression Analysis

Correlation analysis was followed by regression analysis. Regression analysis analyses how a single dependant variable is caused by one or more independent variables and they have linear relationship. The theoretical estimated equations are presented in chapter 3 on page 72. The first estimation of the results which are shown on the following page in table 4.11, the dependent variable, faculty’s organizational commitment was regressed against four independent variables, namely task-oriented and relationship-oriented, laissez-faire leadership behavior and participatory decision making. Equation also shows that even if all other co-efficients become zero, even then the EOC will remain 2.264 units. The researcher found that the four independent variables captured 39% of the variation in OC. The t. statistics showed that three of the four independent variables were statistically significant at the 99% level of confidence in the model. The fourth variable, Laissez-faire behavior is statistically significant at the 90% level of confidence. However, the coefficient of laissez faire is effectively zero. Task-oriented leadership behavior and participatory decision making are positively related to organizational commitment, while relationship oriented behavior is negatively related to organizational commitment.
Regression Results of faculty’s Organizational Commitment to Four Types of Leadership Behavior (Over All Results)

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th>Types of Leadership Behaviors</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>3.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
<td>-3.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-1.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>4.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>8.511</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that when the leader’s task-oriented behavior increases by one unit and the employee’s participation in decision making increases by one unit, the organizational commitment will increase by 0.33 units and 0.36 units in an organization respectively. If the leader’s relationship oriented behavior increases by one unit, OC decreases by 0.32 units. The results of the regression analysis thus shed further light on the effect of relationship oriented behavior.

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the equation the R Square of 0.391 indicates that 39.1% of the variation EOC is explained by the variation in Task-oriented Leadership Behavior (TOLB), Relation-
oriented Leadership Behavior (ROLB), Laissez-faire Behavior (LFB), and Participatory Decision Making (PDM).

**Table 4.12.1 Results of f test for determinants of faculty’s organizational commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>63.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-Test measures the overall significance level of the model. It shows if there is a linear relationship between all of the independent variables (TOLB, ROLB, LFB and PDM) i.e. X variables considered together, and the dependent variable i.e. Y (in this case EOC). In our table the F value is highly significant. So we accept that all of the independent variables affect the value of dependent variable. This result is expected as each of the independent variables is statistically significant at a confidence level of 99% except for laissez-faire behavior. Even this variable is significant at a confidence level of 90%.

**Table 4.12.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-3.39</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table it is evident that relationship between EOC is highly significant with all the independent variables except with the laissez-faire variable where significant level is low i.e. the confidence interval is less than 95%.
Regression Results of Male Faculty’s Organizational Commitment with four Types of Leadership Behavior

Table 4.13 Coefficients for Determinants of Male Faculty members Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable = Employees organizational Commitment
Independent Variable = Task-oriented Leadership Behavior
Relation-oriented Leadership Behavior
Laissez-faire Behavior
Participatory Decision Making

The Co-efficient of determination R Square reports the proportion of total variation in dependent variable (Y) explained by all independent variables (X) is taken together. The R Square of 0.1326 indicates that 13.2% of the variation in faculty’s organizational commitment (EOC) is explained by the variation in the four regression Coefficients.

Table 4.13.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The f-test shows if there is a linear relationship between all of the independent variables (TOLB, ROLB, LFB and PDM). In our Table the F value is not significant. We have to accept that there is no linear relationship among the beta coefficients.
Table 4.13.2 Results of Male Faculty’s Organizational Commitment and Four types of Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>St. Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>2.991E-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the output of excel, our Multiple Regression equation is as under:-

EOC = 2.88 - 0.04 Task Oriented + 0.06 Relationship Oriented - 0.036 Laissez-Faire
+ 0.11 Participatory Decision Making

This equation shows that EOC will decrease by 0.04 units with 1 unit increase in Task Oriented Leader Behavior keeping the other three independent variables constant.

EOC will increase by 0.06 units with an increase of 1 unit in Relationship behavior, keeping the other three independent variables constant. EOC will decrease by 0.036 units with an increase of 1 unit in Laissez-Faire, keeping the other three independent variables constant. EOC will increase by 0.11 units with 1 unit increase in Participatory Behavior keeping the other three independent variables constant. If all other co-efficient become zero, even then the EOC will remain 2.88 units. From the table it is evident that relationship between EOC is highly significant will all the independent variables i.e. the confidence interval is greater than 95%.
Regression Results of Females Faculty’s Organizational Commitment with four Types of Leadership Behavior

Table 4.14 Regression Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable = Faculty’s Organizational Commitment
Determining Variables = Task-oriented Leadership behavior
                         Relation-oriented Leadership Behavior
                         Laissez-Faire Behavior
                         Participatory Decision Making

In the equation the R square indicates that 42% of the variation in the regression is explained by the variation in TOLB, ROLB, LFB and PDM.

Table 4.14.1 F test for determinants of Female Faculty’s Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The f-test measures the overall significance level of the model. In our regression the F value is highly significant. So we accept that the independent variables affect together the value of (EOC) Organizational Commitment.

Table 4.14.2 Co-efficient for Determinants of Female Faculty’s Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This equation shows that EOC will increase by 0.44 units with one unit increase in task oriented leader behavior keeping the other three independent variables constant. EOC will decrease by 0.57 units with an increase of one unit in relationship-oriented behavior. EOC will also decrease by 0.0855 units with an increase of one unit in Laissez-Faire, keeping the other three independent variables constant. EOC will increase by 0.36 units with one unit increase in Participatory Behavior keeping the other three independent variables constant. Equation also shows that even if all other co-efficients become zero, even then the EOC will remain 2.85 units. From the table it is evident that relationship between EOC is highly significant will all the independent i.e. the confidence interval is more than 95%.

4.12 Findings about All types of Leadership Behavior and Organizational Commitment

The findings suggest that organizational commitment and its subscales, affective, continuance and normative commitments are positively related to task oriented behavior. This is not unusual for Pakistani universities setup. The research also suggests that laissez-faire behavior is negatively related to all forms of commitment. This shows that university management is strongly “keeping track of the faculty’s mistakes”, and they are not giving the faculty any feedback. This shows poor leadership behavior whereby the management does not interfere in the faculty’s issues unless their problems become acute. Therefore timely feedback and action about the situation and problems require improvement in university management’s actions. The responses on leadership behavior pertaining to the questions, “He points out my mistakes”, “late action” and would not interfere unless problems become chronic”, comes with disapproval from
faculty regarding the leadership behavior of university management. This behavior also has an impact on how faculty is feeling regarding their obligation to stay with the university. If management wants to give negative feedback about mistakes and below standard performance; it can and should be done in a clarifying and encouraging way. The other important point is that the leadership needs to improve normative commitment level by improving their relationship-oriented behavior because all three OC scales have positive but week relation with relationship-oriented behavior. Therefore the suggestion for Vice Chancellors and management is that they do need to work on their relation-oriented style of leadership. They should show trust and do measures for trust building, confidence building and they should share a common vision and they must recognize and encourage accomplishments. This was also suggested by Chughtai & Zafar (2006) that trust in university management was significantly related to commitment of faculty members. The research showed how willing the universities heads were to share power with faculty and involve them in academic decision making. If the faculty members are consulted in the matters affecting their academic life, if they are given academic freedom, if they have adequate representation on the board of studies, and if decisions are made on time, there is an impact on faculty and organizational performance. These findings augment earlier results which suggested that a bureaucratic environment often resulted in a lower level of organizational commitment.

The result of this study shows that faculty satisfaction with participative decision making process is important. A member who is committed to his job is also more satisfied with his job and will have the intentions of remaining in the same university.
This creates a stable environment in the university and increases its chances of higher educational achievements.

**Regression Results of Faculty’s Commitment with Job Satisfaction and Morale**

Linear Regression Analysis is applied to find the causal relationship between employees’ organizational commitment and two dependent variables the job satisfaction and Morale separately.

**Independent Variable** = Employees Organizational Commitment  
**Outcome (Dependent Variable)** = Job Satisfaction and Morale

\[ B - EQ \ (B_1) = \text{Job Satisfaction} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \varepsilon \]

\[ C - EQ \ (B_2) = \text{Morale} = \alpha + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon \]

The outcome variables, the job satisfaction and Morale, one by one were regressed on Employees organizational commitment. The results of these regression analyses for the main effect of Employees organizational commitment on job satisfaction and Morale are shown below on table 4.15 and 4.16 respectively.

**Table 4.15 Results of Faculty’s Commitment to Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.16 Results of Faculty’s Commitment to Morale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employees’ organizational commitment explained 4.8% variance in Job Satisfaction, 9.3% variance in Morale which is statistically significant.

**Table 4.15.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>113.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>119.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: (Constant), EOC
Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

The F value is 11.95 which is highly significant at 0.001. It indicates that the independent variable is significantly explaining the variation in the dependent variable. So we reject the null hypotheses and accept the alternative hypotheses. The regression results are very significant (p = 0.001) but very high residual sum of squares (113.27) indicate that the model does not explain a lot of the variation in the dependent variable, and there are other factors that account for a higher proportion of the variation in the dependent variable.

**Table 4.16.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>91.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>101.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor: (Constant), EOC
Dependent variable: Morale

The significance value of the F statistic (F=23.97) is less than 0.001 which is highly significant. It indicates that the independent variable is significantly explaining the variation in the dependent variable. So we reject the null hypotheses and accept the alternative hypotheses. Although the regression results are very significant (p < 0.001) but comparatively high residual sum of squares (91.69) indicate that the model does not explain a lot of the variation in the dependent variable, and many additional factors that help account for a higher proportion of the variation in the dependent variable Morale.
Table 4.15.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>Sig. p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>7.709</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: Job Satisfaction

\[ JS = 2.214 + 0.220 \text{EOC}, \]

The equation shows that Job Satisfaction will increase by 0.220 units with 1 unit increase in Employees Organizational Commitment.

Table 4.16.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>Sig. P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>8.212</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>4.896</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Morale

\[ Morale = 2.122 + 0.304 \text{EOC}, \]

The equation shows that Morale will increase by 0.304 units with 1 unit increase in EOC. The results of the regression analysis revealed that Employees organizational commitment was a significant predictor of job satisfaction \( (\beta = 0.22, p = .001) \), and Morale \( (\beta = 0.30, p < .000) \). These results confirmed Hypotheses 5 and 6. From the above tables it is evident that relationship between EOC is highly significant with Job Satisfaction and Morale. The t statistics can help to determine the relative importance of each variable in the model. The results of regression analysis show that when job satisfaction and morale were regressed against EOC, the t statistics for Job Satisfaction was 3.45 and the t statistics for morale was 4.896, which are statistically significant within a confidence interval of 99% and that implies that
organizational commitment has significant impact on both dependent variables but comparatively higher impact on morale than job satisfaction.

**Regression between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction**

*(Male and Female)*

To find the difference in regression results with respect to gender of the respondents, the regression was applied on two groups, males and females separately. Firstly, Job satisfaction is regressed on organizational commitment and secondly Morale is regressed on organization commitment.

When responses were grouped into male and females, Regression analysis showed statistically significant results for both male and female respondents. The R Square was observed .037 for the males and .069 for the females with the same significance level (p<0.05) with a difference in Beta coefficient (.192 for males and .263 for females) as shown in the table given below.

**Table 4.17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.66631</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression between Organizational Commitment and Morale (Male and Female)

Regression analysis between OC and Morale showed statistically significant results for both male and female respondents. The R Square was observed .076 for the males and .121 for the females with the same significance level (p=0.001) with a difference in Beta coefficient (.276 for males and .347 for females) as shown in the table given below.

Table 4.17.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta coefficient</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of T Test:

To find the relative difference in the variables due to the gender of the respondents, T Test is applied. Independent sample method was applied for two groups of sample respondents the female and the male groups. Results indicated no significant difference in means between male and female for three of the variables (p>.05). The results are shown in the given tables.
Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.3990</td>
<td>.65940</td>
<td>.07282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.3567</td>
<td>.65331</td>
<td>.05248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.2071</td>
<td>.76370</td>
<td>.08434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.1903</td>
<td>.67673</td>
<td>.05436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.2933</td>
<td>.51906</td>
<td>.05732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.2016</td>
<td>.51466</td>
<td>.04134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.3990</td>
<td>.65940</td>
<td>.07282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.3567</td>
<td>.65331</td>
<td>.05248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.2071</td>
<td>.76370</td>
<td>.08434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.1903</td>
<td>.67673</td>
<td>.05436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.2933</td>
<td>.51906</td>
<td>.05732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.2016</td>
<td>.51466</td>
<td>.04134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion on Results

The tests were performed to find the causal relationship between Organizational Commitment and two dependent variables the job satisfaction and Morale. As the results indicated significant results between OC and the two dependent variables but low values of R square (4.8% for job satisfaction and 9.3% for Morale) indicated that
although Organization commitment is significant and important factor to explain variation in job satisfaction and Morale but there could be many other factors that may explain variance in the dependent variables.

It is also inferred from the regression results that OC explains more variance in morale(R square: 9.3%) than job satisfaction(R square: 4.8%). It shows that employees who have high organizational commitment, their morale will be relatively higher than job satisfaction. Job satisfaction may be related to many other related factors of the job.

When results are analyzed with respect to gender of the respondents, there was no significant difference observed for male and female for both of the dependent variables in their causal relationships. Even relative importance of three variables i.e. OC, Job Satisfaction and Morale with respect to gender, there was no significant difference in the responses.

4.13 Findings about Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Morale and Participatory Decision Making

Overall results showed that there was significant relation between organizational commitment and Job satisfaction but there are other factors which are contributing the increase in faculty’s job satisfaction. When results were compared between male and female faculty members, it appeared that both genders were satisfied with their jobs. The equation showed R square = 0.42 for leadership behavior and R square for job satisfaction as = .037 and morale = .076 for males. For females R square = .13 in leadership behavior, for job satisfaction = .069 and morale R Square was = .121. Male faculty members were more affected by relationship-oriented behavior and participatory decision making and showed negative impact by task-oriented leadership behavior.
Interestingly females showed more commitment to organization with regard to task-oriented behavior and PDM. And a negative impact was shown by laissez-fare and relation-oriented behavior. In female faculty members the results of morale were significant on 95% confidence level of value of coefficient was 0.347 and for males it was 0.276. It also showed that morale was an outcome of organizational commitment. Both genders were more committed to organization and more satisfied with their jobs. This was not consistent with the findings of (Alvi & Ahmed, 1987), where they suggested that females were more satisfied from their jobs in Pakistan. Another researcher Beth (2004) explains the difference between male and female job satisfaction as, “the academic world was predominantly a male occupation until the later half of the last century, and it is possible that there are different predictors of satisfaction for males than for females. Study done by Tang and Talpade (1999) showed that males tended to have higher level of satisfaction with pay than females and females tended to have a higher level of satisfaction with coworkers than males. Findings of this research also support these earlier findings.

The high correlation of task-oriented behavior with organizational commitment and Job satisfaction implies that university management has a better chance of increasing job satisfaction through practices that are focused on task-oriented behavior. This means that increasing the degree to which a task is personally important to individual is more productive than increasing organizational ties. The findings included: significant influence on teaching faculty’s morale from job satisfaction, participatory decision making’s significant influence on morale, leadership behavior’s influence on job satisfaction, participatory decision making, and relation of participatory decision making
The result of this study shows that faculty satisfaction with participative decision making process is important. A member who is committed to his job is also more satisfied with his job and will have the intentions of remaining in the same university. This creates a stable environment in the university and increases its chances of higher educational achievements.

g with organizational commitment.

4.14 Hypotheses Evaluation

The following hypotheses were developed and were analyzed during research.

1- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase faculty’s organizational commitment.

a- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase organizational commitment in male faculty members.

b- The task-oriented behavior of a leader would increase organizational commitment in female faculty members.

2- Relation-oriented behavior increases faculty’s organizational commitment.

3- Laissez-faire behavior has a negative relationship with employees organizational commitment.

4- Participative decision making has a positive relationship with faculty’s organizational commitment.

5- Organizational commitment has a positive correlation with Job Satisfaction.

6- Organizational commitment has a positive correlation with morale.

My First hypothesis was proven by regression and correlational analysis. Hypothesis two showed that it has affect when regressed collectively but when loaded separately A
is rejected. And also that female’s organizational commitment is increased by task-oriented behavior of leaders while decreased by relation-oriented behavior. The results of males were opposite. Third hypothesis was proved that Laissez-Faire behavior has a negative relationship with OC.

Fourth hypothesis was proven that participatory decision-making has positive relationship with OC, and fifth hypothesis was proven that OC has positive relationship with job satisfaction. Sixth hypothesis was that organizational commitment has positive correlation with morale and it was also proven.

Four significant findings were identified from this research study;

1. Task oriented leadership factored scores were positively and significantly correlated with commitment factored scores and therefore task leadership behavior added significant variance in predicting the level of commitment, (affective, normative and continuance).

2- Relations oriented leadership behavior factored scores were positively and significantly correlated with commitment and job satisfaction. Therefore relation oriented behavior added significant variance in predicting commitment and intention of faculty to leave or stay.

3- Organizations have different working environment that displays leadership behavior and had its effects on faculty’s morale.

4- The type of leadership style determines the job satisfaction of faculty.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This research thesis examined university faculties’ commitment and how that commitment is affected primarily by the leadership style of public university’s Vice Chancellors and private university’s directors or owners. Research also examined affect of participatory decision on faculty’s organizational commitment. The main purpose of this thesis was to investigate the relationship between leadership behavior, participatory decision making and organizational commitment. The research was prompted by lack of attention in the literature to the influence of leadership behavior and university faculty’s participation in decision making and its influence on organizational commitment. It also measured faculty’s job satisfaction, morale, and its relationship with organizational commitment. Previous work done by Bass & Avolio, Meyer & Allen, Steers, Locke and Schweiger, Cohen, Brown, Lok, Tagai, Alvi & Ahmed provided the basis for literature review.

The concept of Organizational Commitment played a central role in this study. There are many factors that can have effect on organizational commitment, including age, gender, personality, attitude, climate, and culture (Steers, 1977); Values, fairness of policies, decentralization, competence, job challenges, degree of autonomy, and variety of skills used (Meyer & Allen, 1997): Individuals come to organizations with certain needs, desires, skills, and so forth, and expect to find a work environment where they can utilize their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs. When the organizations provide such a vehicle, the likelihood of increasing commitment is apparently enhanced. Beyond other factors involved, commitment to the organization is probably most
reflective of how employees feel about leaders and the behavior they exhibit (Brown, 2004). More highly educated people would be less committed to the organization and perhaps more committed to their profession or trade (Steers, 1977). Participation will lead to greater attainment of high order needs, such as self expression, respect, independence, and equality, which will in turn increase morale and satisfaction (Blake & Mouton, 1964, 1967; McGregor, 1960). Highly committed employees should have a strong desire and intent to remain with the organization. Employees who are highly committed to the goals of an organization and have positive attitude towards it should be more likely to have a strong desire to come to work and contribute toward goals attainment. The importance of decision making in educational institutions has been recognized as a key function by this research. And a university where a clear commitment to student learning is apparent, more faculty participation in decision making is crucial to the overall effective operations of the universities. The increased support for participatory management comes from a nation’s attention on education, coupled with the current push for accountability and the increased pressure on Vice Chancellors to run effective universities.

5.2 Discussion

The main results of this thesis were derived from a questionnaire based survey. However, interviews and observational data were also gathered to complement the findings of survey. Mowday et al. (1979) suggested that organizational commitment was different from job satisfaction in a number of ways. They argued that commitment is a more global concept, which reflected the general affective response to the organization as a whole. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, reflected one’s response either to one’s
job or to certain aspects of one’s job. Job satisfaction was found to be less stable measure overtime, reflecting a more immediate reaction to specific and tangible aspects of the work environment such as pay and supervision (Porter et al. 1974, Smith et al. 1969). Mowday et al. (1979) concluded that commitment focused on attachment to the employing organization including its goals and values while satisfaction emphasized the specific task environment where as employee performed his or her duties. This study validated a study done by Steers (1977) that having expectations or needs met, led to satisfaction which resulted in greater commitment among employees.

This research found that job satisfaction and commitment were equally predictive of voluntary turn over. These were relatively important findings, which contributed substantially to the development of theory of organizational commitment. Another important finding from this thesis was that leadership style has positive effect on commitment while bureaucratic style of leadership had a negative affect on organizational commitment. The degree of female commitment in Pakistan appears to be much higher than that of male workers, and age seems inversely related with commitment (Alvi & Ahmed, 1987). My findings suggested that both male and female faculty is committed but only the commitment of females is substantial and statistically significant were on the higher side.

Participatory decision making takes time and time is what faculty might not be willing to spare. But if this has to work and succeed, the faculty must be willing to spare and spend time for it. That would also mean coming to campus on week ends. Willingness and ability goes hand in hand in decision making. For both administrators and faculty, review of workload, in service training and access to important information
is necessary. Faculty members should bear the consequences of their decisions and actions. The results of current study showed that 90% of the faculty members responded that they were not part of decisions which are pure academic related; they are not members of curriculum committees. Faculty is willing to take this responsibility. Faculty members are not sent for training but they are willing to go. Faculty must be ready for accountability if they are willing to accept authority.

5.3 Research Questions

The four research questions and the responses that follow were the focus of the study.

1. Is faculty’s commitment influenced by behavior of university leadership?
2. Among the two types of leadership behavior which one contributes more towards faculty’s intention to stay with their universities?
3. If faculty is consulted in the university’s decision making process would it have positive influence on their loyalty towards university and what would be its effect on their satisfaction from their job, organization and profession?
4. What kind of relation exists between organizational commitment, Job satisfaction and morale of faculty

The results indicated that significant positive relationship was present between combined task and relation-oriented behavior and employees’ organizational commitment. Female faculty members showed positive relationship with task and negative with relation-oriented behavior. Male faculty members had positive relationship with relation-oriented behavior and negative relationship with task when compared separately. This research did provide answer to first question that faculty’s
OC is influenced by the university leadership behavior. The answer to second question was that Task and participatory decision making would be a better model for Pakistani universities. For third research question suggestions have already been given in chapter 4 on page 117 and 118. Fourth research question was proven that Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and morale of faculty have a positive relationship and on correlation matrix it was (0.72).

5.4 Conclusion

The results of this study have important implications for policy makers in the area of higher education. The first is that faculty satisfaction with their involvement in university governance is important and should be monitored by the university administration and by the Higher Education Commission. A faculty member’s level of satisfaction with the university directly influences his level of commitment to the university. The reward that a faculty member receives, particularly the intrinsic rewards, (recommended for higher education or positions) have an effect on their level of commitment to the university.

Vice Chancellors’ leadership style is also a key to the satisfaction of faculty; his leadership behavior has a direct effect on job satisfaction. Specially, the Vice Chancellor’s ability to display “versatile” leadership behavior depending on the situation is important. There are many ways a university leadership can improve the level of satisfaction and subsequently the commitment and retention of its faculty. The administrators should recognize faculty accomplishments both formally and informally, complementing them on their success in conversations and recognizing success during faculty meetings.
5.5 Limitations of the thesis

The overall response rate for this study was 79%, which is quite a high response rate. The survey was also conducted at the end of the spring semester when most of the faculty was going for their summer holidays. Other faculty members were busy with new admissions. It may have been better to administer the survey when more faculty is present and they are less busy. Second, the two variables of job satisfaction and morale which were used in the survey had not been used by the researchers who had done cutting edge research on the subject such as Bass and Avolio regarding multifactor leadership and MLQ and Meyer & Allen’s’ organizational commitment. However the researchers followed the method of convenience sampling which is a non-random method. Hence the results can not be generalized. Further modification may also be required to increase their applicability especially with regards to the Pakistani university. Both sampling techniques and a larger sample might have yielded better results.

5.6 Implications for Educators and Administrators

“The faculty is the heart of our institutions of higher learning”, (Schuster & Bowen: 1985) as the faculty is important. Smith (1978) pointed out that, “a university is its faculty” and “the excellence of a university is the excellence of its faculty”. “Lives and work of faculty are central to institutional quality and students’ learning” (Austin, and Splete: 1991). If this is all true then the administration of universities must do all in its power to improve faculty’s working conditions. That also means listening to faculty and taking their recommendations and suggestions in university governance issue and academic decisions, and giving faculty adequate representation on universities board of
studies, board of governors, sharing authority, and involving them in policy making issues. It also requires that faculty should be consulted openly.

Administrators should not play a blame game and should not blame faculty if due to fulltime load they are not sparing time for the meetings. If that happens the administrators should not say that the system does not work. “If democracy fails, you need more democracy, if it fails again you again need more democracy, it does not mean dictators should take over” (Shahab, 1981).

Administrators also need the skills of open communication, skill of sharing vision with others, skill of relation and trust building and a skill of recognition and appreciation. Administrator needs a skill of consensus building, respect for others views, learn the skill to take criticism and teach them how to give positive feedback. None of these require huge financial resources, all it needs is change of thinking in the way faculty is treated and how things are handled.

The findings of this study have implications for people who sit in the interviews, selection, and hiring panels and serious implications for those who make appointment decisions of Vice Chancellors. They should appoint those with high qualification, research background, must follow the guideline laid by HEC for appointing Vice Chancellors. Those who are eminent scholars, have PhD degrees and research background and Vice-Chancellors who can build trust and who can exercise authority not domination, and who are confident enough of themselves to empower others, often by sending them abroad for training.
5.7 Implications for Higher Education Commission and Policy Makers

The HEC wanted to increase the number of PhDs in Pakistan three fold at least. This policy can only yield results when applied in a rational manner keeping in view the particular conditions in Pakistan. PhD is the most advanced education, it prepare the scholar to undertake research at an advanced level. Universities also need sound academic administration to enable them to excel in their academic performance. Senior faculty members have spent their lives devoted to good teaching and whatever research they can do in the absence of required facilities, apart from sharing the very demanding administrative responsibilities. Each of the three-teaching; research and administration-are of equal importance. Making any criteria alone on the basis of research for promotion and appointments would be negating the importance of the other two.

Instead of establishing new universities with foreign faculties there should have been efforts to improve the existing public and private universities and their existing faculties. Universities of the country cannot attain the same level of international universities overnight. The policy makers must thus take in to account past and current realities. The first engineering university of Pakistan was established 15 years after the independence. The graduates of this university were very instrumental in the manufacturing, engineering, technology, electricity, telephone and other related areas. It took 50 years to establish 7 universities and by establishing 6 engineering universities in the next 2 years, one wonders what kind of results they would yield, while Pakistan’s job market has taken a turn around and its economy has become trade-oriented and lot of jobs for business graduates are available in the marketing sector.
Private universities are offering twice or thrice the salary to PhDs as compared to public sector universities. It may be inferred that only worldly unwise qualified persons shall seek the job in Public Sector University and those who already have jobs may stay for unknown reasons in public sector universities. It may not be out of place to mention that some well qualified and well meaning incumbents have already left. So the need is also to devise new and attractive pay-scales for university teachers.

5.8 Future Research Needs

While this study added to the literature on faculty’s satisfaction and commitment with decision making and leadership behavior, there are still many areas for future research. A major finding of this study was that the university’s top leadership has a direct effect on faculty members’ commitment and satisfaction. Vice Chancellors or owners are to provide direction and guidance to the faculty. A more thorough examination of their role, their own qualification, experience and how it relates to the benefits of faculty members is needed. One area is to do a comparison of public versus private sector in the context of salaries, available resources, rewards, housing and medical facilities and other benefits for the faculty. It would also be interesting to evaluate gender differences within university faculty and examine the job satisfaction and commitment. These comparisons could not be made in this study due to sample size.

5.9 Summary of Major Findings

Much of the results and responses are explained in the results section of chapter 4, however here are some major findings of the study. The study highlights the fact that commitment and leadership style and its outcomes, job satisfaction and morale are
complex concepts. The basis for this complexity lies in the faculty’s opinion about their universities leadership. This opinion, if positive, can take faculty to commitment to their universities and making efforts to achieve the goals. There are examples of personal sacrifices. It is evident that there is a significant relationship between Vice Chancellors leadership styles and level of commitment and job satisfaction, the faculty’s morale tends to rise and fall accordingly. And if we see job satisfaction as a certain element, then faculty morale is something which requires non job elements such as informal, personal and social interactions.

Another need arising from the study is that level of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and morale need to be studied separately in the 18 universities based on their status as private or public.

5.10 Contribution of This Thesis

The findings of this study highlight a number of contributions. First, it provides evidence for the importance of Vice Chancellors and university management’s leadership behaviors that it had direct relationship and effect on faculty’s commitment toward universities. These results are of great importance for the university management and policy makers in the higher education in Pakistan. These decision makers can and should focus on the training and development of faculty, reward and job involvement and participative decision making in the universities. They should promote a trust building culture and take measures for the benefit of faculty to bring more commitment and create a positive environment in the universities and better working conditions. Another important area, which should be focused by the decision makers of educational sector, is that the management must listen to senior faculty
members specially PhD professors and should see who should be truly running our higher education institutions both in public and private sector. Professor Alvi’s comments of Concordia University Canada are worth mentioning here, “the policy makers in education sector should see it as a guiding light to focus their attention on the real issues”.

The third contribution of my thesis is that it had brought into limelight the elements that increase faculty’s job satisfaction, morale and commitment. Also an important outcome is the finding that when faculty is involved in the decision making their job satisfaction and morale also increases. And the policy makers can turn their attention to determine the critical variables, which can improve job satisfaction and morale in our universities. Earlier researchers like Mowday (1982) and this thesis’s findings are also consistent on the issue that job satisfaction is an expression of attitude. And it is organizational commitment, which is more stable over time than job satisfaction. So focus should also be on increasing organizational commitment. The results also confirm the theory of Hershy & Blanchards (1985), that there exists two significant types of leadership behavior over cross cultures, and those are task and relation oriented behaviors. Bass and Avolio (1995) suggested relation oriented behavior to be more dominant in their findings and current research found task oriented behavior to be more dominant in Pakistani settings. The findings also support theory Y of management that employees should be consulted and trusted in delegations and in the matters which are going to affect them. Lastly this thesis also revealed the non leadership behavior and bureaucratic and biased discouraging environment which is being created by non academic heads of universities.
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APPENDIX A, Covering Letter

Center for Advance Studies in Engineering
G-5
Islamabad

22 May 2006

Dear Colleague,

You are invited to participate in a study of leadership behavior and participatory decision makings effect on employee’s organizational commitment, a study of Pakistani higher education. I hope to find out factor that effect job satisfaction and morale and commitment in Pakistani universities. I have selected 18 universities across the country and your university is one of them. Would you please take a little time from your busy schedule to respond to the questionnaire – if at all possible within the next two weeks? It is confidential, and I am hoping that it would only take 15 to 20 minutes of your time. When completed please return it in the stamped envelope provided. After receiving back the questionnaire I plan to follow it up with several semi-structured interviews done face-to-face. If after responding to the questionnaire you decide that, I can interview you, and then please return the enclosed interview card in the same envelope. I would be contacting you after I receive the questionnaire. If you would like to receive the findings of this research, then please tick at the box on the interview card, I will Inshallah send you a summary of the findings.

Thank you sincerely for your time and cooperation

Muhammad I. Ramay
APPENDIX B, Questionnaire Personal Demographics

Survey Questionnaire for Research

Respected Sir/Madam
I am working on my thesis for PhD and title of my research is: Leadership Behavior and Participatory Decision Making Influence the Employees Organizational Commitment: A case of Pakistani Higher Education
In this regard I am contacting faculty members of selected private and public universities. You are requested to participate in this survey to provide the following information that will help me complete this research and eventually the findings would help improve the working environment of Pakistani Universities. Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidentiality is assured. No individual data will be reported. If you wish to get the summary of findings kindly note my email. Please do not put your name or Organizations name on this questionnaire.
Thank You!

Muhammad I. Ramay
Email: miramay_64@yahoo.co.uk        May 15, 2006

Appendix: B1

The following questions concern your position and other personal information.
1. Age:_________________Years
2. Gender
   Male / Female
3. Current Job Title:
   Professor / Associate Professor / Assistant Professor /
   Lecturer / Other ________
4. Qualification: Masters / M Phil / PhD
5. Do you supervise others?   Yes / No
6. How long have you worked for this University / Institute?
   Years___ Months____
7. How long have you worked with current Vice Chancellor /Dean /
   Director/Rector? ________________
8. Any work experience outside of Pakistan? ________________________
The following statements concern how you feel about the organization you work. Please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 5.

**Appendix B2: Organizational Commitment Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) It would be very hard for me to leave my university right now, even if I wanted to .........................................................1 2 3 4 5

2) I do not feel my obligation to remain with my current institution ....1 2 3 4 5

3) I would be very happy to spend rest of my career with this university. ..............................................................1 2 3 4 5

4) I owe a great deal to my university ..................................................1 2 3 4 5

5) Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my department now .........................................................1 2 3 4 5

6) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this university..1 2 3 4 5

7) I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this institution ...............1 2 3 4 5

8) This university deserves my loyalty ..................................................1 2 3 4 5

9) If I had not already put so much of myself into this university, I might consider working elsewhere ...........................................1 2 3 4 5

10) I Would not leave my university right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it. ........................................1 2 3 4 5

**Appendix B3: Leadership Behavior, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

In this section, you are asked to describe your immediate supervisors (that could be Dean/Rector/Vice Chancellor) leadership style as you perceive it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) He/She spends time teaching and coaching others. .........................1 2 3 4 5

12) He/She treats others as individual rather than just as a member of a group.................................................................1 2 3 4 5

13) He/She considers an individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others ......................................1 2 3 4 5

14) He/She helps others to develop their strengths ..........................1 2 3 4 5
15) He/She talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished..1 2 3 4 5
16) He/She seeks differing perspectives in solving problems.............1 2 3 4 5
17) He/She acts in ways that build others respect for him/her.............1 2 3 4 5
18) He/She displays a sense of power and confidence......................1 2 3 4 5
19) He/She instills pride in others for being associated with him.........1 2 3 4 5
20) He/She is effective in meeting others’ job-related needs...............1 2 3 4 5
21) He/She considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions..1 2 3 4 5
22) He/She emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense
   of mission..................................................................................1 2 3 4 5
23) He/She is effective in representing others to higher authority........1 2 3 4 5
24) He/She leads a group that is effective......................................1 2 3 4 5
25) He/She uses methods of leadership that are satisfying................1 2 3 4 5
26) He/She provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts..1 2 3 4 5
27) He/She expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations......1 2 3 4 5
28) He/She focuses attention on irregularities, mistake, exceptions
   and deviations from standards.................................................1 2 3 4 5
29) He/She keeps track of all my mistakes.....................................1 2 3 4 5
30) He/She directs my attention towards failures to meet standards....1 2 3 4 5
31) He/She fails to interfere until problem become serious...............1 2 3 4 5
32) He/She waits for things to go wrong before taking actions.........1 2 3 4 5
33) He/She is absent from office when needed................................1 2 3 4 5
34) He/She avoids making decisions............................................1 2 3 4 5
35) He/She delays responding to urgent questions.........................1 2 3 4 5

Appendix B4: Participative Management and Decision Making

The statements below relate to you and your supervisors supervisory orientation and decision
making style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36) The administration tells me what needs to be done and how
   it should be accomplished..............................................1 2 3 4 5
37) The administration in my university tries to eliminate situations
   that can lead to disagreement......................................1 2 3 4 5
38) Difference in opinions on how work should be done makes
   our administration angry ..............................................1 2 3 4 5
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39) When changes in rules and procedures must be made, the ideas
are gradually introduced so that faculty do not get upset........1  2  3  4  5
40) Our administration finds it difficult to understand why faculty resist
every change. .................................................................1  2  3  4  5
41) When I am in a supervisor role, I know I must not change my opinion
on a significant work situation.......................................1  2  3  4  5
42) Our administration listens carefully to each person in my department
group when any significant change is being made. ...............1  2  3  4  5
43) I am able to influence decisions that affect my work.............1  2  3  4  5
44) I am satisfied with the level of faculty representation on the
university board of governance.......................................1  2  3  4  5
45) I am satisfied with the level of faculty participation in this
institution’s decision-making process. .............................1  2  3  4  5
46) Enrollment of students to the courses I teach, mostly is my
decision.................................................................1  2  3  4  5
47) I have a significant role in the academic policies of this university1  2  3  4  5
Appendix B5: Faculty Job Satisfaction and Morale

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48) I feel there is strong connection between my pay and my

Performance……………………………………………………………………1 2 3 4 5

49) There is flexibility of work hours in this university……………1 2 3 4 5

50) Physical working environment at this university is appropriate……1 2 3 4 5

51) I see a lot of opportunity for advancement in this university……….1 2 3 4 5

52) I have been recommended for higher education/seminars and trainings

by my university………………………………………………………….1 2 3 4 5

53) I frequently communicate with my supervisor………………………1 2 3 4 5

54) I frequently receive recognition from my supervisor on my

performance………………………………………………………………….1 2 3 4 5

55) The administration in my organization effectively leads the

university…………………………………………………………………….1 2 3 4 5

56) My work in this institution gives me a great sense of achievement…1 2 3 4 5

57) I feel a strong sense of direction and purpose provided by the

administration of this institution………………………………………….1 2 3 4 5

58) The administration allows the faculty adequate academic

freedom……………………………………………………………………….1 2 3 4 5

59) I am happy with the current system of faculty pay scale……….……1 2 3 4 5

60) The administration of this institution has improved physical conditions

for faculty work………………………………………………………………..1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for participating in this survey
APPENDIX: C

Interview Card

I am willing to be interviewed by Muhammad Ramay within the next four weeks. I understand Muhammad Ramay will contact me to arrange a suitable time and venue for the interview.

Name..............................................................................

University...........................................................................

Phone .............................................................................

Would you like to receive the findings of this study Yes / No
Reminder Letter

Center for Advance Studies in Engineering
Ataturk Avenue, G-5
Islamabad

Dear Colleague,

Please disregard this note if you have already returned the questionnaire on Leadership behavior and participatory decision making I sent you earlier this month.

However, if you have not done so, would you kindly take a little time from your busy program to respond to the questionnaire and then return it – preferably in the next day or so?

I will greatly appreciate your help and co-operation with this request coming at a particularly busy time of the year for you when some faculty members are busy in fall admissions and some might be planning to take some time off for summer.

Sincerely

Muhammad I. Ramay
APPENDIX: E

Why Regression Analysis was done?
This was done for several reasons: To obtain a partitioning of the total sums of squares (variance) into regression and residual components; to reveal the effect coefficients (beta scores) for each variable and multiple correlation coefficients (r values) for variables entered into the equation; and to indicate the percent of total variance (R square) explained by all of the relevant variables. In order to use multiple regressions, dependent variable should have a normal distribution. Multiple regressions and correlation were used in this study since this study was more concerned with finding relationship and effect between variables.

Acquiring the Instrument
Researchers can purchase all forms of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from publishers in United States, and these questionnaires are also available online with payment. This researcher asked permission from the original authors.
APPENDIX: F

Higher Education Commission and University Ranking

The university ranking list, published by the Higher Education Commission, has been divided into 6 subject categories: Agriculture/Veterinary, Art/Design, Business/I.T., Engineering, General and Health Sciences

Ranking of Universities by Type of University

Agriculture/Veterinary
1. University of Agriculture (UAF), Faisalabad
2. NWFP University of Agriculture, Peshawar
3. University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi
4. Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam

Art/Design
1. National College of Arts, Lahore
2. Textile Institute of Pakistan, Karachi
3. Indus Valley School of Art & Architecture, Karachi

Business/I.T.
1. Lahore Uni. of Management Sciences (LUMS), Lahore
2. Institute of Business Administration (IBA), Karachi
4. Iqra University, Defence View, Karachi
5. Lahore School of Economics (LSE), Lahore
6. Institute of Business Management (IBM), Karachi
7. CECOS Peshawar
8. City University of Science and technology Peshawar.

Engineering
1. Pakistan Institute of Engg. and Applied Sciences, Islamabad
2. National University of Sciences & Technology Rawalpindi
3. Ghulam Ishaq Khan Institute of Engineering, Swabi
4. University of Engg. & Technology (UET), Lahore
5. Mehran University of Engg. & Technology (MUET), Jamshoro
6. University of Engg. & Technology (UET), Taxila
7. National University of computer and emerging sciences Islamabad
8. COMSATS Institute of Information Technology Islamabad
9. University of Engineering and technology Peshawar
10. NED University of Engineering and technology Karachi
11. Quaid-i-Awam University Nawabshah.
12. Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology Karachi.
13. Baluchistan University of Engineering and Technology Khuzdar

General
1. Quaid-i-Azam University (QAU), Islamabad
2. University of the Punjab, Lahore
3. University of Karachi, Karachi
4. University of Peshawar, Peshawar
5. Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan
6. Government College Lahore University, Lahore
7. Isra university Haiderabad
8. International Islamic University Islamabad
9. University of Sindh Jamshoro
10. Hamdard university Karachi
11. University of Baluchistan Quetta
12. Gomal University Dera Ismail khan
13. Islamia University Bahawalpur
14. University of AJK Muzafarabad
15. Lahore College for Women University Lahore
16. Hazara University, Dhodial Mansehra
17. Mohammad Ali Jinnah University Karachi
18. Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi
19. Bahria University Islamabad
20. Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur
21. University of Malakand, Chakdara, Malakand
22. Kohat University of Science and Technology Kohat
23. National University of Modern languages Islamabad.

**Health Sciences**
1. Aga Khan University, Karachi
2. Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences, Jamshoro
3. Baqai Medical University, Karachi
4. Zia-ud-din Medical University, Karachi

(HEC Report 2006)
Table 3.1 Correlation Analysis Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
<th>Task Oriented</th>
<th>Relation Oriented</th>
<th>Laissez-Faire</th>
<th>Participative Decision Making</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation Oriented</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-Faire</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Decision Making</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.20 Reliability Analyses – Scale (Alpha)  Method (covariance matrix)

1. Organizational Commitment
2. Task-Oriented Leadership Behavior
3. Relation-Oriented Leadership Behavior
4. Laissez-faire Behavior
5. Participatory Decision Making
6. Job Satisfaction
7. Morale

Covariance Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>LB_TO</th>
<th>LB_RO</th>
<th>LZF</th>
<th>PDM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.2651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB_TO</td>
<td>.1017</td>
<td>.4473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB_RO</td>
<td>.0573</td>
<td>.3631</td>
<td>.3977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LZF</td>
<td>-.0916</td>
<td>-.2983</td>
<td>-.2234</td>
<td>.9296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>.0859</td>
<td>.1504</td>
<td>.1501</td>
<td>-.0193</td>
<td>.2407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.0767</td>
<td>.2074</td>
<td>.1800</td>
<td>-.2388</td>
<td>.1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORALE</td>
<td>.0978</td>
<td>.2183</td>
<td>.1909</td>
<td>-.2605</td>
<td>.1861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>MORAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.5044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORAL</td>
<td>.3319</td>
<td>.4282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanations

The matrices given above are covariance matrices which is different than correlation matrix. In correlation matrix, the inter correlation among the variables is given in the form of a matrix. The correlation is a pure number without any units and its value varies between -1 and +1 depending on the strength of relationship between the variables. In contrast, the covariance tells us that how much a variable varies with respect to the other variables. It’s not a pure number and does possess units.
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Definitions and Theories

Decision Quality

Decision quality would improve if certain points are taken into account. If management could collect all of the pertinent facts bearing on a decision, within reasonable time, they would be having few problems of difficult decision-making and the decision quality would improve. They must therefore concentrate on obtaining the key pertinent facts. This brings in the element of personal judgment in the determination of need and relevance, (Brown, 2005). Different people at work on the same problem may be expected to bring different facts, different interpretations and different conclusions, the risk which this entails may be a procedural approach which assures that the right people are assigned to get to the facts and that they have a method for obtaining them which is most likely to produce what is needed. It is also important for the quality of the decision that the fact-finders get as close as possible to the primary sources of information, (William, Morris, Bierman, Taylor, Green, Couts, 1969).

Decision Acceptance

People who have considerable influence in making a decision tend to identify with it to be their decision. This feeling of ownership increases their motivation to implement it successfully. (Gary Yukl, 2002). Participation in decision-making also provides a better understanding of the nature of the decision problem and the reasons why a particular alternative was accepted and others rejected. Participants gain a better understanding of how they will be affected by a decision, which is likely to reduce any unwarranted fears and anxieties about it. When adverse consequences are likely, participation allows
people an opportunity to express their concerns and help to find a solution that deals with these concerns. Finally, when a decision is made by participative process considered legitimate by most members, then the group is likely to apply social pressure on any reluctant members to their part in implementing the decision (Yukl, 2002).

**Satisfaction with the Decision Process**

There could be many points to think during inviting others to participate in the decision making, such as giving them enough time to think, enlistment of the positive talent of many people in the decision-making process, and an atmosphere of freedom to maintain a critical position. Absence of pressure from top management for false unanimity among those participating in or contributing to the decisions, genuine participation in the decision-making process by those who would have to carry out the decision, and in short this type of environment will generate and foster a climate for initiative and action.

**Meyer & Allen’s Model**

Although they argued that the model was generally supported, Allen and Meyer (1996) identified a few issues that warranted further investigation. Specifically, they recommended that additional attention be given to investigating

(a) the strength of relation between the components of commitment, most notably affective and normative commitment;

(b) the dimensionality of the CCS; and

(c) The generalizability of the model outside North America.

The dynamics of organizational commitment outside of North America has received only scant attention (Alvi and Ahmed, 1987).
In arguing for their framework, Meyer & Allen (1991) contended that affective, continuance and normative commitment were components rather than types because employees could have varying degrees of all three. For example, one employee might feel both a strong attachment to an organization and a sense of obligation to remain. A second employee might enjoy working for the organization but also recognize that leaving would be very difficult from an economic standpoint. Finally a third employee might experience a considerable degree of desire, need and obligation to remain with the current employer (Meyer, Allen, 1997). Even though the authors present this argument, they do not imply that there is a rationale for summing all scales to obtain an overall score for organizational commitment.

Studies have linked organization commitment to measures of effectiveness that are similar to those found when investigating the outcomes of leadership behaviors. Loui, (1995) for instance found that commitment was significantly related to trust, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Angle and Perry (1981) uncovered a relationship between commitment and turnover. Wiener and Verdi (1980) uncovered a relationship between commitment and job performance.

Research has also linked organizational commitment to leadership behaviors that are relation-oriented and task-oriented. Jermier & Berkes (1979) discovered that employees who were allowed to participate in decision-making had higher levels of commitment to the organization. DeCotiis & Summers (1987) found that when employees were treated with consideration, they displayed greater levels of commitment. Bycio & Hackett & Allen (1995) reported positive correlations between the leadership behaviors of
charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and contingent reward and affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Organizational commitment provides a broad measure of the effectiveness of leadership behaviors. This relationship offers a way to further explore the subject of leadership.

**Alvi and Ahmeds Model and its approach**

**Exchange Approach.**

There are studies, which view commitment to be largely a result of all benefits and advantages, which accrue to a worker for being part of an organization. Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) categorize them as those based on “exchange approach.”

Becker (1960) was the pioneer in the study of exchange approach. This study points out that there are certain extrinsic benefits, such as seniority rights, pension and other accumulated benefits, and the possibility of upward mobility, which induce workers to stay with the organization. Becker calls them “side bets”. These benefits are lost once the membership in the organization is terminated. Thus the degree of commitment becomes largely, though not entirely, a function of the extent to which workers’ psychological, safety, and security needs are met. Fulfillment of psychological and other needs, though not denied, are relegated a secondary importance. This approach has also found support in Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) and, to some extent, in Bhagat and Chassie (1981).

**Psychological Approach**

The studies based on this approach treat commitment as a more active and positive orientation toward the organization (Porter & Smith, 1971) including loyalty to it (Buchanan, 1974) and identification with its goals and values (Porter, Steers, Mowday, &
Boulin, 1974). In contrast to the exchange approach, this one relies heavily on role-related and organizational factors such as work overload, managerial level, organizational size, union presence, and so on. Stevens (1978), for instance, found that the role related factors are more important predictors than other variables of workers’ commitment to their organizations. The importance of psychological variables (role-related, organizational, and personal) in determining commitment has further been confirmed by Morris and Sherman (1981).

**Blended Approach**

The above-mentioned approaches are based on Maslow’s contention that human needs are hierarchically inborn in rank of importance. At the top are physiological needs, followed by psychological ones. It is assumed that the main preoccupation of relatively less affluent workers is the satisfaction of physiological, safety, and security needs. As affluence grows, basic needs met, most workers turn to satisfying their psychological needs. Clearly in this form, this view divides societies, workers, and their needs in terms of the degree of affluence. Further, it suggests a pattern of needs selection and their satisfaction from basic to psychological.

There is a growing awareness among many researchers (Morris & Sherman, 1981) that neither approach alone is sufficient to explain the degree of workers’ commitment to their organizations in any society regardless of its degree of affluence. Workers in an advanced economy may attach as much, if not more, importance to the satisfaction of their basic needs as do those in a less developed nation. Likewise, psychological factors may be equally important for less affluent workers. Hence, there is the need to blend the two prevailing approached in order to explain this phenomenon.
As Steers (1977) points out, individuals have certain needs, desires, skills, and expectations. An organization, which provides its workers with a work environment conducive to realizing their expectations, meeting their just demands, and properly utilizing their skills will, in all likelihood, attract a workforce largely, committed to it. An organization which fulfills its employees’ psychological, financial, or other needs alone will find itself with workers who are less likely to stay, frequently abstain themselves from work, or show other manifestations of their lack of commitment.

**Leadership Theories**

**Managerial Grid**

Robert R. Blake and Anne Adams McCanse, (1985) refined the leadership grid which identified various types of managerial leadership based on concern for people. While they consider the “team Management” style of leadership to be ideal, they recognize that it may be difficult to implement in some work situations. Effective managers have great concern for both people and production. They work to motivate employees to reach their highest levels of accomplishment. They are flexible and responsive to change, and they understand the need to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Quadrant III</th>
<th>Quadrant II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consideration and Low initiating Structure</td>
<td>High Consideration and High Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Quadrant IV</th>
<th>Quadrant I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Consideration Low Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Low Consideration High Initiating Structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Low Initiating Structure | High |
Stogdill and Coons’ from Ohio State University (Stogdill, 1962) suggested that leaders exhibiting consideration and initiating structure behavior can be grouped into four quadrants. To briefly summarize, a Quadrant I leader is production-oriented and interested in getting the work done, and often forgets that he is dealing with human beings. The quadrant II leader is efficient and effective in managing both people and tasks. The Quadrant III leader maintains a friendly relationship with the subordinates and concerned about subordinate welfare, but is ineffective in getting things done. The Quadrant IV leader’s management is characterized by group chaos and effectiveness.

**Contingency Theory**

Fred Fiedler (1965), developed a contingency theory or situational theory of leadership. Fiedler postulates that three important situational dimensions are assumed to influence the leader’s effectiveness. They are:

- Leader-member relations, the degrees of confidence subordinates have in their leader. It also includes the loyalty shown to the leader and leader’s attractiveness.
- Task structure: the degree to which the followers’ jobs are routine as contrasted with non routine.
- Position power: the power inherent in the leadership position. It includes the rewards and punishments typically associated with the position, the leader’s formal authority (based on ranking in the managerial hierarchy), and the support that the leader receives from supervisors and the overall organization.
Path-Goal Theory

The path goal theory postulates that the most successful leaders are those who increase subordinate motivation by charting out and clarifying the paths to high performance. According to Robert House’s path-goal theory, effective leaders:

- Motivate their followers to achieve group and organizational goals.
- Make sure that they have control over outcomes their subordinates desire.
- Reward subordinates for performing at a high level or achieving their work goals by giving them desired outcomes.
- Raise their subordinates’ beliefs about their ability to achieve their work goals and perform at a high level. Take into account their subordinates’ characteristics and the type of work they do. John Storey in his study suggested that leadership is different in many ways from management.

A summary dichotomy: Manager versus Leaders (John Storey, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are transactional</td>
<td>They are transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek to operate in the current system</td>
<td>Create new visions and new Meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control &amp; Monitor</td>
<td>Empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade on exchange leaderships</td>
<td>Seek to inspire and transcend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a short-term focus</td>
<td>Have a long-term focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on detailed procedure</td>
<td>Focus on the strategic big picture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chartered Universities of Pakistan

Punjab University, New Campus, Lahore

University of Engg. & Technology, Lahore

University of Agriculture, Faisalabad

Quaid-e-Azam University, P.O.Box 1090, Islamabad

Allama Iqbal Open University, Sector H-8, Islamabad

Gomal University, D.I.Khan

B.Z.University, Multan, 60800.

Islamia University, Bahawalpur

International Islamic University, P.O. Box 1243, Islamabad

National College of Arts, 4 Shahrae Quaid-I-Azam, Lahore,


National University of Sciences & Technology, Tameez-ud-Din Road Lal Kurti, Old Defence College Building, Rawalpindi Cantt. Rawalpindi

University of Arid Agriculture, Murree Road, Rawalpindi

Government College, Lahore

Lahore School of Economics, 105-C-2, Gulberg III, Lahore

Lahore College for Women University, Lahore

Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi

Bahria University, Islamabad.

Pakistan Institute of Engineering & Applied Sciences, Islamabad

National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences, FAST House,
Rohtas Road, G-9/4, Islamabad

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Plot No. 30, Sector H-8, Islamabad.

Institute of Management Sciences, 23 E-III, Gulberg-III, Lahore

Imperial College of Business Studies, Zafar Ali Road, Lahore

National College of Business Administration & Economics, 40-E-1, Gulberg-III, Lahore

University of Central Punjab, 31-Main Gulberg, Lahore

University of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, Lahore

University of Education, Lahore

Virtual University (VU) 3rd floor Building # 1-2, Aiwan-e-Iqbal Complex, Egerton Road, Lahore

University of Health Sciences, Lahore

Hajvery University, 43/44-Industrial Area, Gulberg-III, Lahore

University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad

University of Lahore, Lahore 1-K.M., Thokar Niaz Baig, Lahore

Riphah International University, Islamabad

Foundation University, Islamabad

Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore

Air University, Islamabad

Federal Urdu University of Arts, Sciences and Technology, Islamabad

University of Sargodha, Sargodha

National Textile University, Faisalabad

Govt. College University, Faisalabad

Institute of South Asia, Lahore

University of Gujrat, Gujrat
The Gift University, Gujranwala
The University of Management & Technology, Lahore
The Superior College, Lahore
University of Agriculture, Faisalabad
Quaid-e-Azam University, P.O.Box 1090, Islamabad
Peshawar University, Peshawar
Pakistan Military Academy, Kakul, Abbottabad
Balochistan University, Sariab Road, Quetta
Mehran University of Engg.& Technology, Jamshoro
Azad Jammu & Kashmir University, Muzaffarabad, Azad Kashmir
NWFP Engg. University, P.O. Box 814, Peshawar
NWFP Agriculture University, P.O. Pak. Forest Institute Peshawar
Al-Khair University, Mirpur, Azad Kashmir
Balochistan University of Engg & Technology, Khuzdar
Quaid-I-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology, Nawabshah
Mohi-ud-Din Islamic University, Nerian Sharif (Trarkhal), AJK
The Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences, Jamshoro
University of Hazara (Functional in October, 2001)
City University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar
CECOS University of Information Technology & Emerging Sciences, Peshawar
Qurtaba University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar
Sarhad University of Science & Information Technology, No. 2, Sir Syed Road, Peshawar, Cantt
Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat
University of Malakand, Peshawar
Balochistan University of Information Technology & Management Sciences, Quetta
Karakurum International University, Gilgit
Institute of Management Science, Peshawar
Northern University, Nowshera
Gandhara University, Peshawar
Preston University, Kohat
Iqra University, Quetta
Sindh University, Jamshoro, Sindh
University of Karachi, University Road, Karachi 75270
Pakistan Naval Academy, Karachi
NED University of Engg. & Technology, Karachi 75270
Sindh Agriculture University, Tandojam, Sindh
Aga Khan University, Stadium Road, P.O. Box 3500, Karachi 74800
Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur, Sindh
Hamdard University, Madina-tal-Hikmat, Muhammad Bin Qasim Avenue, Karachi 74700
University of Engg. & Technology, Taxila
Ghulam Ishaq Khan Institute of Engineering Sciences & Technology, Topi, Distt. Swabi
Indus Valley School of Art & Architecture, Street, 33, Block-2, Scheme-5, Clifton, Karachi-75600
Institute of Business Administration, University Road, Karachi
Zia-ud-din Medical University, Block B, North Nazimabad Karachi
Sir Syed University of Engineering & Technology, University Road, Karachi-75300
Shaheed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science & Technology, 90-Clifton, Karachi
Baqai Medical University, 51 Deh Tar, Gadap Road, P.O. Box 2407, Karachi
Isra University, Halla Road P.O. Box 313, Hyderabad
Greenwich University, Karachi

Institute of Business Management, Korangi Creek, Karachi-75190

Jinnah University for Women, 5-C, Nazimabad Karachi 74600

Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi

Karachi Institute of Economics and Technology, PAF Base Korangi Creek, Karachi

Iqra University, Defence View, Shaheed-e-Millat Extension, P.O. Box 12240, Karachi-75500

Textile Institute of Pakistan, City Campus A-142, Sindhi Muslim Housing Society, Karachi 75400

Khadim Ali Shah Bokhari (KASB) Institute of Technology, 84-B, Sindhi Muslim Cooperative Housing Society, P.O. Box 10526, Karachi

Preston Institute of Management Science and Technology, Karachi

DHA Suffa University, Karachi

The Newport Institute of Communications and Economics, Karachi

Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education, Karachi

Institute of Business & Technology, Karachi

The Nazeer Hussain University, Karachi

Dow University of Health Sciences Karachi
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Private Universities in Pakistan

Aga Khan University [Karachi]
Baqai Medical University [Karachi]
CECOS University of Information Technology and Emerging Sciences [Peshawar]
City University of Science and Technology [Peshawar]
Dadabhoy Institute of Higher Education [Karachi]
DHA Suffa University [Karachi]
Foundation University [Islamabad]
Gandhara University [Peshawar]
Ghulam Ishaq Khan Institute of Engineering and Technology [Topi]
Gift University [Gujranwala]
Greenwich University [Karachi]
Hajvery University [Lahore]
Hamdard University [Karachi]
Imperial College of Business Studies [Lahore]
Indus Valley School of Arts and Architecture [Karachi]
Institute of Business and Technology [Karachi]
Institute of Business Management [Karachi]
Institute of Management Sciences [Lahore]
Institute of South Asia [Lahore]
Iqra University [Karachi]
Iqra University [Quetta]
Isra University [Hyderabad]
Jinnah University of Women [Karachi]
Karachi Institute Economics and Technology [Karachi]
Khadim Ali Shah Bukhari Institute of Technology [Karachi]
Lahore School of Economics [Lahore]
Lahore University of Management Sciences [Lahore]
Muhammad Ali Jinnah University [Karachi]
National College of Business Administration and Economics [Lahore]
National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences (FAST) [Islamabad]
Nazir Hussain University [Karachi]
Newport Institute of Communication and Economics [Karachi]
Northern University [Nowshera]
Preston Institute of Management and Technology [Karachi]
Preston University [Karachi]
Preston University [Kohat]
Qurtaba University of Science and Information Technology [D.I.Khan]
Riphah International University [Islamabad]
Sarhad University of Science and Information Technology [Peshawar]
Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology [Karachi]
Superior College [Lahore]
Shaheed Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto Institute of Science & Technology [Karachi]
Textile Institute of Pakistan [Karachi]
University of Central Punjab [Lahore]
University of Faisalabad [Faisalabad]
University of Lahore [Lahore]
University of Management and Technology [Lahore]
Zia ud Din Medical University [Karachi]
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Abbreviations used in the text

HEC (Higher Education Commission of Pakistan)
IBA (Institute of Business Administration)
LUMS (Lahore University of Management Sciences)
HEI (Higher Education Institutions)
IT (Information Technology)
AAUP (American Association of University Professors)
FAUP (Federal Association of University Professors)
MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire)
OCQ (Organizational Commitment Questionnaire)
EOC (Employees Organizational Commitment)
OC (Organizational Commitment)
JS (Job Satisfaction)
PDM (Participatory Decision Making)
ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)
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Other Researcher’s Results and Explanations

As discussed in chapter 3, job satisfaction and organizational commitment appear to be related to one another. A comparison of the antecedents, correlates, and predictors of the Kinicki (2002), Meta analysis of the Job Description Indexes (JDI) and the Meta analysis of the organizational commitment by Methew and Zajac (1990) showed a strong relationship between the two concepts. Kinicki (2002) found moderately positive correlations between organizational commitment and the five job satisfaction facets of the JDI (pay, r = 0.29, promotion, r = .35, coworkers, r = .34, work itself, r = .50 and supervision, r = .35). Methew and Zajac (1990) found a significant correlation of .53 between the two variables. Neither of these studies specified a causal direction between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, Kacmar, Carlson, and Brymer (1990) found a positive significant coefficient of 0.63 for the effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. (as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire).

A number of studies have looked more closely at this relationship, to determine the causal order of the two constructs. The results of these studies appear to be mixed between no support for the specific causal relationship, and between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and that it is predicted by job satisfaction (Yoon and Thye, 2002). In a longitudinal study of professional employees at a British engineering company that spanned 13 months (n = 295), Cramer (1996) found no temporal causal relationship between job satisfaction at time and organizational commitment at time two. When both variables were measured at the same point time (for example the
relationship between the job satisfaction at time one and organizational commitment at time one), there was significant positive correlation between the two variables (r = .35, p< .001). This suggests that while there is a causal relationship between the two variables, organizational commitment is a product of an employee’s present job appraisal and not based on past appraisal.

Martin and Bennett (1996) tested three possible models of the relationship between the job satisfaction and organizational commitment using multiple regressions; job satisfaction is antecedent to organizational commitment, organizational commitment is antecedent to job satisfaction and there is a reciprocal relationship between the two variables. Data were collected from financial services companies (n = 1, 337) organizational commitment was measured using items from scales identification and internalization; satisfaction was measured as four factors: satisfaction with pay, appraisal, benefits, and work conditions. Procedural and distributive gestures were also measured and controlled for in the regression analysis. The results showed no support for a causal model between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, suggesting that they are independent constructs. However, the variables were significantly correlated with one another (r = .31, .23, .30, and .40 for pay, appraisal, benefits and work conditions respectively). This would suggest that there is in fact a relationship. The authors suggest that it is really procedural and distributive justice that has the direct relationship with commitment and that many previous studies have included measure of this construct in their measure of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Still, the significant correlations between the two constructs from this study would suggest they are not independent from one another.
Yoon and Thye (2002) tested a more comprehensive model of organizational commitment in the model, job satisfaction and organizational support (defined in this research as the employees believes that organization values their contributions and is concerned about their well-being) mediated the relationship between the exogenous variables (job characteristics, organizational related variables, and controls and covariates) and organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ).

Both job satisfaction and organizational support had a direct effect on organizational commitment. To validate the model, data was collected from 2 large organizations in Korea (n = 2,443). Analyses were done via structural equation modeling. Results showed support for the model 87% of the impact exogenous variables on organizational commitment was mediated through job satisfaction and 36% was mediated through organizational support. Overall, the model explained 51% of the variance in organizational commitment.

Results in this study were not unusual when task-oriented behavior showed more significant. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) suggested that leaders need to display more relation-oriented behavior in some instances and more task-oriented behavior for other situations. Results from a number of studies Bass & Avolio, 1997) indicate that transactional leadership provides a basis of effective leadership. However, greater effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction can be achieved through transformational methods.