

Tringë Krasniqi¹
Aleksandra Janeska Iliev²
Ljubomir Drakulevski³

DISCOVERING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: THE CASE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR OF A DEVELOPING COUNTRY⁴

There has been great interest evolving around leadership ever since so, scholars have been challenged by various variables that have been considered relevant for discovering some of the complexities related to leaders. The output orientation of organizational commitment and employee engagement naturally seeks a relationship with leadership. Hence discovering the relationships among leadership and organizational commitment considering the context of Kosovo is one of the main aims of this paper. The presented work reflects three leadership styles that will be considered: laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational, and three dimensions of organizational commitment: affective, normative, and continuance. The main aim is oriented towards understanding relationships and what they will bring to the organizational context. At this stage, the paper utilizes Pearson's Correlation, whereas collected data was gathered through questionnaires distributed to employees and managers in the private sector in Kosovo. A total of 202 samples were collected using random sampling from diverse industries including retail, manufacturing, service, construction, and wholesale. The results of this paper provide some insights and, in this respect, confirm that leadership styles have a moderate positive correlation with organizational commitment. That implies that organizational commitment will eventually determine leadership in organizations and in this line bring forward new possible discussions in the respective field.

Keywords: Leadership styles; laissez-faire; transactional; transformational; organizational commitment

JEL: M12; D23; D91

¹ Tringë Krasniqi, Teaching Assistant, Faculty of Economics, University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina", e-mail: tringe.krasniqi@uni-pr.edu.

² Aleksandra Janeska Iliev, Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics – Skopje, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, aleksandra.janeska-iliev@eccf.ukim.edu.mk.

³ Ljubomir Drakulevski, Full Professor, Faculty of Economics – Skopje, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, ljubomir.drakulevski@eccf.ukim.edu.mk.

⁴ This paper should be cited as: Krasniqi, T., Iliev, A. J., Drakulevski, L. (2024). Discovering the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment: The Case of the Private Sector of a Developing Country. – *Economic Studies (Ikonomicheski Izsledvania)*, 33(6), pp. 71-87.

Introduction

Leaders who succeed in creating a positive work environment, trust, and align organizational goals with individual aspirations are more likely to cultivate committed and engaged employees.

While, on the other side commitment can lead to increased productivity, reduced turnover, and overall organizational success. Therefore, one organizational factor that is considered a key determinant of organizational commitment is leadership (Mowday et al., 1982; Keskes, 2014).

Many scholars have studied and presented evidence about different leadership styles that leaders can adopt to encourage employees to aspire to the highest level of commitment (Bogler, 2015; Oladipo et al., 2016; Beauty, Aigbogun, 2022). Nevertheless, it still raises various discussions within the academic community. The concept of organizational commitment, which is central to individual and organizational performance, refers to the relationship between an organization and its employees (Swales, 2002; Öztekin et al., 2015).

What defines an excellent leader? This is one of many questions that have arisen over time regarding leadership in all organizations and society. There is no society with a complete absence of leadership and leadership itself is influenced by the organizations and the broader societal context in which it operates (Bass, 1997; Van Beveren et al., 2017). Effective leadership is considered one of the key elements to keep the employees committed to the organization. Therefore, organizations should consider leadership approaches and use them to educate managers on the complexities of leading people. Also, leaders need to manage and motivate their employees to reach their maximum potential, be engaged, embrace change, and make good technical decisions (Silva, Mendis, 2017).

Every organization makes an effort to have employees who demonstrate a strong organizational commitment to their company. Organizational commitment is considered a main factor in employee engagement and overall organizational success. This creates a positive bond between employees and leaders where dedicated employees contribute to the company's prosperity and loyalty. Organizations that have a strong organizational commitment tend to achieve their goals more effectively and employees tend to be more productive which means higher profitability for the organization (Setiawan et al., 2019; Purnomo et al., 2020).

The target of organizations are employees who are committed to achieving the company's objectives, and one of the factors that determine employee commitment is leadership. Therefore, in this paper, we will investigate the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment, based on data from respondents of private enterprises in Kosovo from different sectors. Furthermore, the research will determine which of the factors keep the employee more committed to the organization such as emotional connection with the organization (affective commitment), the cost of leaving the organization (continuance commitment), or simply feeling a sense of responsibility and obligation to the organization (normative commitment).

Very few studies on this topic have been conducted in developing countries (Yahaya, Ebrahim, 2016), even less in Kosovo, a country that after **15 years of independence** remains a country in transition. Given the context, it becomes imperative to rigorously examine the potential correlation between leadership paradigms and employee allegiance within private enterprises in Kosovo. Therefore, this relationship could demonstrate a base for further research as well as for raising new questions. For instance, leadership could be considered further in coherence with employees' organizational loyalty which is a dimension strongly related to the abovementioned organizational commitments. The results offer solutions for companies while seeking and fostering organizational commitment with the aim of achieving greater performance. Therefore, this research effort tries to address some of these issues and present some new reflections on the topic of leadership building up the base for even stronger discussions among scholars and generate new research ideas.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Leadership

According to Bhattacharyya and Jha (2018), the act of leadership is considered to be as old as human civilization and one of the fundamental pillars for the progress of human civilization has been humankind's ability to work in teams (Bhattacharyya, Jha, 2018). This topic is multi-layered and multi-disciplinary and its identification, explanation, and description require the simultaneous use of different approaches and conceptual frameworks (Davidkov, 2005; Mladenova, Davidkov, 2023). Leadership is one of the most widely researched and discussed topics in all areas of organizational sciences because literally nothing gets accomplished without it (Yammarino, 2013). It is not surprising that researchers have such an overwhelming interest in the topic because leadership issues are vital for organizational success (Kumar, Kaptan, 2007; Yahaya, Ebrahim, 2016).

The term "leadership" has only been in use since the late 1700s, although the concept of a "leader" has existed since the 1300s (Stogdill, 1974; King, 1990). The term was introduced by G.W. Allport (1937), with reference to different types of personality or behaviour and it is specific to psychology (Vasilescu, 2019). However scientific research on the topic did not begin until the twentieth century (Bass, 1981; King, 1990). Since then, there has been intensive research on this topic (King, 1990).

Leadership is defined as the ability of an individual to motivate, influence, and enable a specific group of people to contribute to increasing the effectiveness and success of the organization (House et al. 1999; Karacsony et al., 2020). Leadership is a disposition agreed upon based on signs of eligibility to be a member of the leader who leads in an organization (Chaurasia, Shukla, 2013; Hajiali, 2022).

Therefore, leadership is essential for creating a clear vision, motivating people, leading individuals and organizations to success creating a positive and productive work environment, promoting innovation, and helping organizations navigate challenges and opportunities (Ejike, 2022). According to Ejike (2022), leadership is challenging and many

Krasniqi, T., Iliev, A. J., Drakulevski, L. (2024). Discovering the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment: The Case of the Private Sector of a Developing Country.

of the leaders are neither aware of their leadership style nor know how to improve it to become more effective.

2.1.1. Transactional Leadership

Within contemporary discussions of leadership, leveraged by traditional leadership theory, transactional and transformational leadership have been often reaffirmed. Burns (1978) who pioneered the study of transactional leadership indicated that transactional leaders are those who seek to motivate followers by appealing to their self-interests (Lo, et al., 2009).

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, leadership theories began to diverge from the specific perspectives of the leader, leadership context, and the follower and toward practices that concentrated further on the exchanges between the followers and leaders. Transactional leadership was described as that in which leader-follower associations were grounded upon a series of agreements between followers and leaders (House, Shamir, 1993; Khan et al., 2016).

Transactional leaders can be defined as those who set explicit, work-related goals and determine the rewards that can be expected for performing successfully. However, the implication is that they do not do this proactively or in close cooperation with each team member (Rowold, 2011; Jangsiriwattana, 2019). Some studies revealed that transactional leadership shows a discrepancy between the level of leaders' actions and the nature of the relations with the followers (Khan et al., 2016).

2.1.2. Transformational Leadership

The natural coherence in leadership research has been considered also transformational leadership being the natural follow-up of transactional leadership. The word “to transform” as a term means to change the appearance or character of something completely or someone, especially so that thing or person is improved (Cambridge Dictionary, 2015; Cetin, Kinik, 2015). Transformational leadership sets the standard level of human interaction between the leader and follower and this can be accomplished by the relationship the leader develops with followers wanting to exceed to the next level therefore creating a new era of leaders (Banerji, Krishnan, 2000; Gray, Williams, 2012).

Transformational leaders transform the values of followers to support the vision and organizational goals by creating a climate of trust and in which visions can be shared (Stone, Russell, Patterson, 2004; Cetin, Kinik, 2015). Transformational leadership improves job satisfaction and followers' job performance through the use of inspiring, supporting, and challenging followers (Dumdum, Lowe, Avolio, 2013; Judge, Piccolo, 2004; Wang, Oh, Courtright, Colbert, 2011; Breevaart, Zacher, 2019).

2.1.3. Laissez-faire Leadership

The term "laissez-faire" is mostly used in economics and political science to define a policy of minimal governmental interference in the economic affairs of individuals and society (Encyclopædia Britannica, and; Tosunoglu, Ekmekci, 2016). According to Northouse (2010), the term laissez-faire refers to a "hands-off, let things ride". Laissez-faire leadership style is considered to be the style that tends to avoid and relinquish one's responsibilities (Hinkin, Schriesheim, 2008b; Skogstad, Hetland, et al., 2014; Robert, Vandenberghe, 2021), makes it less effective and less satisfied style (Bass & Bass, 2008; Robert and Vandenberghe, 2021). Because, leaders who use this leadership style tend to avoid making decisions, abdicate their responsibilities, delay actions, and refrain from using the authority associated with their roles (Robert, Vandenberghe, 2021; Bass, Bass, 2008; Den Hartog et al., 1997).

Kelloway et al. (2005) mentioned two types of negative leaders. The first type consists of active behaviours that are related to a destructive manner and the second type is described by passive behaviours, including laissez-faire leadership (Nguyen et al., 2017). Some researchers might consider laissez-faire leaders as displaying leadership skills that attract and avoid conflict management styles (Gray, Williams, 2012).

2.2. Organizational commitment

Despite organizational commitment had been a subject of study during the 1960s and 1970s, it only gained popularity in the 1980s since it has dominated as one of the most popular topics leaving behind topics such as trust, organizational citizenship behaviour, and extra-role behaviour (Giacalone, Greenberg, 1997; Roe et. al, 2009). The publications that contributed to its popularity in that period were by authors such as Walton (1985; Roe et al., 2009), who sparked managers' interest in "management by commitment" rather than "management by control" and the group of authors such as Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982; Roe et al., 2009).

The key to organizational success depends on the commitment of employees toward the organization. Organizational commitment is a situation where an employee is in line with a particular organization as well as the goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Robbins, Judge, 2007; Sjahrudin, Sudiro, 2013).

Organizational commitment is also defined by Allen and Mayer (1997; Malaysia, 2016) as the desire of employees to remain employed with their organization. George and Jones (1996) said that employees who are committed to the organization like to be members of the organization, believe in the organization have good feelings about the organization, are willing to defend the organization, and want to do something good for the organization (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2014; Yandi and Havidz, 2022). Mowday et al. (1979) conceived organizational commitment as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization". O'Reilly et al. (1991) defined commitment as the psychological bond an individual has with an organization, including job involvement, loyalty, and belief in organizational values (Abstar, Das Swain, 2009). According to Rehman, et al. (2012; Asaari, 2020), organizational commitment in the research represents a major influence on the relationship between employees and their employing organization (Jussila et al., 2012; Zainuddin, Asaari, 2020).

2.2.1. Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a broad popularity researched component of employee attitudes (Gokyer, 2018; Bawuro et al., 2018; Meyer et al., 2002; Meyer, Herscovitch, 2001; Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974; Chughtai, Zafar, 2006; Mowday et al., 1982; Abu-Saad, Haj, 2020). Reilly and Chatman (1986) presented three dimensions of commitment including compliance, identification and internalization. Calculating direction given by Penley and Gould (1988), Meyer and Allen (1991) established a model with affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Sabir et al., 2010).

Affective commitment represents an emotional connection, identification, and involvement with the organization. The third dimension of commitment is normative commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990; Meyer et al., 2002) later suggested this distinguishable component to the model which reflects a perceived obligation that may have employees toward their organization (Meyer, Allen, 1991, 1997; Meyer et. al, 2002).

Affective commitment is the emotional bond of employees toward the organization (Wankel 2009; Sabir et al, 2010). Affective commitment consists of three factors: beliefs, willingness, and desire toward the organizational goal (Porter 1974; Sabir et al, 2010). Mowday (1982; Sabir et. al, 2010) categorized affective commitment with personal and structural characteristics, job and work experience. This dimension leans towards a psychological perspective, where emphasis is placed on the binding force between the person and the organization. Employees who are identified with strong affective commitment desire to continue being a member of the organization, accepting values and goals from the organization taking in exchange psychological rewards, such as support or recognition (Mowday et al., 1979; Mathieu, Zajac, 1990; Herrera, 2021).

Continuance commitment refers to the benefits an employee receives from leaving the organization or staying in the organization as an investment of the employee. This investment may be due to retirement or emotional attachment to other employees (Sabir et al., 2010). Continuance commitment is based on the principle of social exchange, where an individual's commitment to an organization is a result of the small investments they have made over time and these investments prevent voluntary disengagement from the organization (Becker, 1960; Herrea, 2021). This perspective was later developed by Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997; Herrea, 2021) where it was named Commitment to Continuity (CC) (Herrea, 2021).

Normative Commitment, known as the third dimension of Meyer and Allen (1991), focuses on a work ethic and the responsibility that the employees provide toward the organization which drives them to perform their jobs to the best of their abilities in any circumstance (Herrea, 2021). Normative Commitment (NC) refers to an employee's feeling of obligation towards their organization and represents the value of loyalty and responsibility that an employee exhibits towards the organization (Meyer, Allen, 1991; Sabir et al, 2010).

2.3. Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment

One organizational factor that is considered a key determinant of organizational commitment is leadership (Mowday et al., 1982; Keskes, 2014). An important number of research studies

provided significant results putting forth that leadership behaviour has a positive effect on organizational commitment (Adebayo, 2010; Akbolat, Isik, Yilmaz, 2013; Avolio, Zhu, Koh, Bhatia, 2004; Huang, 2000; Cilek, 2019).

Leadership effectiveness can be measured through organizational commitment, which provides a broad measure of the effectiveness of leadership and offers a way to explore further the subject of the relationship between leadership and commitment. Specifically, leaders have the responsibility to emphasize to their employees their link and contribution to the success of the organization and they should also understand the significance of developing a positive relationship with their employees in order to enhance the level of commitment to the organization (Truckenbrodt, 2000; Keskes, 2014).

After analyzing the arguments presented above, we suggest the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis

H1. Leadership has a positive linear correlation with organizational commitment.

H1a. Transactional leadership has a positive linear correlation with effective commitment.

H1b. Transactional leadership has a positive linear correlation with continuance commitment.

H1c. Transactional leadership has a positive linear correlation with normative commitment.

H1d. Transformational Leadership has a linear correlation with effective commitment.

H1e. Transformational Leadership has a positive linear correlation with continuance commitment.

H1f. Transformational Leadership has a positive linear correlation with normative commitment.

H1g. Laissez-faire has a positive linear correlation with effective commitment.

H1h. Laissez-faire has a positive linear correlation with continuance commitment.

H1j. Transformational Leadership has a positive linear correlation with normative commitment.

3. Methodology

Sampling size

This study utilized a random sampling method and involved 202 participants as its respondents. It should be noted that the survey was distributed widely to a group of over 450 potential respondents but less than 44.88% of the distributed surveys were returned.

Data collection

Data was collected using two ways. In most of the organizations, the questionnaire was completed online with a Google Form (175), with the link being provided to the participants.

Krasniqi, T., Iliev, A. J., Drakulevski, L. (2024). Discovering the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment: The Case of the Private Sector of a Developing Country.

In recent years, the availability and relatively low cost of professional online samples have caused their use as a data collection tool to skyrocket (e.g., Aguinis et al. 2021, Bernerth et al. 2021; Zickar and Keith, 2023). In the beginning, the research author contacted managers in every organization that was part of the study (mainly entrepreneurs). The link was then shared by them with employees and managers of organizations. For 27 employees who had difficulty completing the questionnaire and asked for additional clarification, the questionnaires were filled in person, and administered by a person with authority in the organization who had previously been instructed by the authors of the research.

Questionnaire data were automatically generated in an Excel sheet which was then imported into the SPSS (SPSS Statistics 27) database.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire completed for this research consists of three sections. The first section has 18 questions related to organizational commitment. The second section has 19 questions related to leadership styles. The third section has a total of 8 questions related to demographic data.

All the questions for organizational commitment and leadership style are measured by using a Likert scale. A five-point Likert scale questionnaire was developed to provide respondents with the convenience of answering questions according to their level of agreement (McLeod, 2008; Khudhair et al., 2022).

Measurement of Variables

Instrument for organizational commitment

To measure organizational commitment for this study we used the scale from Allen and Meyer (1991, 1993) adapted from Bar-Haim (2019). The authors made some changes to their instrument by reforming and refining it into an 18-item instrument with 6 items for each of three dimensions which are affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Khajuria and Khan, 2022). Each item on this scale was rated on a 5-point scale. The Cronbach's α for this scale was 0.767.

Instrument for Leadership styles

To measure transactional leadership for this study we used a MLQ developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). Eight items were rated on a five-point Likert scale. Cronbach's α of the scale for transactional leadership is 0.789.

To measure transformational leadership, we used the scale from Carless, Wearing, and Mann (2002). Seven items of the scale were rated on a five-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's α of the scale for transformational leadership is 0.924.

To measure laissez-faire leadership was used also multifactor MLQ by Bass and Avolio (1995) and four items of this scale were rated on a five-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's α of laissez faire leadership scale is 0.857.

The questionnaire for leadership styles was in rater form which means that others perceive the leader's leadership behaviors.

Respondents profile

In this study participated total of 202 employees and managers from the private sector. Of the respondents through the questionnaire distributed can be concluded that 126 (62.4%) of the respondents were males and 69 (34.2%) were females. The youngest was 19 years old and the oldest was 64 years old. The average was 35 years old. The majority of the respondents 65.8%, were married, 26.7% were single and 6.4% chose not to answer. While regarding the education of the respondents, 78 (38.6%) had a Bachelor's degree, 71 (35.1%) had a Master's degree, 20 (9.9%) had higher or middle school education, and 13 (6.4%) had a PhD or PhD students. Most of the respondents had a diploma (n=202, 81%).

Regarding the years of service in the organization, the minimum number of services was 1, while the maximum was 35. Respondent answered an open question about the length of service in the current organization, and the results show that 1 year was the minimum and 35 years was the maximum. Furthermore, 123 (52.3%) of them were in managerial positions and 79 (33.6%) were in non-managerial positions. The cross-tabulation between gender and position of the respondents shows that even in the attempt of society to promote gender equality in management positions the findings show a stronger presence of men in managerial positions (90 out of 123 respondents from management positions) and in non-managerial positions females (42 out of 79 respondents from non-managerial positions). Of the 123 respondents from managerial positions, 10.9% were part of the top, 35.6% were in the middle, and 14.9% were part of the low level of the managerial hierarchy. The majority of respondents work in the service sector 58 (28.2%), 47 (20.0%) work in the manufacturing sector, 45 (19.1%) in the retail sector, and 20 (8.9%) in the wholesale.

Validity and Reliability

To interpret Cronbach's alpha coefficient in this study, we used the general rule presented by the authors George and Mallery (2003). They presented an accepted rule for describing internal consistency when using Cronbach's alpha, and they interpret the value alpha as follows: when $\alpha \geq 0.90$ is considered excellent, $0.80 \leq \alpha < 0.90$ is good, $0.70 \leq \alpha < 0.80$ is acceptable, $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.70$ is questionable. 0.60 is weak and when $\alpha < 0.5$ is considered unacceptable. The results of our study show that Cronbach's α coefficient for each variable is: organizational commitment $\alpha=0.767$, laissez-faire leadership $\alpha=0.857$, transactional leadership $\alpha=0.789$ and transformational leadership $\alpha=0.924$. Therefore, considering that the coefficient α of the model and its average for each variable was higher than 0.70 confirms the reliability of the model.

Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents results from descriptive statistics for leadership styles. The mean value for the laissez-faire leadership style is 2.3676 (between low and medium) and the standard deviation is 1.12832. The mean value for transactional leadership style is 3.7420 (high) and the standard deviation is .70193. The mean value for transformational leadership style is 4.0021 (high) and the standard deviation is .85945. The leadership style questionnaire was in rater form which means that others perceive the leader's leadership behaviors. Of the responses from the participants, the most depicted leadership style from leaders in organizations is transformational leadership. The less-depicted leadership style is laissez faire which means that managers do not display a level of refusal to assume the responsibilities that are part of their position.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of three leadership styles

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Laissez-Faire Leadership	202	2.3676	1.12832
Transactional Leadership	202	3.7420	0.70193
Transformational Leadership	202	4.0021	0.85945
Valid N (listwise)	202		

From 1.00 to less than 2.33 = low, from 2.33 to 3.66 medium, and from 3.67 to 5.00 = high, (Al-Daibat, 2017).

Source: Prepared by the authors

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of organizational commitment

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Affective Commitment	202	3.2409	0.60789
Continuance commitment	202	3.5396	0.70970
Normative Commitment	202	3.4818	0.79711
Valid N (listwise)	202		

From 1.00 to less than 2.33 = low, from 2.33 to 3.66 medium, and from 3.67 to 5.00 = high, (Al-Daibat, 2017).

Source: Prepared by the authors

Table 2 presents results from descriptive data for organizational commitment, in detail for the three organizational commitment dimensions. Meyer and Allen (1997) do not guide about expected, desired, average, or ideal means for organizational commitment scales (namely affective, continuance, and normative commitment). Instead, they and other researchers (Allen, Meyer, 1996; Dunham, Grube, Castaneda, 1994) examined whether there was a positive or negative relationship between the different types of organizational commitment, the outcomes that are being measured, as well as the pattern for those findings (Garg, Ramjee, 2013). The scores for the three dimensions are above the average. Normative commitment (NC) has the highest standard deviation, where the mean value is 3.4818 (medium), and the standard deviation is .79711, which means that most of the participants feel that have obligations towards organizations and are loyal to the organizations but not because they have an emotional relationship with the organization. This is followed by continuance commitment (CC) with a mean value of 3.5396 (medium) and a strong deviation of 0.70970. This dimension also has a score above the average which means that employees stay in a current organization because they take into consideration the cost of leaving of organization.

The standard deviation for affective commitment (AC) is the lowest but also is above the average. The lowest score for this dimension means that employees do not have a strong emotional attachment to the organization.

4. Results and Analysis

Table 3 below presents the results of the multicollinearity and variance inflation factor (VIF) between leadership styles and dependent variables which are dimensions of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative). Belsley (1992; Shrestha, 2020) shows how to interpret the VIF value when it takes certain values as below. If the value of VIF is 1 indicates that the independent variables are not correlated with each other. If VIF is between 1 and 5, variables are only moderately correlated. But if VIF is between 5 and 10, variables are highly correlated, which can make it difficult to accurately estimate regression coefficients. A VIF value above 10 indicates that multicollinearity is present and that regression coefficients are weakly estimated (Belsley, 1991; Shrestha, 2020), so in this study correlation between leadership styles (laissez-faire, transactional, transformational) with affective commitment as a depended variable is between 1 and 5 which indicated a moderate correlation between those variables. None of the VIF values in this study exceed value 5, indicating that multicollinearity will not be a problem in the regression model.

The results found a moderate correlation between leadership styles, specifically laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational, and continuance commitment as the dependent variable. The correlation score ranged from 1 to 5. Additionally, the VIF values were all less than value 5, indicating that multicollinearity would not pose a problem in the regression model.

The results found a moderate correlation between leadership styles (laissez-faire, transactional, transformational) and normative commitment, with a correlation score ranging from 1 to 5. Additionally, none of the VIF values exceed value 5, indicating that multicollinearity will not be a concern for the regression mode.

Table 3. Multicollinearity

		Collinearity Tolerance	Statistics VIF
1. Dependent Variable: affective commitment (AC)	Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.843	1.186
	Transactional Leadership	0.555	1.802
	Transformational Leadership	0.507	1.972
2. Dependent Variable: continuance commitment (CC)	Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.843	1.186
	Transactional Leadership	0.555	1.802
	Transformational Leadership	0.507	1.972
3. Dependent variable: Normative commitment (NC)	Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.843	1.186
	Transactional Leadership	0.555	1.802
	Transformational Leadership	0.507	1.972

Source: Prepared by the authors.

According to Asuero et al. (2016), the rule of thumb scale to evaluate the strength of the correlation is: 0.90 to 1.00 very high correlation, 0.70-1.89 high, 0.50-0.69 moderate, 0.30-0.49 low and 0.00-0.29 little if any correlation. Based on this rule it's interpreted the results from the table below (Table 4).

Table 4. Pearson correlation between leadership styles and organizational commitment

		Organizational Commitment	Affective Commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative Commitment
Leadership Styles	Pearson Correlation	0.617**	-	-	-
	Sig (2-tailed)	<0.001	-	-	-
	N	202	-	-	-
Laissez-Faire Leadership	Pearson Correlation	-	0.398**	0.209**	0.053
	Sig (2-tailed)	-	<0.001	0.003	0.455
	N	-	202	202	202
Transactional Leadership	Pearson Correlation	-	0.270**	0.304**	0.477**
	Sig (2-tailed)	-	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	N	-	202	202	202
Transformational Leadership	Pearson Correlation	-	0.239**	0.370**	0.536**
	Sig (2-tailed)	-	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
	N	-	202	202	202

Source: Prepared by the authors.

Table 4 above presents the Pearson correlation between three leadership styles and organizational commitment dimensions. The Pearson correlation coefficient between leadership styles and organizational commitment is 0.617. Since this number is between 0.50 to 0.69 indicates a moderate positive linear correlation between the two variables. The p-value is <0.001. Since the value is less than the accepted value of 0.05, indicating a statistically significant association between leadership styles and organizational commitment.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment is 0.398. Since this number is between 0.30 to 0.49 indicates a low but positive linear correlation between the two variables. The p-value is <0.001. Since the value is less than 0.05 the two variables have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between laissez-faire leadership and continuance commitment is 0.209. Since this number is between 0.00 and 0.29 indicates negligible correlation or little if any correlation between the two variables. The p-value <0.003. Since the value is less than 0.05, laissez-faire leadership and continuance commitment have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between laissez-faire leadership and normative commitment is 0.053. Since this number between 0.00 and 0.24 indicates negligible or little if any positive correlation between two variables. The p-value <0.455. Since this value is not less than 0.05 the two variables don't have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transactional leadership and affective commitment is 0.270. Since this number is between 0.00 and 0.29 indicates negligible correlation or little if any correlation between the two variables. The p-value <0.001. Since this value is less than 0.05 the two variables have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transactional leadership and continuance commitment is 0.304. Since this number is between 0.30 to 0.49 indicates a low positive linear correlation between the two variables. The p-value <.001. Since this value is less than

the accepted value of 0.05, indicating a statistically significant association between transactional leadership and continuance commitment.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transactional leadership and normative commitment is 0.239. Since this number is between .00 to 0.29 indicates a low positive linear correlation between the two variables. The p-value <0.001. Since the value is less than 0.05 the two variables have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transformational leadership and affective commitment is 0.239. Since this number is between 0.00 and 0.29 indicates negligible or little if any correlation between two variables. The p-value <0.001. Since the value is less than the accepted value of 0.05, transformational leadership and affective commitment have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transformational leadership and continuance commitment is 0.370. Since this number is between 0.30 to 0.49 indicates a low but positive correlation between the two variables. The p-value <0.001. Since the value is less than 0.05 the two variables have a statistically significant association.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between transformational leadership and normative commitment is 0.536. Since this number is between 0.50 to 0.69 indicates a moderate positive correlation between the two variables. The p-value <0.001. Since the value is less than 0.05 indicating a statistically significant association between transformational leadership and normative commitment.

The results of our study demonstrate varying degrees of correlation between three leadership styles and three organizational commitment dimensions. Generally, there's a statistically significant association between most leadership styles and commitment dimensions, with strengths of correlations ranging from negligible to moderate. However, laissez-faire leadership's association with normative commitment is not statistically significant, indicating no strong relationship between these variables.

5. Discussions

The results provided a broader picture setting the tone for future research efforts. In this perspective starting with descriptive statistics where it is indicated that the average score across the three dimensions of organizational commitment is higher than the mean. The results suggest that most of the respondents feel that they have obligations toward the organization and should be loyal to it, but not necessarily because of an emotional bond they have with the organization. The continuance commitment dimension also scores above the average, indicating that many employees remain in their current organization because they weigh the costs of leaving it. The affective commitment (AC) dimension has the smallest standard deviation, yet it's still higher than the mean. This result of the AC dimension suggests that there isn't a strong emotional bond between employees and the organization. The leadership style survey was in a rater form, which implies that employees are assessing the leadership behaviours exhibited by their leaders. The least observed leadership style is laissez-faire, suggesting that some managers might avoid or neglect their responsibilities.

This paper aimed to investigate how strong is relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment. The results from the study found a moderate positive correlation between leadership styles and organizational commitment which is consistent with previous research by Yahaya and Ebrahim (2016) who consider that using a variety of leadership and commitment measures in various settings consistently showed a positive linkage between leadership style and organizational commitment. The results are consistent also with results from Yousef (2000; Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016) who examined the linkages between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment in 50 major organizations in the United Arab Emirates and the results of the study found significant positive relationships between leadership behaviour and organizational commitment (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016).

According to the results, laissez-faire leadership has indicated a low but positive correlation with affective commitment but little if any correlation with continuance commitment. The correlation between laissez-faire leadership and normative commitment is not statically significant which supports to some extent and the previous studies that have found that laissez-faire leadership style either has no correlation or correlates negatively with organizational commitment as a whole (Erkutlu, 2008; Mass, 2014) but does not support finding from Clinebell (2013) and colleagues as well and studies from Silva and Mendis (2017) that said that laissez-faire leadership correlate negatively with affective commitment, because in this study the correlation between those variables is low but positive. Not much research has been done on the effects of laissez-faire leadership on the different dimensions of organizational commitment (Mass, 2014), even less in Kosovo.

Transactional leadership indicates negligible correlation or little with affective commitment but indicates a low but positive correlation with continuance and normative commitment. This study does support the suggestions by Ahmad (2015) who suggested that the relationship between transactional leadership and organizational commitment is significant. The results were also supported by Chen (2002) who found that both transformational and transactional leadership behaviours have a weak positive correlation with organizational commitment (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016). However, the study does not support the findings from Lee (2004; Keskes, 2014) which say that transactional leadership does not have a significant relationship with organizational commitment. A relationship between transactional leadership and affective commitment is not found in many studies (Bučiūnienė & Škudienė, 2008; Dahie, 2017).

According to the results, transformational leadership indicates negligible or little if any correlation with affective commitment, low but positive correlation with continuance commitment, and moderate positive correlation with normative commitment. Based on the results of the study not all suggestions are supported by Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995; Dahie 2017) that there exists a significant positive correlation between transformational leadership and affective commitment and a somewhat weaker but significant positive relation with normative commitment. Very similar results from Bycio and colleagues were presented by Bučiūnienė and Škudienė (2008) in manufacturing firms as well as a group of authors, Dun, Dastoor, and Sims (2012) who found that no significant relationship between transformational and continuance commitment (Clinebell, et al., 2013), but which findings do not find support in this study.

The research found a moderate positive correlation between leadership styles and organizational commitment, consistent with prior studies. However, some findings, such as the relationship between transformational leadership and various dimensions of commitment, diverged from earlier research.

6. Conclusions

The study investigated the magnitude and direction of the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment. The results obtained from this study show varying degrees of correlation between leadership styles and commitment dimensions. Most leadership styles have a statistically significant association with commitment dimensions, with the strengths of correlations ranging from negligible to moderate which means that when one variable increases, the other variable also tends to increase. The results demonstrated a moderate positive linear correlation between leadership styles and organizational commitment which is consistent with prior studies. For example, between transformational leadership and normative commitment exists a moderate correlation. This means that leaders who tend to inspire and stimulate employees and create an environment where employees feel motivated can moderately increase the obligation and responsibility of employees towards the organization.

On the other hand, there is no correlation between laissez-faire leadership and normative commitment. This means that by increasing or decreasing the use of laissez-faire leadership the other variable (in this case normative commitment) doesn't change in any particular direction. So, when leaders refuse to assume the responsibilities that are part of their position, it will not increase or decrease the level of the employee's obligation toward the organization.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

The aim of simple regression analysis is to assess how significantly a predictor variable influences a specific outcome. This is distinct from correlation analysis, which focuses on determining the magnitude and direction of the relationship between two random variables (Zou et al., 2003). In this research, we probed the direction of the relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment. Hence that is the main limitation and shall be considered for subsequent studies, by utilizing linear regression is advised. This paper treated a direct effect between leadership styles and organizational commitment. For future research, it will be important to treat the indirect effect of those variables.

References

- Absar, S., Swain, R. D. (2009). Organizational Commitment of University Teachers across Discipline and Designation. – Conference paper – Management and Professionalisation of Higher Education.
- Abu-Saad, I., Haj, A. (2020). Relationships between leadership style and teachers' organizational commitment in alternative Arab high schools in Israel. – *Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(1), pp. 12-21.
- Ahmad, A., Abdul Majid, A. H., Mohd Zin, M. L. (2015). The measurement of the effectiveness of leadership styles for organizational commitment in Pakistan. – *Asian Social Science*, 11(25), pp. 135-143.

Krasniqi, T., Iliev, A. J., Drakulevski, L. (2024). Discovering the Relationship between Leadership Styles and Organizational Commitment: The Case of the Private Sector of a Developing Country.

- Al-Daibat, B. (2017). Impact of leadership styles in organizational commitment. – *International journal of business and management review*, 5(5), pp. 25-37.
- Alimo-Metcalfe, B. (2013). A Critical Review of Leadership Theory. – In: Leonard, H. S., Lewis, R., Freedman, A. M., Passmore, J. (eds.). *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Anderson, M. H., Sun, P. Y. T. (2017). Reviewing Leadership Styles: Overlaps and the Need for a New 'Full-Range' Theory. – *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, pp. 76-96.
- Asuero, A. G., Sayago, A., González, A. G. (2006). The correlation coefficient: An overview. – *Critical reviews in analytical chemistry*, 36(1), pp. 41-59.
- Bar-Haim, A. (2019). Measuring Organizational Commitment, World Scientific Book Chapters, in *Organizational Commitment. The Case of Unrewarded Behavior*, pp. 13-19.
- Bar-Haim, A. (2019). *Organizational commitment: The case of unrewarded behavior*.
- Bass, B. M., Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. – *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 8(1), pp. 9-32.
- Beauty, M., Aigbogun, O. (2022). Effects of Leadership Styles on Employee Performance: A Case Study of Turnall Holdings LTD., Harare. – *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(1), pp. 289-305.
- Bhattacharyya, S. S., Jha, S. (2018). *Strategic Leadership Models and Theories: Indian Perspectives*. United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Breevaart, K., Zacher, H. (2019). Main and interactive effects of weekly transformational and laissez-faire leadership on followers' trust in the leader and leader effectiveness. – *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(2), pp.384-409.
- Bučičienė, I., Škudienė, V. (2008). Impact of leadership styles on employees' organizational commitment in Lithuanian manufacturing companies. – *Southeast European Journal of Economics and Business*, 3, pp. 57-66.
- Cetin, M. O., Kinik, F. S. F. (2015). An analysis of academic leadership behavior from the perspective of transformational leadership. – *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, pp. 519-527.
- Cilek, A. (2019). The effect of leadership on organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. – *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 14(4), pp. 554-564.
- Clinebell, S., Skudiene, V., Trijonyte, R., Reardon, J. (2013). Impact of leadership styles on employee organizational commitment. – *Journal of Service Science (JSS)*, 6(1), pp. 139-152.
- Ejike, E. E. (2022). Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness: A Study of Zenith Bank Plc. – *Journal of Psychology and Behavioural Disciplines*, 2(3), pp. 100-110.
- Garg, A. K., Ramjee, D. (2013). The relationship between leadership styles and employee commitment at a parastatal company in South Africa. – *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 12(11), pp. 1411-1436.
- George, D., Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 11.0 update (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gray, E. C., Williams, J. A. (2012). Retail managers: Laissez-faire leadership Is synonymous with unsuccessful conflict management styles. – *Open Journal of Leadership*, 1(3), pp. 13-16.
- Hajiali, I., Kessi, A. M. F., Budhiandriani, Prihatin, E., Sufri, M. (2022) Determination of Work Motivation, Leadership Style, Employee Competence on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. – *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 2(1), pp. 57-69.
- Herrera, J., De Las Heras-Rosas, C. (2021). The organizational commitment in the company and its relationship with the psychological contract. – *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11.
- Jangsiriwattana, T. (2019). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership: Employee perceptions of organizational performance and work engagement. – *Journal of the International Academy for Case Studies*, 25(3), pp. 1-10.
- Karacsony, P., Vinichenko, M. V., Demchenko, T. S., Szabo, Sz., Demchenko, M. V. (2020). Examining the Characteristics of the Leaders in Non-Profit Organizations. – *Economic Studies (Ikonomicheski Izsledvania)*, 29 (4), pp. 148-165
- Keskes, I. (2014). Relationship between leadership styles and dimensions of employee organizational commitment: A critical review and discussion of future directions. – *Intangible Capital*, 10(1), pp. 26-51.
- Khajuria, G. & Khan, N. (2022). Literature Review of Instruments Measuring Organisational Commitment. – *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(3), pp. 1352-1365.
- Khan, Z. A., Nawaz, A. Khan, I. (2016). Leadership Theories and Styles: A Literature Review. – *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 16(1), pp. 1-7.
- Khudhair, F. S., Rahman, R. A., Adnan, A. A. B. Z., Khudhair, A. A. (2022). Impact of Leadership Style on Employee Performance (A Case Study on a Private Organization in Iraq). – *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 13, pp. 15-32.
- King, A. S. (1990). Evolution of leadership theory. *Vikalpa*, 15(2), pp. 43-56.
- Lo, M. C., Ramayah, T., & Min, H. W. (2009). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: a test on Malaysia manufacturing industry. – *African Journal of Marketing Management*, 1(6), pp. 133-139.

- Malaysia, M.P. (2016). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. – *International journal of academic research in business and social sciences*, 6(12), pp. 2222-6990.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L., Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. – *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), pp. 20-52.
- Mladenova, I., Davidkov, T. (2023). Leadership, Adaptability and Performance of Bulgarian Organizations – Cultural Reflections on Empirical Data. – *Economic Studies (Ikonomicheski Izsledvania)*, 32(7), pp. 93-113.
- Nguyen, D., Teo, S., Grover, S., Nguyen, N. P. (2017). Laissez-faire leadership behaviors in the public sector in Vietnam. – *The Palgrave Handbook of Leadership in Transforming Asia*, pp. 397-415.
- Öztekin, Ö., İşçi, S., Karadağ, E. (2015). The effect of leadership on organizational commitment. – *Leadership and Organizational Outcomes: Meta-Analysis of Empirical Studies*, 57-79.
- Purnomo, B. R., Eliyana, A., Pramesti, E. D. (2020). The Effect of Leadership Style, Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance with Organizational Commitment as the Intervening Variable. – *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(10).
- Robert, V., Vandenberghe, C. (2021). Laissez-faire leadership and affective commitment: The roles of leader-member exchange and subordinate relational self-concept. – *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 36, 533-551.
- Roe, A. A., Solinger, O., Van Olffen, W. (2009). Shaping Organizational Commitment. – *Organizational Behavior (Handbook)*, 130-149.
- Sabir, M. S., Razzaq, A., Yameen, M. (2010). Impact of Organizational Culture on the Employees' Commitment: Relationship between Levels of Organizational Culture with Commitment. – *KASBIT Business Journals*, Khadim Ali Shah Bukhari Bukhari Institute of Technology (KASBIT), 3, pp. 88-95.
- Sabir, M. S., Sohail, A., Khan, M. A. (2011). Impact of Leadership Style on Organization Commitment: In A Mediating Role of Employee Values. – *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 3(2), pp. 145-152.
- Shrestha, N. (2020). Detecting multicollinearity in regression analysis. – *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 8(2), 39-42.
- Silva, S., Mendis, B. A. K. M. (2017). Relationship between transformational, transaction and laissez-faire leadership styles and employee commitment. – *European Journal of Business and Management*, 9(7), pp. 13-21.
- Sjahruddin, H., Sudiro, A. A. (2013). Organizational justice, organizational commitment and trust in manager as a predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. – *Interdisciplinary J. of contemporary Res. Bus. (IJCRB)*, 4(12), pp.133-141.
- Tosunoglu, H., Ekmekci, O. (2016). Laissez-faire leaders and organizations: how does laissez-faire leader erode the trust in organizations?. – *Journal of Economics Finance and Accounting*, 3(1).
- Van Beveren, P., Dimas, I. D., Lourenço, P. R., Rebelo, T. (2017). Psychometric properties of the Portuguese version of the Global Transformational Leadership (GTL) scale. – *Revista de Psicologia del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 33(2), pp. 109-114.
- Vasilescu, M. (2019). Leadership styles and theories in effective management activity. – *Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuși, University of Târgu Jiu”, Economy Series*, (4), pp. 47-52.
- Yahaya, R., Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: a literature review. – *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2), pp.190-216.
- Yammarino, F. (2013). Leadership: Past, present, and future. – *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(2), pp. 149-155.
- Yandi, A., Havidz, H, B, H. (2022). Employee Performance Model: Work Engagement Through Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment (A Study of Human Resource Management Literature Study). – *Dinasty International Journal of Management Science*, 3(3), pp. 547-565.
- Zickar, M., J., Keith, M, G. (2023) Innovations in Sampling: Improving the Appropriateness and Quality of Samples in Organizational Research. – *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10(2), pp. 315–337.
- Zou, K. H., Tuncali, K., Silverman, S. G. (2003). Correlation and simple linear regression. – *Radiology*, 227(3), pp. 617-628.