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EVALUATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN TAIWANESE BANKING INDUSTRY

By Chien-hong Chu

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors and employees’ organizational commitment. According to some of the literature reviewed, transformational leadership includes four factors: (a) charismatic leadership (or idealized influence), (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration (Bass 1985). Organizational commitment contains three factors: (a) a strong belief in acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership (Mowday, Steer, & Porter, 1979).

This study used quantitative, non-experimental, correlation, and explanatory research design. The three parts of a questionnaire administered to study participants were (a) socio-demographic profile, (b) transformational leadership dimension of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1995), and (c) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ; Mowday et al., 1979).

The target population of this study included all employees who work for Taiwan’s domestic banks (47 domestic banks with 133,139 employees in Taiwan). After stratified random sampling, a total of 12 of Taiwan’s domestic banks were selected, and a total of 1,000 questionnaires were distributed to their employees. A total of 408 bank employees participated in this study.
The t-test, one-way ANOVA, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation, MANOVA, and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze the data collected in this study. The results of this study revealed that there were significant relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment, and between demographic variables (age, marital status, and years of employment) and organizational commitment. The findings suggest that leaders who demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors will enhance their followers' organizational commitment. In addition, older, married, and long-term employees may have a higher level of organizational commitment. Recommendations for future research are also discussed.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction and Background

The business environment has changed dramatically in recent years. Organizations are fighting to survive or to remain profitable in the face of accelerated change. Rapid changes in organizational environment have heightened the need for effective leaders and committed employees. The manner leaders handle change has a critical impact on the success of their organizations (Manion, 1998).

Kouzes and Posner (1995) indicated that “Leadership is a relationship, founded on trust and confidence. Without trust and confidence, people don’t take risks” (p. 12), “Leaders cannot command commitment, only inspire it” (p. 11), “Leaders breathe life into the hopes and dreams of others and enable them to see the exciting possibilities that the future holds” (p. 11), and “People must believe that leaders understand their needs and have their interest at heart” (p. 11). If people feel valued and cared for, they are motivated and committed; when people are committed, they are more productive and caring (Mui, 2003). A leader’s ability to demonstrate an effective leadership style that fosters employee organizational commitment enhances the competitive advantage of the organization (McGuire, 2003).

Since the early 1990s, Taiwan’s financial institutions have been facing severe challenges due to drastic changes in the financial environment. The Taiwanese government permitted the establishment of private banks in 1991. Fifteen private banks were established, making a total of 32 domestic banks in 1992. There were 47 domestic
banks with 3,202 branch offices in 2004. Too many banks established caused rigorous competition that led to deterioration in profitability and quality. Moreover, after joining the World Trade Organization (WTO), Taiwan’s banks faced competition not only domestically but also internationally. Taiwan’s economic growth attracted a number of international banks to establish banks or branch offices. Under domestic and international competition, severe problems emerged that forced the Taiwanese government to reform the financial industry. A number of financial laws were enacted or amended in Taiwan in 2000, such as Financial Institutions Merger Law, Financial Holding Company Law, the Banking Law, the Law Governing Bills Finance Business, Deposit Insurance Act, and Trust Enterprise Act, etc. The financial reform focused on helping financial institutions become stronger by expansion, universal banking, and globalization. The evolution created a completely different platform for financial institutions (The Bankers Association of The Republic of China, 2005).

The changing financial environment fostered the need for transformational leaders and committed employees of Taiwan’s domestic banks to enhance their competitiveness. Is there a relationship between leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors and employees’ organizational commitment? Will leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors enhance employees’ organizational commitment? If the answers to these questions show that transformational leadership and organizational commitment are correlated, and transformational leadership will enhance organizational commitment, the research will help the banking industry to make improvements. However, none of the literature was found to measure the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in the banking industry in Taiwan.
Purpose

The areas of transformational leadership and employee organizational commitment have been identified as important issues. However, transformational leadership theories and organizational commitment theories were developed according to Western culture and values. To make the theories more global in their approach, researchers should consider Asian culture and values in expanding their theoretical formulations. Moreover, scholarly research to test transformational leadership framework and organizational commitment framework, and to examine the relationship between these two variables is needed in the Asian environment.

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors and employees’ organizational commitment. Specifically, the purposes are:

1. To determine whether there are significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration).
2. To determine whether there are significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).
3. To determine whether there are significant relationships between transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and organizational commitment.
4. To determine whether there are significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).

5. To determine whether transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment) are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment.

Definitions of Terms

Independent Variable (Transformational Leadership)

Theoretical Definition

Transformational leadership is a style of leadership characterized by Charismatic Leadership (or Idealized Influence, CL or II), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC) (Bass, 1998).

Operational Definition

This study assessed transformational leadership through the five factors (20 items) of transformational leadership of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass (1995). The five factors include (a) idealized influence - attributed, (b) idealized influence - behavioral, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration.
Independent Variable (Demographic Profile)

Theoretical Definition

A demographic profile includes personal particular background information concerning race, gender, marital status, age, education, social background, years of employment, etc.

Operational Definition

This study measured personal information through five items of a Socio-Demographic Profile designed by the researcher. The five items are (a) gender, (b) age, (c) education, (d) marital status, and (e) years of employment.

Dependent Variable (Organizational Commitment)

Theoretical Definition

Organizational commitment is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979, p. 226).

Operational Definition

This study evaluated organizational commitment through the three factors (15 items) of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday et al. (1979). The three factors are “(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 226).
Justification

The topic of the influence of transformational leadership on employee organizational commitment is of global interest, especially for organizations undergoing change as a result of internal and/or external dynamics. Fast-paced changes in technology, economics, and societies have pressured organizations to respond quickly (Wegner, 2004). To survive, organizations need both dynamic leaders and committed followers; therefore, there is an ongoing need for research on leadership, organizational commitment, and the influence of a leader’s style on followers’ levels of commitment.

The theories of transformational leadership and organizational commitment are still developing, and there is a lack of research testing transformational leadership and organizational commitment in Taiwan. The results of this study could contribute to the understanding of transformational leadership and organizational commitment and may help fill the gap of empirical research in Taiwan, while globalizing existing literature about transformational leadership and organizational commitment theories. If there is a positive correlation between transformational leadership and organizational commitment, the result could help organizations build their strengths and overcome their weaknesses in leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors and employees’ organizational commitment.

Delimitations and Scope

This study focused on investigating the relationship between leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors and employees’ organizational commitment. The variables were transformational leadership and organizational commitment. Related
variables such as organizational culture, job satisfaction, turnover, and performance were not included because of time and manpower constraints.

The measurements included the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1995) for transformational leadership and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ; Mowday et al., 1979) for organizational commitment. To conduct this study in Taiwan, the Chinese version of the MLQ and the OCQ were administered. The researcher used the MLQ to measure transformational leadership and the OCQ to measure organizational commitment because they were reliable, valid, and the most widely used measurements. In addition, none of the literature found by this study used these two measurements together in the Taiwanese banking industry. Therefore, other questionnaires such as the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) for transformational leadership, and the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales for organizational commitment were not chosen for this study.

Participants were employees of Taiwan’s domestic banks. There were 47 domestic banks with 133,169 employees in Taiwan. A total of 12 domestic banks with 1,000 employees from four major departments (Deposit, Lending and Investment, Foreign Exchange, and Consumer Financing) of each bank were chosen to participate. Employees of foreign banks and employees of other industries were excluded because this study focuses on domestic banks.

Chapter I provided an overview of this study. It included introduction and background, purpose, definitions of terms, justification, and delimitations and scope. Chapter II presents an in-depth review of transformational leadership and organizational commitment.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Review of Literature

Leadership

Leadership is a sophisticated concept and the word “leadership” did not appear until the year 1800 (Stogdill, 1974). Since then, “about 40,000 research articles, magazine articles, and books have been written about leadership. As a consequence, leadership has been defined in many ways” (Dubrin, 2004, p. 3). There are more than 350 definitions of leadership (Bennis, 1985), and there is no universal definition of leadership because leadership is complex and studied in different ways that require different definitions (Lussier & Achua, 2001). Definitions of leadership include “the lifting of a man’s vision to higher sights, the raising of a man’s performance to a higher standard, the building of a man’s personality beyond its normal limitations” (Drucker, 1954, p. 159); “the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically toward the achievement of group goals” (Koontz, O’Donnell, & Wehrich, 1986, p. 397); “the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation” (Hersy & Blanchard, 1996, p. 91); “the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goals” (Robbins, 2003, p. 130); “the influencing process of leaders and followers to achieve organizational objectives through change” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p.130); “the relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p.
Bass (1990) summarized leadership studies and noted that leadership has been viewed as “a focus of group processes, personality and its effects, the art of inducing compliance, the exercise of influence, an act or a behavior, a form of persuasion, a power relation, an instrument of goal achievement, an emerging effect of interaction, a differentiated role, the initiation of structure, and a combination of elements” (pp. 11-18). It is important to distinguish leadership from management in order to understand leadership. According to Bennis (1989), leading is about focusing on people, doing the right things, inspiring trust, challenging status quo, and being innovative; whereas management is about focusing on systems and structure, doing things right, relying on control, accepting status quo, and carry out administrative tasks. According to Dubrin (2004), the standard concept of management includes leading (or directing), planning, organizing, and controlling, and leading is one of the major components of management. Generally speaking, “leadership deals with the interpersonal aspects of a manager’s job, whereas planning, organizing, and controlling deal with the administrative aspects” (p. 4), and “leadership is said to deal with change, inspiration, motivation, and influence. In contrast, management deals more with maintaining equilibrium and the status quo” (p. 4).

A leadership theory is “an explanation of some aspect of leadership; theories have practical value because they are used to better understand, predict, and control successful leadership” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 16). In the following section, trait theory, behavior theory, contingency theory, and transformational leadership theory are
explained and their evolution is explored. These theories are among the most prevalent and widely accepted leadership theories today.

**Trait Theory**

Early leadership studies focused on the notion that “leaders are born, not made” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 16), and trait studies were conducted to explore a list of leaders’ qualities. Trait theories are “to explain distinctive characteristics accounting for leadership effectiveness” (p. 16). Stogdill (1974) investigated more than 160 trait studies conducted in 1948 and 1970 to identify leaders’ traits. Bass (1990) classified the significant traits of leaders into the categories of physical characteristics, social background, personalities, intelligence and ability, personality, task-related characteristics, and social characteristics. Lussier and Achua (2001) noted that traits of leaders included “dominance, high energy, self-confidence, internal locus of control, stability, integrity, intelligence, flexibility, and sensitivity to others” (p. 47).

Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996) categorized traits of leaders into: management of attention, management of meaning, management of trust, and management of self (p. 102). Management of attentions means “the ability to communicate a sense of outcome, goal, or direction that attracts followers” (p. 102); management of meanings refers to “the ability to create and communicate meaning with clarity and understanding” (p. 102); management of trust is “the ability to be reliable and consistent” (p. 102); and management of self shows “the ability to know one’s self and to use one’s skills within the limits of one’s strengths and weakness” (p. 102).

Dubrin (2004) divided leaders’ traits into two categories: general personality traits and task-related personality traits. General personality traits of leaders included “(1) self-
confidence, (2) humility, (3) trustworthiness, (4) extroversion, (5) assertiveness, (6) emotional stability, (7) enthusiasm, (8) sense of humor, (9) warmth, and (10) high tolerance for frustration” (p. 57), while leaders’ task-related personality traits were “(1) passion for the work and people, (2) emotional intelligence, (3) flexibility and adaptability, (4) internal locus of control, and (5) courage” (p. 57).

Trait theory contributes to leadership research by distinguishing effective leaders from ineffective leaders through their characteristics and by providing some guidance. However, there are some weaknesses of trait theory. According to Higgins (1991), the traits found are not universally accepted traits for all situations. Moreover, according to Robbin (2001), trait theory ignores situational factors.

Behavior Theory

None of the trait studies during the 1930s and 1940s developed “a universal list of traits that all successful leaders possess, or traits that will guarantee leadership success” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 16). Therefore, by the 1950s, most leadership researchers changed their focus from trait theory to behavior theory. Behavior theories were developed “to explain distinctive styles used by effective leaders” (p. 16). According to behavior theory, the definition of an effective leader is “one who helps group members attain productivity, quality, and satisfaction” (Dubrin, 2004, p. 95).

In the 1930s, studies conducted by Kurt Lewin at Iowa State University identified the autocratic leadership style and the democratic leadership style. One of the researcher’s major findings was that, under an autocratic leadership style, followers performed well when their leaders supervised them; however, under democratic
leadership style, followers performed well even when their leaders were absent (as cited in Daft, 1999).

During the mid-1940s to the mid-1950s, Ohio State University and the University of Michigan and conducted leadership research simultaneously. Under the direction of Rensis Likert, the University of Michigan identified two leadership styles: job-centered style and employee-centered style. In the job-centered leadership style, the leader concentrates on getting the job done, while in the employee-centered leadership style, the leader concentrates on meeting the needs of followers (as cited in Lussier & Achua, 2001).

Under the direction of Ralph Stogdill, researchers at Ohio State University identified 1,800 specific leadership behaviors that were narrowed down to 150 questionnaire items. Two particular leadership dimensions that accounted for 85 percent of the leadership behaviors described in the research were initiation structure behavior and consideration behavior; initiation structure leadership behavior refers to assigning specific tasks, indicating specific procedures to be followed, scheduling work, and stating expectations for team members; and consideration leadership behavior means “creating an environment of emotional support (as cited in Dubrin, 2004).

Research into behavior theory continued throughout the mid-1950s. After that period, “Robert Blake and Jane Mouton developed the Managerial Grid and published it in 1964, updated it in 1978 and 1985, and in 1991 it became the Leadership Grid with Anne Adams McCanse replacing Mouton” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 74). Lussier and Achua (2001) reported that in Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid, leaders’ styles varied from the combinations of 1 to 9 in their concern for production (the horizontal
axis) and 1 to 9 in their concern for people (the vertical axis). These two concerns interacted with one another in the grid. Five leadership styles were identified: impoverished style, country-club style, authority-compliance style, middle-of-the-road style, and team style. The impoverished style (1, 1) shows “low concern for both production and people” (p. 75). Such a leader does only the minimum required in his/her leadership position. The country-club style (1, 9) represents “a high concern for people and a low concern for production” (p. 75). A leader with this style endeavors to maintain a friendly relationship but ignore production. The authority-compliance style (9, 1) demonstrates “a high concern for production and a low concern for people” (p. 75). Such a leader concentrates on maximizing production by using authority and treats people like machines. The middle-of-the-road style (5, 5) represents “balanced, medium concern for both production and people” (p. 75). Leaders with this style attempt to maintain satisfactory employee morale and performance. The team style (9, 9) means “a high concern for both production and people” (p. 75). A leader with this style seeks to reach maximum results through participation, involvement, and commitment.

Behavior theory adds to the understanding of leadership by exploring leaders’ leadership styles. As Higgins (1991) noted, compared to trait theory, which focuses on what leaders are like, behavioral theory concentrates on what leaders do. According to Robbins (2003), “if behavioral studies were to turn up critical behavioral determinants of leadership, we could train people to be leaders” (p. 132), there is an implication that effective leaders can be trained.
Contingency Theories

Trait theory and behavior theory attempted to find the best leadership style for all situations, but in the late 1960s, it was viewed that no single best leadership style would fit in all situations. Therefore, there was a shift toward research into what is called contingency theory, which was developed to define the appropriate leadership styles to suit the leaders, followers, and situations (Lussier & Achua, 2001). Fiedler’s Contingency Theory, House’s Path-Goal Theory, and Hersey-Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory are major contingency theories developed since the mid-1960s.

Fiedler’s contingency theory. Fiedler (1967) introduced the first contingency leadership theory that identified the interaction between situation variables and leaders’ behaviors. Fiedler’s contingency theory was used to define a particular person’s leadership style as either task-oriented or relationship-oriented and to determine whether the situation is appropriate to the leader’s style to ensure optimal performance. Fiedler (1984) noted that the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Scale was used to measure leaders’ behavior as being relation-motivated or task-motivated, and leader-member relation, task structure, and position power were used to determine the leader’s control of the situations. Leader-member relation is “the degree to which the group supports the leader” (p. 46); task structure involves “the degree to which the task clearly spells goals, procedures, and specific guidelines” (p. 46); position power means “the degree to which the position gives the leader authority to reward and punish subordinates” (p. 46). A leader has strong control if (a) his or her subordinates support him or her, (b) a set of specifications are available to subordinates, and (c) he or she can discipline his or her subordinates.
**House’s path-goal theory.** After Fiedler’s contingency theory, Robert House (1971) developed the path-goal theory. House’s path-goal theory was developed to select the appropriate leadership style for the situation (subordinate and environment) to ensure followers’ performance and job satisfaction.

Higgins (1991) noted that House’s path-goal theory included four leadership styles (directive, supportive, achievement-oriented, and participative), two contingency variables (subordinate characteristics and the nature of the task), and leadership styles selected according to situations. Directive leaders provide specific guidance to followers; supportive leaders are sensitive to the needs of their followers; achievement-oriented leaders set challenging goals for followers to achieve; and participative leaders consult with followers before making decisions. Subordinate characteristics include the ability and perceived control of destiny. The nature of the task includes routine and ambiguous. Directive leadership is proper when subordinates have a low level of training and the tasks are ambiguous. Supportive leadership is appropriate when subordinates have the ability to do the job and the tasks are routine. Achievement-oriented leadership is suitable when subordinates have a high level of skills and the tasks are innovative. Participative leadership is appropriate when subordinates have medium levels of experience and the tasks have medium levels of ambiguity.

**Hersey-Blanchard’s situational leadership theory.** After House’s path-goal theory, Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard (1988) developed the situational leadership model in 1977, in which they described how leaders match leadership style to the readiness of the group members. Readiness was defined as “the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task” (p. 174); levels of
readiness identified were low readiness (R1), low to moderate readiness (R2), moderate to high readiness (R3), and high readiness (R4). According to situational leadership, leadership styles are telling (S1), selling (S2), participating (S3), and delegating (S4); and leaders’ behaviors are task behavior and relationship behavior. Task behavior was “the extent to which the leader engages in spelling out the duties and responsibilities of an individual or group” (p. 172), and relationship behavior was “the extent to which the leader engages in two-way or multi-way communication” (p. 172).

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), in the low readiness state (R1), followers are unable and unwilling to follow a leader’s direction; therefore, an effective leader should focus on a telling (S1) style (high task/low relationship behavior). A telling style involves providing specific instructions and closely supervising members. In low to moderate readiness (R2), followers are unable but willing to follow a leader’s direction; in such situations, the leader should emphasize a selling (S2) style (high task/high relationship behavior). A selling style involves explaining decisions and providing opportunities for clarification. In moderate-to-high readiness (R3), followers are able but unwilling to follow a leader’s direction; in these circumstances, the leader should use a participating (S3) style (high relationship/low task behavior). A participating style involves sharing ideas and assisting in making decisions. Finally, in high readiness (R4), followers are able and willing to follow a leader’s direction; therefore, the leader should demonstrate a delegating (S4) style (low relationship/low task behavior). In a delegating style, a leader turns over responsibility for decisions and implementation to the members.

Although contingency theory contributed to the overall development of leadership theory as with previous models, there were some disadvantages of the theory. As noted
by Daft (1999), Fiedler’s Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Scale to assess leaders’ behavior was criticized as too simplistic by some observers, and it was unclear if the model works over time. Robbin (2001) noted that compared to other leadership theories, leaders in House’s path-goal theory were assumed to be flexible and able to demonstrate any or all leadership behaviors, depending on different situations. Dubrin (2004) observed that in Hersey-Blanchard’s situational leadership theory, “the prescriptions for leadership will work only some of the time. For example, many supervisors use a telling style with unable and unwilling or insecure team members and still achieve poor results” (p. 148).

**Transformational Leadership**

In the 1980s, Asia and Europe rose in economic power, influencing the global economy and drawing the attention of researchers toward world competition (Conger, 1999). Increasing global competition led to a wave of business downsizing and reorganizations; therefore, corporations were demanding “ever greater performance and commitment” (p. 147). As a result, most leadership researchers in the late 1970s changed their focus to research explaining how leaders positively transform their organizations to succeed in the face of ongoing competition, that is, transformational leadership theory (Conger, 1999).

**Transformational Leadership Theories**

The evolution of transformational leadership theory dates back to the late 1970s. House (1977) developed the theory of charismatic leadership, a component of Burn’s (1978) and Bass’s (1985) transformational leadership theory, based on Weber’s (1947)
work on charismatic leaders. *Charisma* means divinely inspired gift in Greek (Dubrin, 2004). Lussier & Achua (2001) noted that charismatic leaders possess exceptional qualities, emerge during a great social crisis, and inspire and motivate people to act. Charismatic leaders are characterized as “(a) visionary (b) superb communication skills (c) self-confidence and moral conviction (d) ability to inspire trust (e) high risk orientation (f) high energy and action orientation (g) relational power base (h) minimum of internal conflict (i) empowering ability (j) self-promoting personalities” (p. 376).

There are dark sides of charismatic leadership. According to Durbin (2004), the dark sides of charismatic leadership are that “charismatic leadership can be exercised for evil purpose” (p. 86), “some charismatic leaders are unethical and lead their organizations toward illegal and immoral ends” (p. 86), and “some charismatic leaders neglect their social responsibility” (p. 87).

The concept of transformational leadership was first introduced by Burns (1978) together with transactional leadership, in his Pulitzer-Prize-winning book *Leadership* portraying political leaders. Burns (1978) developed transformational leadership theory upon the following previously accepted theories: (a) Weber’s concept on charismatic leadership; (b) Rokeach’s notion of values; (c) Maslow’s constructs of needs; and (d) Kohlberg’s platform of moral development. Transactional leadership occurs “when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (p. 19), whereas transformational leadership occurs “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivations and morality” (p. 20).
Bass (1985, 1998) expanded Burns' (1978) theory to include transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and transformational leadership, and to apply these leadership styles to industrial and military contexts. According to Bass (1985, 1998), dimensions of transactional leadership consisted of contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception active (MBE-A), and management-by-exception passive (MBE-P); dimension of laissez-faire leadership contained laissez-faire (LF) only; and dimensions of transformational leadership included charismatic leadership (or idealized influence, CL or II), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individualized consideration (IC).

Transactional leaders seek “to maintain stability rather than promoting change within an organization through regular economic and social exchanges that achieve specific goals for both the leaders and their followers” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 383). Transactional leadership “occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower depending on the adequacy of the follower’s performance” (Bass, 1998, p. 6). The strategies of transactional leadership are: contingent reward (CR), management-by-exception active (MBE-A), and management-by-exception passive (MBE-P) (Bass, 1985, 1998). According to Bass, contingent reward means leaders assign what needs to be done and reward followers in exchange for satisfactorily achieving their assignments; management-by-exception active means leaders actively monitor followers and take corrective actions if needed; and management-by-exception passive means leaders wait passively and involve themselves in situations only when there are problems.

There are differences between transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership is transitory, whereas transformational leadership is
more enduring; transactional leaders demonstrate stability and seek to satisfy followers’ needs by exchange, while transformational leaders create change and inspire followers to go beyond their own self-interest for the good of their organizations (Lussier & Achu, 2001).

Laissez-faire is defined as “noninterference in the affairs of others” (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2000). Laissez-faire leaders “delay and appear indifferent to what is happening. They avoid taking stands on issues, do not emphasize results, refrain from intervening, and fail to perform follow-up” (Bass, 1998, p. 148). According to much of the research on style, laissez-faire leadership is “the avoidance or absence of leadership and is, by definition, the most inactive, as well as most ineffective according to almost all research on the style” (p. 7).

Transformational leadership serves “to change the status quo by articulating to followers the problems in the current system and a compelling vision of what a new organization could be” (Lussier & Achua, 2001, p. 382). Transformational leaders raise followers to higher levels of values and motivation (Burns, 1978), and motivate followers to achieve more than expected (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders can “move followers to exceed expected performance” (p. 2). The factors of Bass’ (1985, 1998) transformational leadership include charismatic leadership (or idealized influence, CL or II), inspirational motivation (IM), intellectual stimulation (IS), and individualized consideration (IC). According to Bass (1985, 1998), charismatic leadership (or idealized influence) means leaders have the competency to exert influence by serving as role models and to demonstrate high standard of ethics and morals; inspirational motivation refers to leaders have the ability to create an attractive vision that offers challenge and
addresses followers’ higher needs; intellectual stimulation means that leaders question assumptions, reframe problems, and challenge old situations to stimulate followers’ efforts; and individualized consideration refers to the fact that leaders consider each follower’s needs by acting as coaches or mentors (Bass, 1998). Table 2-1 lists factors and meanings of Bass’s transformational leadership theory.

Table 2-1

| Factors and Meanings of Bass’s (1985, 1998) Transformational Leadership Theory |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Factors                          | Meanings                         |
| 1. Charismatic Leadership (Idealized Influence) | Leaders have the competency to exert influence by serving as role models and to demonstrate a high standard of ethics and morals. |
| 2. Inspirational motivation      | Leaders have the ability to create an attractive vision that offers challenge and addresses followers’ higher needs. |
| 3. Intellectual stimulation      | Leaders question assumptions, reframe problems, and challenge old situations to stimulate followers’ efforts. |
| 4. Individualized consideration  | Leaders consider each follower’s needs by acting as coaches or mentors. |

Kouzes and Posner (1995, 1997a, 2002) viewed transformational leadership in terms of five leadership practices – model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. Each practice contains two...
commitments of leadership serving as a basic guide for learning to lead. The first practice, *model the way*, comes with commitment one, “find your voice by clarifying your personal values” (p. 22), as well as commitment two, “set the example by aligning actions with shared values” (p. 22). The second practice, *inspire a shared vision*, comes with commitment three, “envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities” (p. 22), as well as commitment four, “enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations” (p. 22). The third practice, *challenge the process*, comes with commitment five, “search for opportunities by seeking innovative ways to change, grow, and improve” (p. 22), as well as commitment six, “experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from mistakes” (p. 22). The fourth practice, *enable others to act*, comes with commitment seven, “foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust” (p. 22), as well as commitment eight, “strengthen others by sharing power and discretion” (p. 22). The fifth practice, *encourage the heart*, comes with commitment nine, “recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence” (p. 22), as well as commitment ten, “celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community” (p. 22).

The works of Bass (1985, 1998) and Kouzes and Posner (1995, 1997a, 2002) are socially significant, and they address essential issues in the discipline of transformational leadership. These authors offer well-developed theories of transformational leadership, and their claims feature well-developed propositions that have strong empirical support. The theories feature a productive balance between simplicity and complexity that contribute to their usefulness. Empirical studies of transformational leadership are presented in the following section.
Empirical Studies

Arnold, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) investigated the differential impacts of transformational leadership and the iron cage on trust, commitment and team efficacy. Iron cage is a control system based on behavioral norms and rules. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 177 Executive MBA students attending Canadian business school completed surveys, resulting in a response rate of 44%. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for teams developed by Bass and Avolio was used to measure transformational leadership. The items obtained from Barker’s description of the iron cage system were used to assess the iron cage. The items adapted from Jarvenpaa, Tractinsky, and Vitale’s questionnaire were used to measure trust. The items adapted from Ellemers, de Gilder, and Van den Heuvel’s questionnaire were used to assess commitment. Scales developed by this study were used to measure team efficacy.

Hierarchical regression analyses indicated that transformational leadership significantly improved the predictions of trust, commitment and team efficacy. Iron cage did not add to the prediction of trust or team efficacy, but significantly added to the prediction of commitment. These findings suggest that leaders who focus on transformational leadership will be more effective in developing trust, commitment and team efficacy. The iron cage style will only lead to increased commitment. The strength of the study is in testing the hypothesis that a team could experience trust, commitment, and team efficacy through transformational leadership. The limitations of the study are: (a) the scales assessing team efficacy and iron cage are new and require extensive validation, and (b) the use of student sample limits the generalizability.
In 2003, a study by Kamencik was designed to examine leaders’ transformational leadership behaviors perceived by themselves and their followers, the relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes, and organizational commitment as an intervening variable of transformational leadership and outcomes. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. Participants were chief executives and the mid-level managers who reported to them at a Tennessee acute care hospital. A total of 60 hospitals responded to the surveys, resulting in a response rate of 48%. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio was used to measure transformational leadership, and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al. was used to assess organizational commitment. Data collection procedures were clearly described, and the Institutional Review Board approved the study.

Correlation and regression were used to analyze the data. The results indicated that (a) transformational leadership was demonstrated very often by leaders as perceived by both leaders and followers, (b) a positive relationship was found between transformational leadership and outcomes, and transformational leadership was a significant predictor of outcomes such as job satisfaction, extra effort, and leadership effectiveness, and (c) transformational leadership was a significant predictor of organizational commitment and outcomes. The findings of this study suggest that followers have high levels of job satisfaction, work effort, and commitment, when they perceive their leaders demonstrate transformational leadership styles.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it provided support for hypothesized relationships between transformational leadership and outcomes, (b) the reliability and
validity of the measurements resulted in a high level of data quality, and (c) data collection and data analysis were clearly described, allowing replication. Limitations of the study are: (a) a cross-sectional design, (b) a single method of data collection, (c) the generalizability, (d) a convenience sample, (e) a self-report survey, and (f) a lack of qualitative information. Future studies suggested include (a) using another method to conceptualize and measure commitment, (b) replicating the study in other settings, (c) using an experimental design, (d) focusing on unit effectiveness as an outcome variable, (e) using more objective measures of performance, and (f) using qualitative methods to conduct a study.

A 2003 study by Mandell and Pherwani examined the predictive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership, and investigated whether there were any gender differences in the relationship. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. Thirty-two female and male managers or supervisors of mid-sized to large organizations in the northeastern section of the United States completed questionnaires. The Emotional Quotient Inventory developed by Bar-On was used to measure emotional intelligence, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio was used to assess transformational leadership.

Hierarchical regression analyses showed there was a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. The results of the analyses also revealed that there was no difference in the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style for females and males. The findings
suggest that there is a predictive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership.

Independent *t* tests showed there was a significant difference in emotional intelligence of females and males, but there was no significant difference in transformational leadership of females and males. The study’s findings further suggest that females may be better at managing their emotions as compared to males, but as far as leadership goes, females are as transformational in their leadership as males.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it tested the hypothesized relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, and (b) the reliability and validity of the measurement resulted in a high level of data quality. The limitations of the study are: (a) the MLQ leadership form consisted of three different leadership styles; therefore, a participant could score high in other leadership styles but not the transformational leadership style, and (b) the data collected was self-reported. Suggested future research included collecting subordinate report data, examining a larger sample of leaders, and adding variables such as cultural background, age, and years of experience, and work settings for future analysis.

In their study, Felfe and Schyns (2004) examined the relationship between perceived similarity between subordinates and supervisors in transformational leadership and leadership specific outcomes, such as efficiency, extra effort, and satisfaction with the leader. They also examined organizational outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior, commitment, achievement orientation, overall satisfaction, stress, and irritability. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling
plan were used. A total of 213 administrative officers in two public organizations completed surveys.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio was used to measure transformational leadership. The outcome scales of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire were used to assess leadership specific outcomes. The multiple facets of commitment designed by Felf, Six, and Schmook were used to measure commitment. A Kunin scale developed by Kunin was used to assess overall satisfaction, and an instrument designed by Six, Felfe, Schmook, and Knorz was used to measure organizational citizenship behavior. A short scale developed by Felf, Resetka and Liemann was used to assess achievement orientation. An instrument developed by Flefe, Resktka, and Liepment was used to measure stress and irritability.

Correlation analyses indicated that there was a positive relationship between similarity to transformational leadership and leadership specific outcomes such as extra effort, efficiency, and satisfaction with leader efficiency. The findings suggest that similarity did not significantly correlate with organizational outcomes such as commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, overall satisfaction, and achievement orientation, and negatively correlated to organizational outcomes such as stress and irritability. These findings suggest that when supervisors perceive a similarity between themselves and their leaders, they consider their leaders to be more successful. The strength of the study is that it provided support for hypothesized relationships between perceived similarity in transformational leadership behavior and organizational outcomes. Future areas for suggested research are using objective measures of performance and
using the ratings of peers or customers, using a larger sample, and using a sample of higher-level superiors in relation to subordinates.

Finally, Bell-Roundtree (2004) conducted a study to provide support that job satisfaction and organizational commitment increased when leaders demonstrated the type of transformational leadership identified by Kouzes and Posner. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 190 army employees and contractors in Huntsville, Alabama completed the questionnaires. The researcher used the Leadership Practice Inventory developed by Kouzes and Posner to measure transformational leadership, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss et al. to assess job satisfaction, and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al. to measure organizational commitment. Data collection procedures were clearly described, and the Institutional Review Board approved the study.

Regression analyses of the study’s data indicated that transformational leadership was positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study’s findings suggest that leaders who practice transformational leadership will experience positive outcomes in terms of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

The primary strengths of the study are its validation of Kouzes and Posner’s transformational leadership theory, the reliability and validity of its measures, the soundness of its data analysis, and its clearly defined procedures. Areas for future study include examining first line managers’ satisfaction and commitment, measuring leadership effectiveness, using a longitudinal study, and utilizing Meyer and Allen’s Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales to measure organizational commitment.
Organizational Commitment

Becker (1960) first introduced organizational commitment as “when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interest with a consistent line of activity” (p. 32). Sheldon (1971) described organizational commitment as “an attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization” (p. 143). Buchanan (1974) viewed organizational commitment as “a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one’s role in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth” (p. 533). Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) further defined organizational commitment as “(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (p. 226). Wiener (1982) viewed organizational commitment as “the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way, which meets organizational goals and interests” (p. 421). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) described organizational commitment as “a bond or linking of the individual to the organization” (p. 171). Meyer and Allen (1991) defined organizational commitment as “a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization” (p. 64). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) reported that organizational commitment “(a) is a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to a target and (b) can be accompanied by different mind-sets that play a role in shaping behavior” (p. 299).
Organizational Commitment Theories

The studies of organizational commitment did not appear in the literature until the 1970s, and at that time organizational commitment emerged as a key element of the relationship between organizations and individuals (Mowday et al., 1982). The most generally cited concept of organizational commitment was developed by Mowday et al. (1979). In their concept, organizational commitment was constructed by the following three factors: "(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (p. 226). Table 2-2 lists three factors of Mowday et al.'s organizational commitment theory. An employee will display all of these attributes if he or she commits to an organization, while an employee will not display these attributes if he or she does not commit to an organization (Zangaro, 2001).

Table 2-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors of Mowday et al.'s (1979) Organizational Commitment Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are different categories of organizational commitment. Mowday et al. (1979) noted that most of the studies distinguished organizational commitment in terms of attitudinal commitment or behavioral commitment. Attitudinal involvement represents "a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organization and its goals and
wishes to maintain membership in order to facilitate these goals” (p. 225); behavior commitment represents “sunk costs in the organization where individuals forgo alternative courses of action and choose to link themselves to the organization” (p. 225). Penley and Gould (1988) identified the two views of organizational commitment as affective and instrumental. The affective view associates with an individual’s level of emotional attachment to an organization; the instrumental view associates with rewards received by an individual for his/her accomplishments in an organization. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequence of organizational commitment. Five antecedents include personal characteristics, job characteristics, organizational characteristics, role states, and group/leader relations; two correlates are motivation, and job satisfaction; and one consequence is job performance. Buchko, Weinzimmer, and Sergeyev (1998) divided the consequences of organizational commitment into two types: performance outcomes and withdrawal behavior. Consequently, an individual with a high level of organizational commitment performs well and is likely to remain in an organization.

Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment that included affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to the “want to stay” condition, meaning that an employee is emotionally attached to, identifies with, and is involved in the organization. Continuance commitment refers to the “need to stay” condition, in which an employee is aware of the costs of leaving the organization. Normative commitment is the “ought to stay” condition, in which an employee has a feeling of obligation or duty to remain in the organization.
The works of Mowday et al. (1979) and Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) are socially significant, and they address essential issues in the discipline of organizational commitment. These authors offer well-developed theories of organizational commitment, and their claims feature well-developed propositions that have strong empirical support. The theories feature a productive balance between simplicity and complexity that contributes to their usefulness. Empirical studies of organizational commitment are presented in the following section.

*Empirical Studies*

Sommer, Bae, and Luthans (1996) examined the impact of demographic and organizational factors on organizational commitment. The study used non-experimental quantitative design and non-probability sampling plan to investigate employees of 27 large companies in Korea. A total of 1,192 questionnaires were completed, resulting in a response rate of 55.4%.

Factors including age, tenure, position, and education were measured by a demographic questionnaire. Organizational factors including organizational structure, management style, and organizational climate were assessed by different questionnaires. The instrument developed by Inkson, Pugh, and Hickson was used to evaluate organizational structure. A scale developed by this study was used to evaluate management style. The dimensions developed by Litwin and String were used to measure organizational climate. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al. was used to rate organizational commitment.

Multiple regression analysis of the data collected for the study revealed that age, tenure, organizational structure, and organizational climate had a significant impact on
organizational commitment. The findings indicate that older employees have a higher level of commitment than the younger employees. The longer employees work in their organizations, the higher the reported level of their organizational commitment. When organizational structure is employee focused (decentralized), employees' organizational commitment increases. Employees demonstrate higher levels of organizational commitment, when they have more positive organizational climate perceptions.

The strength of the study is that it tested the hypothesized influence of demographic and organizational factors on organizational commitment. Limitations of the study are that the sample is from large organizations only, and the reliability of the scale measuring management style is low. Suggested future studies are to examine middle size or small size of organizations, and to use more reliable measurements.

In 1998, Harrison and Hubbard investigated the influence of personal characteristics, job satisfaction, and leaders' behaviors on organizational commitment from a large U.S. manufacturing firm located in Mexico. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 83 questionnaires were completed, resulting in a response rate of 83%.

The researchers measured personal characteristics (gender, age, tenure, and education) by a demographic questionnaire, job satisfaction by the Job Descriptive Index developed by Smith et al., leaders' behaviors by the Managerial Behavior Survey designed by Yukl, and organizational commitment by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al.

Regression analysis results indicated that job satisfaction and age were predictors of organizational commitment. Correlation analysis results revealed that leaders'
behavior and tenure were significantly correlated with organizational commitment. The study’s findings suggest that when age and tenure with the organization increase, employees’ organizational commitment increases. When employees experience greater satisfaction with their work, they feel greater commitment to their organizations.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it tested the hypothesized influence of personal characteristics, job satisfaction, and leaders’ behaviors on organizational commitment, (b) the reliability and validity of the measurements resulted in a high level of data quality. The limitation of the study is that the generalizability of the findings may be limited because data were collected from a single Mexican manufacturer only. Suggested future studies are to replicate this study to more organizations, other settings, and other countries.

Meyer, Irving, and Allen (1998) conducted two studies to examine the combined effects of work values and early work experiences on organizational commitment. Both studies used non-experimental quantitative design and non-probability sampling plan. One study investigated university graduates, and 257 questionnaires were completed, resulting in a response rate of 77%. The Work Values Inventory developed by Manhardt was used to measure work values and work experiences, and the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales developed by Allen & Meyer was used to assess organizational commitment. The second study examined the graduating classes from 1991 to 1993, and 265 surveys were completed, resulting in a return rate of 87%. The Work Values Inventory designed by Manhardt was used to measure work values and work experiences, and the revised version of the Affective, Continuance, and Normative
Commitment Scales developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith was used to assess organizational commitment.

Multiple regression analyses of the data collected for these studies revealed that work values and work experiences did interact in the prediction of an employee's organizational commitment. However, the interaction was complex and different for different work value/experience combinations. The study's findings challenge the common assumption that positive early work experiences will have the strongest impact on organizational commitment among those who most value such work experiences.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it tested the hypothesized relationships between the work values/experiences and organizational commitment, (b) the reliability and validity of the measurements resulted in a high level of data quality, and (c) data collection and data analysis were clearly described, allowing replication. Limitations of the study are: the participants were well-educated and many of them were entering the workforce on a full-time basis for the first time, the measures used were self-reported, and the data were subject to alternative casual interpretations. Suggested future studies are to replicate and extend the findings of this study and to modify existing theory concerning the joint influence of person and situation variables on commitment and other work attitudes.

Abdulla and Shaw (1999) examined the relationships between personal factors and organizational commitment. A total of 147 employees of the Ministry of Health in the United Arab Emirates completed the questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 85%. A quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. Personal factors (gender, marital status, education, age, and tenure) were measured by a
demographic questionnaire. Organizational commitment was assessed by the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales developed by Allen and Meyer.

Correlation analyses results indicated that there are significant relationships between personal characteristics and organizational commitment. Regression analysis revealed that marital status was a strong predictor of organizational commitment. The findings suggest that married individuals not only have a greater sense of obligation, but also tend to have a greater psychological bond to their organizations. Married individuals are more committed to their organizations than single individuals.

The strength of the study is that it tested the hypothesized relationships between personal factors and organizational commitment, and it provided greater insight to organizational attitudes in the global business environment. The limitations of the study are: (a) self-report measures could cause bias, and (b) the small sample size of the study makes the generalizing of the results to other settings difficult. Future research suggested are using a larger sample size to examine the relationships, and replicating the study to other settings and other countries.

In their 2000 study, Somers and Birnbaum explored the relationship between commitment profiles and work attitudes, employee withdrawal, and job performance from professional employees of a major medical center located in the southeastern United States. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used, and a total of 175 questionnaires were returned.

The researchers measured organizational commitment using the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales developed by Allen and Meyer, and assessed career commitment using the career commitment scale developed by Blau, Paul,
and John. They measured respondents’ work attitude with the job satisfaction scale
developed by Quinn and Staine, job involvement scale developed by Lefkowitz and
Some, and a person-organization value congruence scale developed for this study. The
response scales developed by Bluedorn, and the Job Search Behavior Index developed by
Kopelman, Rovenpor, and Milsap were used to assess withdrawal intention. Job
performance was measured by supervisor ratings.

ANOVA results indicated that respondents with dual commitments
(organizational commitment and career commitment) displayed the most positive work
attitudes, and the lowest overall withdrawal intentions, but showed no differences on
quality of job performance. The study’s findings suggest that employees who committed
to both their organizations and their careers will demonstrate the strongest work attitudes
and the highest intentions to remain in their organizations, and that a strong relationship
between organizational commitment and job performance was not shown.

The strength of the study is that it provided support for hypothesized relationships
between commitment and work attitudes, withdrawal behavior, and work performance.
Limitations of the study are that the generalizability of the findings may be limited
because data were collected from a limited sample, and the study’s cross-sectional survey
design does not enable researchers to infer causal relationships.

In 2000, Meyer and Smith conducted a study to examine the relationship between
human resource management (HRM) practices and employee organizational
commitment. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling
plan were used. A total of 281 employees from various organizations completed surveys.
The researchers of this study created a multi-item evaluation measure that contained performance appraisal, benefits, training, and career development to measure HRM practices. The Survey of Perceived Organizational Support developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa was used to measure organizational support. A measure incorporating Leventhal’s fairness criteria to show the fairness of formal procedures was used to assess procedural justice. The Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales developed by Meyer and Allen were used to measure organizational commitment.

Correlation analyses results indicated that both affective commitment and normative commitment were significantly related to the HRM measures, organizational support, and procedural justice. Continuance commitment was not significantly related to the HRM measures, organizational support, or procedural justice. SEM analyses demonstrated that relationships between employees’ evaluations of HRM practices and their affective and normative commitment were significantly affected by how they perceived organizational support and procedural justice. The findings support the notion that HRM practices can be useful tools to maintain employee organizational commitment.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it tested and supported the hypothesized relationships between HRM practice and employees’ organizational commitment, (b) the reliability and validity of the measurements resulted in a high level of data quality, and (c) data collection and data analysis were clearly described. The limitations of this study include the fact that the self-report measures could raise response bias, and the study’s non-experimental design did not enable researchers to draw conclusions about the direction of causality. Suggested future researches are an investigation of the effect of
HRM practices on productivity and organizational effectiveness and an exploration of the factors that contribute to employees' perceptions of management's motives for the introduction of HRM practices.

In another study, Testa (2001) investigated the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and work effort in the service industry. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 397 employees from 24 departments of a cruise line and a food-service organization completed the surveys, resulting in a response rate of 93%. Organizational commitment was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday, et al., job satisfaction was assessed by two scales of the Cruise Line Job Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Testa, Williams, and Pietrzak, and work effort was measured by a scale created by the researchers of this study.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analyses indicated that job satisfaction represented 70% of the variance in organizational commitment, and organizational commitment demonstrated 22% of the variance in the work effort. The findings provide a linkage between employees' attitudes and performance, support the argument that job satisfaction is an antecedent to organizational commitment, and suggest that increases in job satisfaction will increase organizational commitment and, as a consequence, increase work effort.

The strength of the study is that it tested and supported the hypothesized relationships among organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and work effort. The limitations of the study are that the self-report measures could cause bias, and the sample was drawn from only two organizations, which could reduce generalizability of the
study’s conclusions. Future research is suggested to include moderators of respondents’ job satisfaction – work effort relationship, and to measure performance.

In their 2002 study, Goulet and Frank examined employees’ organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit, and for-profit. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 228 employees from 16 businesses and agencies representing public, non-profit, and for-profit sectors completed study surveys, resulting in a response rate of 61%. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al. was used for measuring organizational commitment.

The means of the sectors were compared. The results indicated that organizational commitment was the highest among for-profit employees (73.9), followed by non-profit employees (72.8). Public employees had the lowest organizational commitment scores (66.9) of all respondents. The findings give the organizational commitment differences between non-profit employees and those of the other two sectors. The strengths of the study are: (a) it compared organizational commitment of three sectors: public, non-profit, and for-profit, and (b) the reliability and validity of the measurement resulted in a high level of data quality. Future research could replicate a similar study in other countries.

Cullen, Parboteeah, and Victor (2003) assessed the effects of ethical climates on organizational commitment in two studies. Both studies used non-experimental quantitative design and non-probability sampling plan. In one study, a total of 411 employees from seven departments of a local mid-western telephone company completed surveys, resulting in a response rate of 84%. A total of 139 employees from four accounting organizations located in the southeast returned the second study’s
questionnaires, resulting in a return rate of 61%. The Ethical Climate Questionnaire developed by Victor and Cullen that included the general egoistic climate, the general benevolent climate, and the general principled climate was used to measure ethical climates, and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday et al. was used to assess organizational commitment. MANOVA results indicated that benevolent climates were positively related to organizational commitment, but egoistic climates were negatively related to organizational commitment. A principled climate was positively related to organizational commitment, but only for professional workers. The findings support the notion that perceived ethical climates have a positive significant impact on organizational commitment, and suggest that people are likely to commit to an organization that regards the interests of others.

The strength of the study is that it provided support for hypothesized relationships between organizational commitment and ethical climates. The limitation of the study is its generalizability, and future research could replicate this study in other settings, industries, and countries.

Chen (2004) examined the relationship among organization culture, leadership behaviors, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 929 employees across 57 organizations (34 manufacturing firms and 23 service companies) completed the surveys, resulting in a response rate of 64%. The organizational culture index developed by Wallach was used to measure organizational culture. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio was used to assess leadership behavior. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
developed by Mowday et al. was used to measure organizational commitment. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss, et al. was used to assess job satisfaction. The overall performance definition developed by Motowidlo and Scotter was used to measure job performance.

Correlation analyses indicated that there are significant positive correlations between transformational leadership and organizational commitment and culture, organizational commitment and organizational culture and job satisfaction, organizational culture and job satisfaction, but no significant correlations with job performance. The study’s findings suggest that leaders should recognize organizational culture, and that if they demonstrate transformational leadership style, employees’ commitment and job satisfaction may be enhanced.

The strengths of the study are: (a) it was conducted in an Asian setting, helping to fill the gap in global literature, (b) it tested the relationship between many variables at the same time, and (c) it used a large sample to test the hypothesis.

McMurray, Scott, and Pace (2004) explored the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational climate. A non-experimental quantitative design and a non-probability sampling plan were used. A total of 1,382 employees from three large Australian automotive component-manufacturing companies completed the study’s questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 98%. The Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales developed by Allen and Meyer were used to measure organizational commitment. The researchers used the Organizational Climate Scale developed by Koys and Decotiis with some minor language modifications to assess organizational climate.
EQS (Bentler, 1989) analyses indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational climate, and that when respondents’ reactions to organizational climate were positive, their reactions to organizational commitment were positive. The study’s findings support the hypothesis that there is a statistically significant, positive relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment.

The strengths of the study are testing the hypothesized relationship between organizational commitment and organizational climate, using a large sample, and using reliable and valid measurements. The limitation is that the research was conducted in specific circumstances – in an Australian setting using a mixed group of both supervisory and factory workers; therefore, the generalizability of the findings could be limited. Future research could refine the measures of climate and commitment so that the data collection would be simpler and more precise.

Discussion of the Literature

The purpose of this literature review was to explore the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment, and to identify areas of future scholarly inquiry. The major findings of this literature review are that there are two leading transformational leadership theories – Bass’ (1985, 1998) transformational theory, and Kouzes and Posner’s (1995, 1997a, 2002) transformational theory as well as two generally accepted organizational commitment theories – Mowday et al.’s (1979) organizational commitment theory, and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) organizational commitment theory. These theories have been tested and proven by a range of empirical
studies that were reviewed earlier. The summary and interpretations that follow the existing theoretical and empirical literature are structured to correspond to selected and pertinent themes from the Literature Map. The literature map was used to guide the researcher's library search for theoretical and empirical literature in this review about leadership, transformational leadership, and organizational commitment. As shown in Figure 2-1, the literature map serves to identify themes, theories, and concepts that organized the Literature Review.
Leadership
Trait Theory
Behavior Theory
Contingency Theories

Transformational Leadership
(Bass' Theory)
Idealized Influence
(Attributed/behavior)
Inspirational Motivation
Intellectual Simulation
Individualized Consideration

(Kouzes & Posner's Theory)
Model the Way
Inspire a Shared Vision
Challenge the Process
Enable Others to Act
Encourage the Heart

Organizational Commitment
(Mowday, Steers, & Porter's Theory)
A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values
A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization
A strong desire to maintain membership in the organization

(Meyer & Allen's Theory)
Affective Commitment
Continuance Commitment
Normative Commitment

Figure 2-1: Literature map.
Theoretical Literature

The theoretical literature review includes three areas: (a) leadership; (b) transformational leadership; and (c) organizational commitment. Popular theories in the leadership field include trait theory, behavior theory, and contingency theory. The transformational leadership field consists of Bass’s (1985, 1998) theory, and Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) theory. The two main theories in the organizational commitment field are Mowday et al.’s (1979) theory and Meyer and Allen’s (1991, 1997) theory.

Leadership. Leaders’ traits are flexibility, emotional stability, self-confidence, internal locus of control (Dubrin, 2004; Lussier & Achua, 2001); dominance, high energy, integrity, and sensitivity to others (Lussier & Achua, 2001); and humility, trustworthiness, extroversion, assertiveness, enthusiasm, sense of humor, warmth, high tolerance for frustration, emotional intelligence, adaptability, and courage (Dubrin, 2004).

Leaders’ behaviors include the autocratic style and democratic style identified by researchers at Iowa State University; job-centered style and employee-centered style identified by researchers at University of Michigan; impoverished style, authority-compliance style, country-club style, middle-of-the-road style, and team style identified by Blake and Mouton (as cited in Lussier & Achua, 2001); and initiation structure style and consideration style identified by researchers at Ohio State University (as cited in Dubrin, 2004).

Leaders’ contingency styles include leader-membership relationship style, task structure style, and position power style (Fiedler, 1984); directive style, supportive style, participative style, and achievement-oriented style (Higgins, 1991); and telling style, selling style, participating style, and delegating style (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).
Transformational leadership. Bass (1985, 1998) described four key characteristics of transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Adopting a different approach to the same topic, Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1997a, 2002) identified five key behaviors of a transformational leader: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart.


Empirical Literature

In the empirical literature review section, transformational leadership behavior was shown to have been linked to numerous variables: trust (Arnold et al., 2001); efficacy (Arnold et al., 2001; Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamencik, 2003); commitment (Arnold et al., 2001; Bell-Roundtree, 2004); emotional intelligence (Mendel & Pherwani, 2003); organizational citizenship behavior, achievement orientation, stress, and irritability (Felfe & Schyns, 2004); extra effort (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamencik, 2003); job satisfaction (Bell-Roundtree, 2004; Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamencik, 2003); and outcomes (Kamencik, 2003).

Through a variety of empirical studies, organizational commitment has been linked to several variables: work values and experiences (Meyer et al., 1998); work attitudes, employee withdrawal (Somers & Birnbaum, 2000); job performance (Somers &
Birnbaum, 2000; Chen, 2004); HRM practices, organizational support, and procedural justice (Meyer et al., 2000); job satisfaction (Chen, 2004; Testa, 2001); work effort (Testa, 2001), public, non-profit, and profit sectors (Goulet & Frank, 2002); ethical climates (Cullen et al., 2003); organizational climates (McMurray et al., 2004); organizational culture (Chen, 2004); leadership behaviors (Chen, 2004); and public, non-profit, and for profit organizations (Goulet & Frank, 2002).

Proven instruments for measuring transformational leadership are the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1996a, 1997) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 1997b). Instruments for assessing organizational commitment are the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979); the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales (Allen & Meyer, 1990); and the revised version of Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales (Meyer & Allen, 1993).

Regression analyses, correlation, ANOVA, and MANOVA have been successfully used in transformational leadership research. Regression analyses, ANOVA, correlation, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), MANOVA, and EQS have been successfully used in organizational commitment research.

Numerous research projects have revealed that transformational leadership added to the positive prediction of employee trust (Arnold et al., 2001); commitment (Arnold et al., 2001; Bell-Roundtree, 2004); efficacy (Arnold et al., 2001; Felfe & Schyns, 2004); extra effort (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamencik, 2003); outcomes (Kamencik, 2003); job satisfaction (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamencik, 2003; Bell-Roundtree, 2004); and
leadership effectiveness (Kamencik, 2003); and had a significant relationship with emotional intelligence (Mendell & Pherwani, 2003).

Organizational commitment was related to age (Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Sommer, Bue, & Luthans, 1996), gender (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999), tenure (Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Sommer, Bue, & Luthans, 1996), and marital status (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999), but not related to education (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Sommer, Bue, & Luthans, 1996). Organizational commitment added to the positive prediction of employee work attitude and negative prediction of withdrawal intention (Somers & Birnbaum, 2000). HRM practice, organizational support, and procedural justice contributed to employee organizational commitment (Meyer & Smith, 2000). Values and work experience did interact in the prediction of employee organizational commitment (Meyer et al., 1998). Job satisfaction increased employee organizational commitment and, consequently, work effort (Testa, 2001). Employee organizational commitment was the highest in for-profit sectors, followed by non-profit sectors, and public sectors (Goulet & Frank, 2002). Transformational leadership could enhance organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Chen, 2004). Ethical climates (Cullen et al., 2003) and organizational climates (McMurray et al., 2004) had positive impacts on organizational commitment (Cullen et al., 2003).

The general limitations of reviewed empirical studies are: (a) cross-sectional sampling design (Arnold et al., 2001; Kamencik, 2003), (b) single data collection method (Kamencik, 2003; Mendell & Pherwani, 2003; Meyer et al., 1998; Meyer & Smith, 2000; Testa, 2001), and (c) weak generalizability (Arnold et al., 2001; Kamencik, 2003; Kontogiorghes & Bryant, 2004, Somers & Birnbaum, 2000; Testa, 2001).
General suggestions for future studies include using larger samples (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Mendell & Pherwani, 2003), extending to other settings (Mendell & Pherwani, 2003), using peer or customer ratings (Felfe & Schyns, 2004), using objective measures of performance (Felfe & Schyns, 2004; Kamenciks, 2003), using experimental design (Kamenciks, 2003), using a qualitative design (Kamenciks, 2003), and creating a longitudinal study (Bell-Roundtree, 2004).

Conclusions

Both theoretical literature and empirical literature of transformational leadership and organizational commitment were reviewed in this literature review. The theory of transformational leadership is still evolving, and few empirical studies examined transformational leadership; however, a positive trend was found between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in this literature review. Further, none of the studies reviewed examined the influence of transformational leadership on organizational commitment in Taiwan. Scholarly research into the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment in Taiwan would contribute to the existing global body of literature by testing theories in a different environment.

Theoretical framework

The theories that guide and form the framework for this study include the transformational leadership theory developed by Bass (1985, 1998), the organizational commitment theory developed by Mowday et al. (1979), and the demographic
information designed by the researcher. Figure 2-2, schematic model, illustrates the relationship among the theories in this study.

**Figure 2-2:** Schematic model of theories in this study.

Chapter II presented an in-depth review of transformational leadership and organizational commitment. It included reviewing theoretical literature and empirical literature of transformational leadership and organizational commitment. A theoretical framework was also presented in this chapter. Chapter III describes the methodology for testing the hypotheses.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a quantitative, non-experimental, correlation, and explanatory research design. One independent variable was transformational leadership that included five factors: (a) idealized influence - attributed, (b) idealized influence – behavioral, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration. Another independent variable was a demographic profile, which included five variables: (a) gender, (b) marital status, (c) age, (d) education, and (e) years of employment. The dependent variable was organizational commitment that included three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Data were collected by the combination of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Socio-Demographic Profile, and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ).

Research Hypotheses

1. There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration).
2. There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).

3. There are significant relationships between transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and organizational commitment.

4. There are significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).

5. Transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment) are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment.

**Population and Sampling Plan**

**Target Population**

The target population is “all the members of a real or hypothetical set of people, events, or objects to which researchers wish to generalize the results of their research” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 167). There are 47 domestic banks (3,202 branch offices)
with 133,139 employees in Taiwan. Therefore, the target population included all employees who worked for Taiwan’s domestic banks.

**Accessible Population**

The accessible population means “all the individuals who realistically could be included in the sample” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 168). One thousand employees of Taiwan’s domestic banks were selected to participate in this study. Therefore, the accessible population included all of the employees chosen from Taiwan’s domestic banks to participate in this study.

**Sampling Plan**

Sampling refers to “the process of selecting a sample from a defined population with the intent that the sample accurately represents that population (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 167). A stratified sampling plan involves “selecting a sample so that certain subgroups in the population are adequately represented in the sample” (p. 172). Random sampling is the process of “selecting a sample in such a way that all individuals in the defined population have an equal and independent chance of being selected for the sample” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 123). When the target population is above 5,000, a sample size of 400 will be adequate (p. 135). This study used a stratified random sampling plan with a sample size of 400.

Taiwan’s domestic banks were divided into four strata: (a) under 50 branch offices; (b) 51 to 100 branch offices; (c) 101 to 150 branch offices; and (d) over 151 branch offices. There were 21 banks with under 50 branch offices, 15 banks with between 51 to 100 branch offices, seven banks with between 101 to 150 branch offices, and four banks with over 151 branch offices.
After stratified sampling, the banks of each stratum were randomly selected. Within 21 banks of the first stratum, five banks were selected. Within 15 banks of the second stratum, four banks were randomly selected. Within seven banks of the third stratum, two banks were selected. Within four banks of the fourth stratum, one bank was selected.

A total of 1,000 questionnaires were distributed to Taiwan’s domestic banks. The distribution formula for each stratum was: \[ X = \frac{1,000 \times \text{(sum of total branches offices of the selected banks from each stratum)}}{\text{(sum of total branch offices of the selected banks from all strata).}} \]

For example, the number of questionnaires for the first stratum should be:

\[ 1,000 \times \frac{a1+a2+a3+a4+a5}{(a1+a2+a3+a4+a5+b6+b7+b8+b9+c10+c11+d12)} \]

**Eligibility Criteria and Exclusion Criteria**

The participants of the study must meet three eligibility criteria: (a) He/she is an adult; (b) He/she works for a domestic bank in Taiwan; and (c) He/she has only one leader to directly report to. The participants must be rejected for any of three exclusion criteria: (a) He/she is not an adult; (b) He/she does not work for a domestic bank; and (c) He/she has more than one leader to directly report to.

**Instrumentation**

Three instruments were used in the study. The Socio-Demographic Profile was designed to collect the subjects’ personal data, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used to measure transformational leadership, and the Organizational
Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to assess employees' organizational commitment.

The MLQ and OCQ were reliable and valid instruments because they had a high level of reliability and validity. Babbie (1995) noted that reliability referred to “a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, would yield the same result each time” (p. 124), and validity was defined as “the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration” (p. 127). Convergent validity assessed the level to which the instrument was similar to another. Predictive validity evaluated the ability of the instruments to predict the other measurements.

**Socio-Demographic Profile**

The demographic questionnaire was designed by the researcher to collect the participants’ personal information. There were five items in this profile including gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment. To conduct the survey in Taiwan, the surveys were translated into Chinese.

Gender included two categories: (a) male, and (b) female. Age contained five categories: (a) 20 or under 20, (b) 21 to 30, (c) 31 to 40, (d) 41 to 50, and (e) over 50. Education had five categories: (a) elementary or under, (b) high school, (c) college, (d) university, and (e) master. Marital status included two categories: (a) single, and (b) married. Years of employment contained four categories: (a) 2 years or under, (b) 3 years to 5 years, (c) 6 years to 10 years, and (d) over 10 years.
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Description

Bass (1985) developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) according to his leadership theory. Several revisions of the MLQ have been made since 1985, and this study used the newest version of the MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). The MLQ was conceptually characterized by three leadership dimensions: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. Transformational leadership includes five factors: (a) idealized influence - attributed, (b) idealized influence - behavioral, (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, and (e) individualized consideration. Transactional leadership contains three factors: (a) contingent reward, (b) management-by-exception (active), and (c) management-by-exception (passive). Laissez-faire leadership included laissez-faire behavior. This study used the dimension of transformational leadership only, because the purpose of this study was to measure transformational leadership.

There are 20 items of transformational leadership in the MLQ, and the strength of each factor was evaluated by five descriptions about how frequently each behavior is demonstrated on a 5-point Likert scale: 0 (not at all), 1 (once in a while), 2 (sometimes), 3 (fairly often), and 4 (frequently, if not always). To conduct the research in Taiwan, the questionnaires were translated into Chinese.

Reliability

The MLQ is a reliable instrument to measure transformational leadership. Bass and Avolio (1997) noted that from the MLQ completed by 2,080 participants rating business, health care, military, and government leaders, Alpha coefficients of the five
factors of transformational leadership evaluated ranged from 0.90 to 0.93 (Idealized influence – attributed, 0.90; idealized influence – behavioral, 0.91; inspirational motivation, 0.94; intellectual stimulation, 0.93; and individualized consideration, 0.93). Arnold et al. (2001) administrated the MLQ to 177 executive MBA students. The total Alpha coefficient of transformational leadership assessed was 0.96.

In this study, five transformational leadership dimensions resulted in good internal consistency. The idealized influence (attributed) dimension had a coefficient alpha of .65, the idealized influence (behavior) dimension had a coefficient alpha of .72, the inspirational motivation dimension had a coefficient alpha of .76, the intellectual stimulation dimension had a coefficient alpha of .70, and the individual consideration dimension had a coefficient alpha of .71.

**Validity**

The MLQ was developed by Bass (1985) to examine his leadership theory. The measurement had been reviewed and analyzed by researchers such as Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) and Carless (1998) to evaluate its validity. The results of the researchers' studies indicated that the MLQ had good validity.

The MLQ included three factors: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire. The transformational leadership scale was a subscale of the Multiple Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The author of the transformational leadership theory, Bass, designed the scale based on the transformational leadership theory; therefore, the scale represents the transformational leadership well.

In this study, the transformational leadership scale was translated into Chinese by a credentialed translation service to make sure of the correctness of the translation, and
was checked by experts to make sure the items of the scale were relevant to measurement of the transformational leadership. Therefore, the content validity was strengthened.

**Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)**

**Description**

Mowday et al. (1979) developed the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) from Porter and Smith's 1970 edited version of the OCQ. According to the organizational commitment theory, the OCQ was conceptually characterized by three related factors: "(1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (p. 226).

There are 15 items in the OCQ, and within these items, number 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 15 are negatively phrased and reverse scored. According to Mowday et al. (1982), the items were negatively phrased and reverse scored to reduce response bias. The OCQ was measured on a 7-point Likert scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (moderately disagree), 3 (slightly disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (slightly agree), 6 (moderately agree), and 7 (strongly agree). To conduct the study in Taiwan, the questionnaires were translated into Chinese.

**Reliability**

Mowday et al. (1979) administered the OCQ to examine the organizational commitment of 2,563 employees in different positions in nine public and private organizations. Alpha coefficients ranged from 0.82 to 0.93. Goulet and Frank (2002) assessed organizational commitment of 228 employees in three sectors (public, non-public, and for-profit) by OCQ. The total alpha coefficient was 0.91. Chen (2004)
investigated organizational commitment of 1,451 employees in manufacturing and service organizations. The total alpha coefficient of OCQ assessed was 0.90.

In this study, the two organizational commitment leadership dimensions resulted in good internal consistency. The value and effort dimension had a coefficient alpha of .89, and the maintenance dimension had a coefficient alpha of .81.

**Validity**

Mowday et al. (1979) noted that convergent validity of the OCQ was evaluated by rating the Sources of Organizational Attachment Questionnaire (SOA), and the results ranged from 0.63 to 0.74; discriminant validity of the OCQ was measured by comparing the OCQ to job involvement, career satisfaction, and Job Descriptive Index (JDI), and the results ranged from 0.36 to 0.56, from 0.39 to 0.40, and from 0.01 to 0.68 respectively; and predictive validity of the OCQ was investigated for tenure, performance, turnover, absenteeism, and the results ranged from 0.23 to 0.26, from 0.05 to 0.36, from 0.17 to 0.43, and from 0.08 to 0.28 respectively.

In this study, principal component analysis of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) demonstrated high construct validity. Fifteen items of the OCQ were attributed to two dimensions: value and effort commitment, and maintenance commitment. The factor loadings of value and effort commitment ranged from 0.51 to 0.82, and the factor loadings of maintenance commitment ranged from 0.65 to 0.81.

**Procedures: Ethical Considerations and Data Collection Methods**

Three types of data resources are: (a) primary information that comes from original documents such as surveys, interviews, and photographs; (b) secondary sources
that explain and critique the primary information, such as journal articles and books; and
(c) tertiary sources comprising bibliographic instruments of organized information such as bibliographies, encyclopedias, and dictionaries (Zhu, 2000). This study collected primary data by using survey packages that included three questionnaires in each package. The procedures of data collection methods used were as follows:

1. Obtain permissions from publishers for using the MLQ and the OCQ in this study;
2. Prepare consent form that indicates the purpose, procedure, risk, benefit, right to withdraw, and anonymity of the study for participants;
3. Secure approval from Lynn University’s Institute Review Board (IRB) with a full board review;
4. Get certificate of translated Chinese version of the questionnaires from a credentialed translation service;
5. Contact the high-level managers of the chosen banks such as general managers of the chosen banks by e-mail, stating the purpose, procedure, and benefits of the study, inviting their companies to participate, and asking the cooperation of their Human Resource (HR) departments to distribute the questionnaires;
6. Mail Chinese-version questionnaire packages with stamped envelopes for each participant employee to the HR department of the chosen banks with a reminder to distribute the questionnaires to employees of each of their four major departments (Deposit, Lending and Investment, Foreign Exchange, and Consumer Financing) randomly after their receipt of the questionnaires. After respondents
completed the questionnaires, they mailed them to the researcher by using the stamped, pre-addressed envelopes;

7. Email the first follow-up letters to the chosen banks after two weeks and the second follow-up letters after four weeks;

8. The data collection was conducted within four weeks from December 12, 2005 to January 09, 2006; and

9. After the completion of data collection, the principal investigator submitted the Lynn University IRB Report to terminate the project.

Methods of Data Analysis

Reliability

Reliability explains the consistency of the scores produced and is expressed numerically as a reliability coefficient (Gay & Airasian, 2000). This study examined the reliability of the measurements (MLQ and OCQ) with coefficient alpha.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is to simplify factor structure so that minimum common factors could explain the maximum factors (Wu, 2000). This study used principle component analysis to examine the factors of the measurements (MLQ and OCQ).

t-Test

The t-test is the method used to test the mean differences between two factors of independent variables (Wu, 2000) such as gender or marital status. The t-test was used to find the differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors of hypothesis 1. The t-test was also used to test the
differences in organizational commitment according to gender and marital status of demographic variables of hypothesis 2.

**One-way ANOVA**

One-way ANOVA is used to analyze the differences among three or more factors of independent variables (Wu, 2000) such as age, education, and years of employment. One-way ANOVA was used to test the differences in organizational commitment according to age, education, and years of employment of demographic variables of hypothesis 2.

**Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation**

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation is developed to analyze the relationship between two continuous and interval variables (Wu, 2000). This study used this method to investigate the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment of hypothesis 3.

**MANOVA**

MANOVA means multiple ANOVA that analyzes multiple dependent variables simultaneously (Wu, 2000). MANOVA was used to test the differences in transformational leadership behaviors according to demographic variables of hypothesis 4.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

A multiple regression equation is “a prediction equation that includes more than one predictor” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 501). A multiple regression equation uses “variables that are known to individually predict the criterion to make a more accurate prediction” (p. 501). Multiple regression analysis was used to test whether
transformational leadership behaviors and demographic variables are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment of hypothesis 5.

**Evaluation of Research Methods**

1. The quantitative design is appropriate to test hypotheses and to investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment.

2. The stratified random sampling plan is sound for results to generalize to the target population (domestic banks in Taiwan) of this study. However, the results cannot be generalized to international banks and other industries in Taiwan.

3. The MLQ and OCQ measurements are valid and reliable measurements because they were developed by the original author of the theories and were commonly used to measure transformational leadership and organizational commitment. However, the translated Chinese version may not reflect the original meanings.

4. The data collection plan is detailed and the ethical aspects are well concerned. However, the use of mail packages may not be time efficient.

5. The data analyses are appropriate to analyze each of the hypotheses.

Chapter III described the methodology for testing the hypotheses. It included research design, research hypotheses, population and sampling plan, instrumentation, procedures, methods of data analysis, and evaluation of research methods. The instrumentation included a socio-demographic profile, a multifactor leadership questionnaire, and an organizational commitment questionnaire. The procedures included ethical considerations and data collection methods. Chapter IV presents the results of the hypotheses testing.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Participants in this study were employees of Taiwan’s domestic banks. A total of 1,000 questionnaires were distributed to twelve Taiwan’s domestic banks. A total of 411 questionnaires were returned, resulting in a response rate of 41.1%. Due to three questionnaires not being completed, 408 valid questionnaires were used in the data analysis of this study. The twelve selected banks are shown in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1

The Sample Banks of Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>Questionnaires Distributed</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Response Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bank of Taiwan</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Central Trust of China</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chinfon Commercial Bank</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Enterprise Bank of Hualian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Land Bank of Taiwan</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Macoto Bank</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Shin Kong Bank</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sunny Bank</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taishin International Bank</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taiwan Cooperative Bank</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The Chinese Bank</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Farmers Bank of China</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table 4-2 presents the descriptive statistics of the participant’s gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment. As shown in Table 4-2, of the
respondents, there were more females (52.5%) than males (47%). The largest age group was 21 to 30, and the smallest age group was 20 or under 20. The largest group by level of education was university, and the smallest group by level of education was elementary or under. Of the respondents, there were more married respondents (53.4%) than single respondents (46.6%). The largest group of years of employment was over 10 years, and the smallest group of years of employment was 6 years to 10 years.
Table 4-2

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Bank Employees by Gender, Age, Education, Martial Status, and Years of Employment (N=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or under 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martial Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or under</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to 5 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years to 10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multifactor Leadership (Transformational Leadership Style) Profile**

The transformational leadership questionnaire contains five dimensions to measure leaders' transformational leadership behaviors: idealized influence (attributed), idealized
influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. As shown in Table 4-3, the total score of transformational leadership was 63.13. The highest rated item was “Displays a sense of power and confidence” (3.52), and the lowest rated item was “Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her” (2.72).
Table 4-3

Bank Employees' Perceptions of Transformational Leadership: Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration (N=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Percent Distribution (%)</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all...</td>
<td>Frequently, if not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Acts in ways that builds my respect</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Displays a sense of power and confidence</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talks about their most important values and beliefs</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Talks optimistically about the future</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Articulates a compelling vision of the future</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spends time teaching and coaching</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Helps me to develop my strengths</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Item Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Multifactor Leadership Score (range 20-100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Item Score 3.16
Total Multifactor Leadership Score (range 20-100) 63.13
Organizational Commitment Profile

The organizational commitment questionnaire contains two dimensions to measure followers’ organizational commitment: value and effort, and maintenance. As shown in Table 4-4, the total score of transformational leadership was 68.46. The value and effort dimension (4.68) was rated higher than the maintenance dimension (4.33). The highest rated item was “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful” (5.24), and the lowest rated item was “Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees” (3.83).
Table 4-4
Organizational Commitment of Bank Employees: Value and Effort, and Maintenance (N=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Percent Distribution(%)</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the types of work were similar</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I really care about the fate of this organization</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension Score (Range 8-56)</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension Score (Range 5-35)</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Item Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organizational Commitment Score (range 15-105)</td>
<td>68.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1

There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed,
idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration).

The independent t-test was used to determine whether the means of two groups significantly differed from each other. In this study, the independent t-test was used to compare the mean dimension scores for organizational commitment according to transformational leadership behaviors: idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Each transformational leadership behavior had two categories: high mean and low mean. As shown in Table 4-5, all high means of transformational behaviors scored significantly higher in organizational commitment dimensions than low means of those in organizational commitment dimensions.
Table 4-5

Comparison of the Mean Scores for Organizational Commitment According to Transformational Leadership Behaviors: Independent t- tests (N= 408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>High Behavior Means</th>
<th>Low Behavior Means</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=244</td>
<td>N=164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.648***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.940***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>5.610***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.667**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>7.242***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.021**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.593***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.092*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>8.099***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.767*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<=.05 ** p<=.01 *** p<=.001

The results of t-tests showed there were significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors.

Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.
Hypothesis 2

There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).

Gender and Marital Status: t-test Comparisons

The independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean dimension scores for organizational commitment, according to gender (males and females) and marital status (single and married) in this study. As shown in Table 4-6, analyses of t-tests revealed that males did not score significantly higher than females, and married respondents scored significantly higher than singles.

Table 4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=194</td>
<td>N=214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=218</td>
<td>N=190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and Effort</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.435***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.433***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<=.05 ** p<=.01 *** p<=.001
The results of t-tests showed there were significant differences in organizational commitment according to marital status. However, there were no significant differences in organizational commitment according to gender.

**Age, Education, and Years of Employment: ANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons**

ANOVA statistics using a five group comparison of age (20 or under 20, 21 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, and over 50), a five group comparison of education (elementary or under, high school, college, university, and master), and a four group comparison of years of employment (2 years or under, 3 years to 5 years, 6 years to 10 years, and over 10 years) were used to examine differences in each dimension of organizational commitment. Where there were significant F-values, post hoc tests were conducted by the more rigorous Scheffe test and the Least Significant Difference (LSD) to check the differences.

As shown in Table 4-7, for the value and effort dimension of the organizational commitment, ANOVA showed no differences according to education. ANOVA showed a significant difference according to age ($F=7.769^{***}$) and years of employment ($F=4.525^{**}$). Furthermore, post hoc comparisons by the more rigorous Scheffe test showed some significant differences in age and years of employment status. By the LSD, there were more significant differences in post hoc comparisons. Generally speaking, both older employees and long-term employees scored higher in the value and effort commitment.
Table 4-7

ANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons of Significant Differences in Value and Effort According to Age, Education and Years of Employment (N= 408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value and Effort Means</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.769***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (N=408)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or under 20 (N=6)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 (N=168)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 (N=125)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 (N=63)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 (N=46)</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>ns°</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns°</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>ns°</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns°</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 31 to 40</td>
<td>ns°</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (N=408)</td>
<td>0.614°°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or under (N=1)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (N=35)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (N=148)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (N=204)</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master (N=20)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Employment (N=408)</td>
<td>4.525°°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or under (N=77)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to 5 years (N=86)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years to 10 years (N=57)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years (N=188)</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years &gt; 2 years or</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<=.05  **p<=.01  ***p<=.001
As shown in Table 4-8, for the maintenance dimension of the organizational commitment, ANOVA showed no differences according to education. ANOVA showed a significant difference according to age \((F= 7.199^{***})\) and years of employment \((F= 3.568^{*})\). Furthermore, post hoc comparisons by the more rigorous Scheffe test showed some significant differences in age and years of employment status. By the LSD, there were more significant differences in host hoc comparisons. Generally speaking, both older employees and long-term employees scored higher in the maintenance dimension of organizational commitment.
Table 4-8

ANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons of Significant Differences in Maintenance According to Age, Education and Years of Employment (N= 408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Maintenance Means</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Post Hoc Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (N=408)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.199***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or under 20 (N=6)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 (N=168)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 (N=125)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 (N=63)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 (N=46)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns a</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns a</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 31 to 40</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 31 to 40</td>
<td>ns a</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (N=408)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.157*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary or under (N=1)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (N=35)</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (N=148)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (N=204)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master (N=20)</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Employment (N=408)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.568*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or under (N=77)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years to 5 years (N=86)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years to 10 years (N=57)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years (N=188)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years &gt; 2 years or under</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years &gt; 3 years to 5 years</td>
<td>ns a</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<=.05  **p<=.01  ***p<=.001
As shown in Table 4-9, for the total score of the organizational commitment, ANOVA showed no differences according to education. ANOVA showed a significant difference according to age ($F=10.996^{***}$) and years of employment ($F=6.039^{***}$). Furthermore, post hoc comparisons by the more rigorous Scheffe test showed some significant differences in age and years of employment status. By the LSD, there were more significant differences in post hoc comparisons. Generally speaking, both older employees and long-term employees scored higher in the total score of organizational commitment.
Table 4-9

ANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons of Significant Differences in Organizational Commitment (Total Score) According to Age, Education and Years of Employment (N=408)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment Means</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Post Hoc Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (N=408)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.996***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or under 20 (N=6)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns* .017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 (N=168)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns* .003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 (N=125)</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns* .004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 (N=63)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 (N=46)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.012 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.033 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 20 or under 20</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 21 to 30</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030 .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50 &gt; 31 to 40</td>
<td>ns*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.082 .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education (N=408) | 0.941a |
| Elementary or under (N=1) | 4.53 |
| High school (N=35) | 4.36 |
| College (N=148) | 4.53 |
| University (N=204) | 4.61 |
| Master (N=20) | 4.75 |

| Years of Employment (N=408) | 6.039*** |
| 2 years or under (N=77) | 4.27 |
| 3 years to 5 years (N=86) | 4.50 |
| 6 years to 10 years (N=57) | 4.51 |
| over 10 years (N=188) | 4.73 |
| over 10 years > 2 years or under | ns* |
| over 10 years > 3 years to 5 years | ns* |
| over 10 years > 6 years to 10 years | ns* |
The results of ANOVA showed there were significant differences in organizational commitment according to age and years of employment. However, there were no significant differences in organizational commitment according to education. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

**Hypothesis 3**

There are significant positive relationships between transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence-attributed, idealized influence-behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and organizational commitment.

*Transformational Leadership Behaviors (Idealized Influence-attributed, Idealized Influence-behavioral, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration) and Organizational Commitment*

Pearson $r$ correlation coefficients were used to test the relationships between two variables. As shown in Table 4-10, there was a significant positive relationship ($r = .0404^{***}$) between transformational leadership (total score) and organizational commitment (total score), and almost all Pearson $r$ correlation coefficients were significant. All Pearson $r$ correlation coefficients between transformational leadership behaviors and the value and effort commitment were higher than those between transformational leadership behaviors and the maintenance commitment.
Table 4-10

*Pearson r Correlation Matrix: Correlation Between Transformational Leadership Dimensions and Organizational Commitment Dimensions (N=408)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Value and Effort</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment (Total Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td>0.386***</td>
<td>0.223***</td>
<td>0.392***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>0.349***</td>
<td>0.117*</td>
<td>0.316***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>0.414***</td>
<td>0.167***</td>
<td>0.388***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>0.351***</td>
<td>0.152**</td>
<td>0.334***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>0.416***</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.338***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.441***</td>
<td>0.159***</td>
<td>0.404***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<=.05  **p<=.01  ***p<=.001

The results of Pearson r correlation showed there were significant positive relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was supported.

**Hypothesis 4**

There are significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).

**MANOVA**

As shown in Table 4-11, for transformational leadership behaviors, using MANOVA showed no differences according to gender, marital status, and years of employment. However, it showed significant differences according to age and education.
As shown in Table 4-12, for age, the significant difference was in individual consideration. For education, the significant difference was in idealized influence (attributed) and intellectual stimulation.
The results of MANOVA showed there were significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors according to age and education. However, there
were no significant differences in transformational behaviors according to gender, marital status, and years of employment. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

Hypothesis 5

Transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment) are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment.

Transformational Leadership Behaviors and Socio-Demographic Variables in Explaining Organizational Commitment

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between five transformational leadership behaviors and five socio-demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment), and the dependent variable of organizational commitment. As shown in Table 4-13, the $F$ value (13.962) for the overall regression equation was significant ($p = .000$). The adjusted $R^2$ indicated the regression equation using the five transformational leadership behaviors and five socio-demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment) explained 24.2% (.242) of the variation in organizational commitment. To analyze the individual predictors, the $t$-statistic was significant for three variables: idealized influence (Attributed) ($t= 2.372^*$), inspirational motivation ($t= 2.502^*$), and age ($t= 3.692^{**}$). Based on the values of the beta ($\beta$) coefficients, the order of relative importance
predictors was age (β= .254), inspirational motivation (β= .199) followed by idealized influence (Attributed) (β= .156).

Table 4-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>BETA (β)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational leadership behaviors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>2.372*</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.498</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>2.502*</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>3.692***</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Employment</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=408

F=13.962                       df=10   P= .000  R²=.260  Adjusted R²=.242

* p<=.05  ** p<=.01  *** p<=.001

The results of multiple regression showed idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and ages were significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment. However, the rest of the variables were not significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment. Therefore, hypothesis 5 was partially supported.
As shown in Table 4-14, a summary listed the results of the hypotheses tested in this study. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported; however, hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were only partially supported.

Table 4-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration).</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>There are significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>There are significant relationships between transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and organizational commitment.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There are significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) according to demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment).</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Transformational leadership behaviors (idealized influence - attributed, idealized influence - behavioral, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) and demographic variables (gender, age, education, marital status, and years of employment) are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment.</td>
<td>Partially supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter IV presented the results of the hypotheses testing. It included the results of socio-demographic information, multifactor leadership profile, organizational commitment profile, hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2, hypothesis 3, hypothesis 4, and hypothesis 5. Chapter V provides a discussion of this study.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Interpretations

The results of hypotheses 1 and 3 supported the relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment. The results of hypothesis 1 showed significant differences in organizational commitment according to high versus low transformational behaviors. This finding suggests that when leaders demonstrate higher levels of transformational leadership behaviors than leaders who do not, their followers will be more committed to the organization. It is possible that when bank leaders exhibit higher levels of transformational leadership behaviors, the practices would be a positive influence to their employees to be more committed to the banks.

The results of hypothesis 3 indicated that there were significant relationships between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment. This finding is consistent with the study of Chen (2004), and suggests that when leaders demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors, their followers will commit to the organization. It is reasonable to conclude that when bank leaders are idealized and become a role model for followers, they encourage followers’ innovation, heighten followers’ motivation, and address the individual follower’s needs, their followers would be inspired to be more committed to the banks.

The results of hypothesis 2 showed the relationships between demographic variables and organizational commitment. The results of hypothesis 2 revealed that there were significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables such as age, marital status, and years of employment, but not education and
gender. These findings are consistent with the study of Sommer, Bue, and Luthans (1996) as to age; consistent with the study of Abdulla and Shaw (1999) as to marital status; consistent with the study of Harrison and Hubbard (1998) as to years of employment; and consistent with the studies of Abdulla and Shaw (1999), Harrison and Hubbard (1998), and Sommer, Bue, and Luthans (1996) as to education. However, this finding is not consistent with the study of Abdulla and Shaw (1999) as to gender. The findings of this study suggest that older, married, and longer-term employees will be more committed to the organization. In addition, employees’ education and gender will not affect their organizational commitment.

The possible explanations for why older, married, and longer-term bank employees are more committed to the banks could be that older bank employees do not like to change their jobs frequently, and it’s hard for them to find other jobs; the married bank employees have more responsibilities to ensure an adequate income for their family, and it’s risky for them to leave their jobs; and the longer the employment the bank employees have, the better they adjust themselves to the organization and the more comfortable they are, and longer-term employees generally hold more desirable positions than newcomers.

It should perhaps not be surprising that bank employees’ education and gender have no correlation to their organizational commitment. The majority of bank employees are college or university graduates, and the environment the banks offer for them such as level of position, salary, and work load could be similar; therefore, their treatment was reflected in their degree of organizational commitment to the banks with few differences shown. The ratio of males to females was almost 50% to 50% in this study. This shows
that males and females could have the same opportunity to work in the banks and there was no gender issue in their responses. This equality of opportunity was reflected in their commitment to the banks with few differences shown.

Hypothesis 4 was supported to the degree that there were significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors according to demographic variables such as age and education. Support was found for the hypothesis that older employees perceived that their leaders exhibited more individual consideration of the five transformational behaviors. Employees with higher levels of education perceived that their leaders demonstrated more idealized influence (attributed) and intellectual stimulation behaviors. There are several possible explanations for these results. Older employees might be more respected and cared for within the organization, which would indicate that employee perception reflects reality. Higher educated employees could be considered as intelligent in the organization and their leaders would like their help; therefore, they perceive more intellectual stimulation and idealized influence (attributed) demonstrated by their leaders.

Hypothesis 5 was supported by the results that transformational leadership behaviors and demographic variables were significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment. The findings that transformational leadership added to the prediction of organizational commitment is consistent with the studies by Arnold, Barling, and Kelloway (2001), Bell-Roundtree (2004), and Kamencik (2003), and the findings that demographic variables added to the prediction of organization is consistent with the studies by Abdulla and Shaw (1999), Harrison and Hubbard (1998), and Sommer, Bae, and Luthans (1996). The findings of this study suggest that leaders’
transformational behaviors and employees' demographic information will add to the predictability of employees' organizational commitment.

Three significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment were idealized influence (attributed), inspirational motivation, and age. It is possible that when bank employees look up to their leaders as role models for inspiration and motivation, they usually follow what their leaders say and will therefore be committed. Older bank employees might be more stable and would therefore be more committed. In short, bank leaders' idealized influence (attributed) and inspirational motivation behaviors, and employees' age are significant explanatory variables of organizational commitment.

Practical Implications

The positive relationship found between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment is valuable for the practical environment. The knowledge found might not only help leaders understand the leader-follower relationship better, but also help them recognize the important of demonstrating transformational leadership behaviors for enhancing their followers' organizational commitment. Transformational leaders are valued because they can foster positive work environments and outcomes.

Bank leaders could demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors and develop a transformational work environment to increase bank employees' organizational commitment. Transformational leadership behaviors include idealized influence (attributed and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1988). The research findings of this study suggest that transformational leadership behaviors can be applied to the banking industry to enhance organizational commitment. To have idealized influence (attributed and
behavior), bank leaders should act as role models for their followers. They should demonstrate high ethical conduct so that their followers would admire, respect, and emulate them. To provide inspirational motivation, bank leaders should inspire and motivate their followers by providing meaning to their followers’ work. They need to articulate an attractive vision of the future to their followers, create expectations that their followers want to meet, and express optimism and confidence for their followers to reach their goals. To offer intellectual stimulation, bank leaders should stimulate their followers to be innovative by approaching old situations in new ways. They should encourage followers to find new ideas for solving problems, and should not publicly criticize individual followers’ mistakes. To increase individualized consideration, bank leaders should pay attention to individual followers’ needs for achievement and growth. They should treat each individual as a whole person; address each individual’s needs and desires; and delegate tasks and offer additional directions if needed to develop the individual’s potential.

Human Resource (HR) departments of banks could seek leaders who have transformational leadership knowledge and behaviors, or employ training programs for developing transformational leaders. Transformational leaders are those who have charisma, have the ability to create visions, can stimulate followers’ innovation, and can develop followers. HR departments should hire transformational leaders or value transformational leaders who have already worked in the banks.

Banks could also employ training programs for developing transformational leaders. Assessment of bank leaders’ leadership behaviors rating by leaders themselves
and their employees could be done before planning suitable training programs. Lectures, study groups, speeches, practice, and ratings could be used in the program.

**Conclusions**

Of the six hypotheses discussed in this paper, hypotheses 1 and 3 tested the relationships between transformational leadership and organizational commitment, and found a strong correlation between the two. Hypothesis 2 showed that there were significant differences in organizational commitment according to demographic variables, such as age, marital status, and years of employment, but not gender and education. Hypothesis 4 indicated that there were significant differences in transformational leadership behaviors according to the demographic variables of age and education. Finally, hypothesis 5 showed that transformational leadership behaviors and demographic variables were predictors of organizational commitment.

The significant correlation between transformational leadership behaviors and organizational commitment suggests that bank leaders should demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors to enhance bank employees' organizational commitment. The first transformational leadership behavior is idealized influence (attributed and behavior), which involves leaders setting examples for their followers to emulate. The second is inspirational motivation, which is demonstrated by leaders creating visions for their followers. The third is to stimulate employees mentally to ensure their innovation. Finally, leaders should give employees individualized consideration to increase their sense of worth within the organization. The result of such leadership is that bank employees should be more committed to their organizations.
The significant differences found in organizational commitment according to demographic variables, such as age, marital status, and years of employment suggest that banks should stress respect and recognition for older, married, and long-term employees. In addition, banks may find that through implementing transformational leadership behaviors, they will develop stronger employee organizational commitment.

To conclude, this study serves as an example to explore the relationship among transformational leadership behaviors, demographic variables, and organizational commitment. As this study has been conducted in Taiwan, perhaps these findings will be a step toward a greater understanding of organizational commitment in the global environment.

**Limitations**

1. This study was restricted to employees of Taiwan’s domestic banks; therefore, the results could not be generalized to Taiwan’s foreign banks and other industries.

2. The quantitative design of this study might lack the depth that a qualitative research design could have produced.

3. By using a cross-sectional design, this study could not draw a firm conclusion of the direction of causality.

4. All variables were measured by the self-report method in this study; therefore, it is possible that the relationships among variables reflect response bias such as self-presentation. The participants might reflect personal biases such as their like or dislike of their leaders.
Recommendations for Future Study

1. Use the leadership Practice Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 1997)) to measure transformational leadership, and the Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment Scales (Meyer & Allen, 1993) to measure organizational commitment.

2. Add antecedent variables of organizational commitment such as organizational climates, ethical climates, organizational culture, organizational support, organizational justice, management training, job satisfaction, and add consequence variables of organizational commitment such as turnover, performance, citizenship, and psychological health to test the consequences of organizational commitment.

3. Compare the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment of domestic banks and that of foreign banks in Taiwan, and compare the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational commitment of Western and Eastern culture.

4. Use a qualitative method to provide further insights of this study.

5. Conduct a longitudinal study to draw a conclusion of causation.

6. Replicate this study in other settings, industries, and other countries.
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You are being asked to participate in my research study. Please read this carefully. This form provides you with information about the study. The Principal Investigator Chien-hong (Tracy) Chu will answer all of your questions. Ask questions about anything you don’t understand before deciding whether or not to participate. You are free to ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH STUDY: The study is about the relationship between transformational leadership and employee organizational commitment. Approximately 1,000 employees (at least 18 years and older) of Taiwan’s domestic banks will be asked to participate in this study.

PROCEDURES:
This survey is an anonymous survey and is used for this study only. Please answer all questions provided by three parts of questionnaires (Socio-Demographic Profile, Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and Organizational Commitment Questionnaire). After filling out the questionnaires, please put them into the self-stamped, pre-addressed envelope and mail them back to the Principal Investigator. By mailing these questionnaires, you give your informed consent to participate in this study. Once the data analysis is done, all documents will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed after five years.

You will first complete a Socio-Demographic Profile. Then you will be asked to complete a Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and an Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. These three surveys should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.
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FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS: There is no financial compensation for your participation in this research. There are no costs to you as a result of your participation in this study.

ANONYMITY: Surveys will be anonymous. You will not be identified and data will be reported as "group" responses. Participation in this survey is voluntary and return of the completed survey will constitute your informed consent to participate.

RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: You are free to choose whether or not to participate in this study. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate.

CONTACTS FOR QUESTIONS/ACCESS TO CONSENT FORM: Any further questions you have about this study or your participation in it, either now or any time in the future, will be answered by Chien-hong (Tracy) Chu (Principal Investigator) who may be reached at: extension [removed] and Dr. E. Bernstein, faculty advisor who may be reached at: [removed]. For any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may call Dr. F. Farazmand, Chair of the Lynn University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at [removed]. If any problems arise as a result of your participation in this study, please call the Principal Investigator Chien-hong (Tracy) Chu and the faculty advisor Dr. E. Bernstein immediately. A copy of this consent form will be given to you.

INVESTIGATOR’S AFFIDAVIT: I have carefully explained to the subject the nature of the above project. The person participating has represented to me that he/she is at least 18 years of age, and that he/she does not have a medical problem or language or educational barrier that precludes his/her understanding of my explanation. I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge the person participating in this project understands clearly the nature, demands, benefits, and risks involved in his/her participation.
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我是朱子紅，林恩大學博士班學生，目前正在研究全球領導，專攻企業與組織管理。進行研究是完成我學業的一部分。

參與者作答說明
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本研究主旨：本研究是有關台灣銀行業界轉換型領導與員工組織承諾之間的關係。大約將有 1000 名台灣本土銀行員工（18 歲或以上）受邀參與此次研究。

程序：這份調查為匿名問卷調查，而且僅供本研究之用。問卷共分成三部份（基本資料問卷、多元因素領導問卷、和組織承諾問卷），請回答全部問題。填完問卷後，請將已填寫好地址的回郵信封內，寄回給主要研究員。在寄回此份問卷時，即表示您知情同意參與本研究。在完成資料分析後，所有文件會被銷在櫃內保存，並於 5 年後銷毁。

首先，您要填寫一份基本資料問卷，之後完成多元因素領導問卷，最後是組織承諾問卷。完成這三份問卷調查大約需要 10 至 15 分鐘。

人類受試者保護機構審查委員會
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可能風險或不安：本研究涉及之風險極微。您可能會發現部份問題本身具有敏感性。此外，參與本研究亦不會佔用您太多的時間和心力。
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退出研究的權利：您可以自由選擇是否參與本研究。選擇不參與不會受到處罰或損失任何您有權享有的利益。

同意書相關問題之聯絡方式：有任何關於本研究或您所參與的研究有任何問題，可以隨時與李克紅主要研究員，聯絡方式是（姓名）分機（分機號碼），以及常見問題回答教授 Dr. E. Bernstein，聯絡方式是（姓名），有關您所研究問題的權利問題，您可致電（姓名）。查詢林恩大學人類受試者保護機構審查委員會主席 Dr. F. Farazmand。若有因參與本研究而產生的問題，請立即告知主要研究員李克紅和指導教授 Dr. E. Bernstein。

研究員宣誓：本人已向研究對象充分說明上述研究計劃內容。參與者已向本人表明，他／她年滿 18 歲，對於本研究的說明，參與者本人並無會無法瞭解說明的障礙問題，其語言或教於之障礙。本人特此保證，盡本人所知，本研究計劃之參與者清楚本研究的性質，以及瞭解他／她參與本研究之要求、利益、和風險。
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APPENDIX D

Survey Instrument
Socio-Demographic Profile

Please check ✓ on the □.

1. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female

2. Age:  □ 20 or under 20  □ 21 to 30  □ 31 to 40  □ 41 to 50  □ over 50

3. Education:  □ Elementary or under  □ High school  □ College
   □ University  □ Master

4. Marital status:  □ Single  □ Married

5. Years of employment:  □ 2 years or under  □ 3 years to 5 years
   □ 6 years to 10 years  □ over 10 years
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
(Transformational Leadership Style)
Rater Form

This questionnaire is to describe transformational leadership of the person you report to as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet.

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

1. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate........0 1 2 3 4
2. Talks about their most important values and beliefs........................................0 1 2 3 4
3. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems...........................................0 1 2 3 4
4. Talks optimistically about the future............................................................0 1 2 3 4
5. Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her............................................0 1 2 3 4
6. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished..................................0 1 2 3 4
7. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose................................0 1 2 3 4
8. Spends time teaching and coaching.................................................................0 1 2 3 4
9. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group..............................................0 1 2 3 4
10. Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group..........................0 1 2 3 4
11. Acts in ways that builds my respect.........................................................................0 1 2 3 4
12. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.....................................0 1 2 3 4
13. Displays a sense of power and confidence............................................................0 1 2 3 4
14. Articulates a compelling vision of the future..........................................................0 1 2 3 4
15. Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others...........0 1 2 3 4
16. Gets me to look at problems from many different angles........................................0 1 2 3 4
17. Helps me to develop my strengths.............................................................................0 1 2 3 4
18. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments...................................0 1 2 3 4
19. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission............................0 1 2 3 4
20. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved....................................................0 1 2 3 4

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. All rights reserved. Distributed by Mind Garden, Inc., 1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 (650) 261-3500

Note. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire from Mind Garden, Inc. by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio. Adapted with permission of the authors.
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

This questionnaire includes a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the organization for which they work. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately 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>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.........................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization........................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.........................................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. I find that my values and the organization’s values are very similar........1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization......................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the types of work were similar............................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.................................................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization....................................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.................................................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees.................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I really care about the fate of this organization........................................1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.....1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part...1 2 3 4 5 6 7

© L. W. Porter and F. J. Smith

Note. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire from Behavioral Measurement Database Services by L. W. Porter and F. J. Smith. Adapted with permission of the authors.
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Survey Instrument (Chinese)
基本資料問卷

請在框內打勾

1. 性別：  [ ] 男性  [ ] 女性

2. 年齡：  [ ] 20 歲或20 歲以下  [ ] 21-30 歲  [ ] 31-40 歲
   [ ] 41-50 歲  [ ] 50 歲以上

3. 教育程度：  [ ] 小學或小學以下  [ ] 高中  [ ] 專科  [ ] 大學
   [ ] 碩士

4. 婚姻狀況：  [ ] 單身  [ ] 已婚

5. 就業年資：  [ ] 2 年或2年以下  [ ] 3-5 年  [ ] 6-10年  [ ] 10年以上

Global Translation Center

We, Global Translation Center, do hereby certify that this document written in Chinese
is translated into English by our translator and the translation is
proved to be true and accurate without any
error.
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Chang Hsiao
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此份問卷是要描繪您所觀察到的直接主管的轉型型領導風格，請回答此答案卷上所有問題。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>完全沒有</th>
<th>偶爾</th>
<th>有時</th>
<th>經常</th>
<th>非常頻繁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 重複檢視關鍵假設，質疑它們是否適當。  
2. 談論他們最重要的價值和信仰。  
3. 解決問題時，採用不同的觀點。  
4. 樂觀地談論未來。  
5. 向我灌輸與我／她合作是值得驕傲的。  
6. 滿懷熱情地談論需要完成的事情。  
7. 詳細說明困難目標的重要性。  
8. 花時間傳授與指導。  
9. 將個人利益放在團隊利益之外。  
10. 視我為個體，而不是團隊一份子而已。  
11. 行為舉止令我尊敬。  
12. 考慮決策的道德與倫理後果。  
13. 展現權力和自信。  
14. 明確說明目前目標的未來遠景。  
15. 認為我有與其他人相同的責任、能力，和機會。  
16. 讓我以不同的角度思考問題。  
17. 幫助我發展我的優勢。  
18. 建議思考如何完成任務的新方法。  
19. 強調集體使命感的重要性。  
20. 表現出能達成目標的自信。
組織承諾問卷

本問卷內容包括一系列的敘述，陳述個人對所服務的組織可能會有的感覺。請指出您對每個敘述同意或不同意的程度。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>程度</th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>有點不同意</th>
<th>沒意見</th>
<th>有點同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 爲了幫助這個組織成功，我願意比正常時期付出更多心力。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

2. 我會向朋友說這個組織是一個值得效力的好組織。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

3. 我對這個組織只有一點點忠誠度。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

4. 爲了能繼續為這個組織效力，幾乎任何型態的工作我都願意接受。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

5. 我覺得我的價值觀和組織的價值觀非常接近。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

6. 我很自豪地告訴其他人我是這個組織的一份子。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

7. 只要工作型態類似，我也可以到不同的組織。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

8. 這個組織真的能激發我有最好的工作表現。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

9. 我目前的環境只要有少許變化，就足以引起我離開這個組織。
   [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

10. 我十分高興當初選擇為這個組織工作，而不是當時考慮的其他幾家。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

11. 繼續無限期留在這個組織得不到什麼好處。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

12. 在與員工作業的重要業務上，我經常覺得很難去同意這個組織的政策。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

13. 我真的很關心這個組織的命運。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

14. 對我而言，這裡是所有可能的組織中最值得我效力的地方。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

15. 決定在這個組織工作確實是我的錯誤。
    [ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ] 3 [ ] 4 [ ] 5 [ ] 6 [ ] 7

* 本問卷由 T. W. Porter 和 D. Smith 聯合製作。
* 翻譯：組織承諾問卷
* 中華民國政府登記立案
* 台北市發問公會授權編號 053

Global Translation Center

We, Global Translation Center, do hereby certify that this document, written in Chinese, is translated into English by our translator, [last name] and the translation is proved to be true and accurate without any error.

Signed: [signature]
Affixed in Taipei, Taiwan
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Permission Letter from the Instrument Developers
MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Permission Set

Leader Form, Rater Form, and Scoring Key for MLQ Form 5x-Short

Permission for Chien-Hong Chu to reproduce either leader or rater forms for up to 1000 copies in one year from date of purchase:

August 30, 2005

by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio

Distributed by Mind Garden, Inc.
1690 Woodside Road Suite 202, Redwood City California 94061 USA
Phone: (650) 261-3500 Fax: (650) 261-3505
info@mindgarden.com
www.mindgarden.com

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.

It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If any part of this Work (e.g., scoring, items, etc.) is put on an electronic or other media, you agree to remove this Work from that media at the end of this license. The copyright holder has agreed to grant permission to reproduce the above number of copies of this work for one year from the date of purchase for non-commercial use only. Non-commercial use means that you will not receive payment for distributing this document. If you need to make additional copies than the above stated, please contact MIND GARDEN.
To: Chien-Hong Chu  
From: Evelyn Perloff, PhD  
Date: August 11, 2005

Enclosed is the:

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire  
L. W. Porter and F. J. Smith

As I have indicated authors like to receive feedback on your study. All that is asked is that you provide a brief summary of your findings upon completion of your study/project. In addition, we encourage you to send a full report which we will consider for inclusion in Health and Psychosocial Instruments (HaPI) and which you may list on your vita/resume.

Enclosed also is an invoice. It covers the cost (e.g., handling, postage, and copyright fee) for these instruments.

Please note that the instruments are for a single study only. It is, of course, necessary to provide the appropriate title and author credit in reproduced material and in your report.

The enclosed material comes with the author(s) permission for its administration.
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美國林恩大學 (Lynn University) 全球企業領導博士班學生朱千紅小姐

為完成 "轉換型領導與員工組織承諾關係-以臺灣的銀行業界為例" 之

論文研究，需對銀行業界行員做問卷調查 (問卷包括基本資料問卷、

多元因素領導問卷、組織承諾問卷等三種) 一事，本行可協助將問卷
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