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The study examined the effects of transformational leadership on employees’ satisfaction, workgroup supportiveness, commitment, and performance at both the individual and at the organizational levels. A survey study was conducted at the Armorp Nigeria Limited, using a sample of 280 employees. The study sought to investigate specifically the mechanism through which transformational leadership influences employee’s commitment to their job schedules as well as to the organization. Six propositions which explained the relationships among the variables in the study were postulated, five accepted and one partially rejected. Pearson correlation, one way analysis of variance, multiple regression analysis and Chi-square were used in the analysis of data. The results suggest that transformational leadership directly affects employee’s satisfaction and commitment to job schedule and to the organization. But, employee’s commitment to their supervisors was not significant as other intervening variables were at work. The regression analysis reveals that the best indicator of employee satisfaction is workgroup supportiveness. The influence of grapevine interactions within the organization, if properly harnessed by a transformational leader directly results in essential mechanism that subsequently leads to employee’s satisfaction, commitment, and increased performance. Monetary incentives if closely tied to motivation might be helpful in creating a more satisfying and productive work environment. This study thus, suggests a new paradigm in which the study of leadership can be based in African setting in order to create effective and viable organizations.
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INTRODUCTION

As a trend in global economic recession and massive organizational failures, the issue of leadership becomes more topical than before. Leadership is seen as one of the most important variables affecting the attitudinal and behavioural dimensions of organisational life (Nzelibe and Yusuf, 2013; Jaskyte, 2004). Leadership has been described with respect to individual personality traits, leader’s behaviour, responses to Leader’s behaviours, interpersonal exchange relationships, task goals, follower perceptions, organisational culture and nature of work processes (Yukl, 1989).

Transformational leadership has also been found to be effective in the context of follower’s intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, commitment and perform beyond expectations (Bishop and Hill, 1971; Ford, 1969; Orpen, 1979; Nemanich and Keller, 2009; Herold and Fedor 2008; Chou,
As was advanced by (Yammarino, Spangler, and Bass (1993) transformational leader is one who helps to develop and maintain a sense of commitment and raises aspirations of followers to perform higher than expected. Although studies have shown that transformational leadership has been conceptually and empirically linked to followers commitment and satisfaction to organization as well as higher performance, not much empirical research has dealt with the process and mechanism through which transformational leaders influence their followers’ level of commitment.

This study thus, addressed the issue from the African perspectives. This present research represents an advance over previous investigations of transformational leadership in many ways. First, it focuses on the process of interaction (both structural and personal relational ties) between leaders and followers that influence both actual and perceived levels of work outcomes. Second, it provides weighty understanding of dynamic of the complex nature of man at workplace and the mechanics by which leaders’ behavior can improve performance. Third, in contrast to previous field studies, the present work utilizes an empirically derived measuring instruments developed by the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) by Hackman and Oldham (1975) to assess precisely how employees perceive their jobs and Multi-Factor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ- 5X) by Avolio (1991) to assess followers perception of their leaders. Fourth, unlike many other studies, objective measures were taken of the crucial dependent variables, those which are hypothesized to change as a result of leaders behavior such as employee satisfaction, employee commitment and employee performance (both individual and organizational performance). Fifth, the present study focuses on another aspect of the work setting that has received little attention in the work design literature, yet which could influence the manner to which an employee responds positively to a job.

Thus, the research sought to answer the following major questions:

I. What transformational leadership attitudes and practices are critical to employee satisfaction among organizational members?
II. Which of the significant transformational leaders’ attitudes and practices (both actual and perceived) are related to employee commitment and performance?

The main purpose of this study was to explore and seek application of certain propositions which seem fundamental to much current research in organizational behavior. The specific objectives of the study are:

I. To determine how transformational leadership styles could be directed to lead to improved interpersonal interactions among members and to refine employee’s perceptions of the supervisor, the job and the organization.
II. To explore the dynamic nature of transformational leadership variables as antecedent to work group structure or the pattern of affiliation, affinity and relation by positions or specific job assignments that foster employee satisfaction, commitment, and increased performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Transformational Leadership and Employee Commitment to the Organization

Transformational leadership theory was introduced by Bwin (1978) on a qualitative analysis of the biographies of political leaders. Bass and Avolio (1990) further developed the theory. According to them, transformational leadership has four components: charismatic role modeling,
individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Using charisma, the leader inspires admiration, respect, and loyalty and emphasizes the importance of having collective sense of mission. By individualized consideration, the leader builds a one-to-one relationship with his or her followers, and understands and considers their differing needs, skills, and aspirations. By intellectual stimulation, the leader broadens and elevates the interests of the employees and stimulates followers to think about old problems in new ways (Bass and Avolio, 1990). Emery and Baker (2007) examined the effects of transformational leadership on organizational commitment and employee satisfaction of customer contact personnel in the banking and food organizations. Meyer et al., (2007) view employee commitment as critical to the successful implementation of organizational change which also enhances performance.

The impact of changes on employee’ commitment is expected to be based on their daily interaction and perception of their supervisors which invariably enhances performance at both individual and organizational level (Chou, 2013). Transformational leaders stimulate team work which propels work group supportiveness and motivates organizational members to seek for ways and means to develops their skills, elicit members commitment for improved performance (Nzelibe, 1981). There is sample evidence to believe that transformational leaders can significantly influence subordinates feelings and desire to commit themselves to the organization of which enhances individual and organization’s performance. This assumption led to the derivation of:

Hypothesis I: There is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ commitment.

Transformational Leadership and Employee Satisfaction.

Transformational leadership and employee satisfaction and satisfaction with organization climate are used interchangeably in this study. Studies are abound which prove that employees whose job is redesigned or enriched were more satisfied and often perform higher than expectation (Ford, 1969; Umstot, Bell and Mitchell, 1976). However, some studies appear which indicate that job redesign sometimes fail to create positive outcomes for employees and their employing organizations (Bishop and Hill, 1971).

Hackman and Oldham (1975) found that employees react positive when working with others doing jobs of comparable in complexity than when working with others doing jobs of greater or lesser complexity. Nzelibe (1981) found that transformational leadership variable had significant reaction on the employees; as leaders who motives employees contentment at workplace engenders trust and close personal interaction and communication, exhibit interest in subordinates personal welfare and family, provides conducive, harmonious work environment, enriches subordinates assignments that presents challenges and induce employees greater satisfaction and work group supportiveness, which alter employee performance (Hur-yagba, 2013). Based on the preceding discussions, hypothesis II was derived.

Hypothesis II: There is a direct positive correlation between transformational leader and employees’ satisfaction.

Transformational Leader and Work Group Suppportiveness:

Work group supportiveness refers to the closeness among group members which directly affect their influence on each other as well as their perceptions of their supervisors and organization.
According to Bass and Avolio (1994) under transformational leadership there is generally a sense of purpose and family; leaders and followers share mutual interest and a sense of shared fates and interdependence. Nzelibe (1981) found that task similarity and value similarity can result to the emergence of work group supportiveness which substantially affect the leaders formal authority balance. The transformational leader’s supportive supervision results in the leaders care for their employees feelings and needs, facilitates their skill development, show them ways to achieve the goals and express confidence Bass and Avolio (1994). Therefore transformational leader has to plan, control, and direct work group network so as to maintain positive and productive interactions motivates employees, and create harmonious, committed and non-competitive organisational work environment where workers grow through roles and relationships for increased performance. Hence hypotheses 3 and 4 are postulated.

Hypothesis III: Transformational leaders behaviour positively mediates with employee satisfaction and work group supportiveness for increased performance.

Hypothesis IV: The greater the similarity in values and tasks among work group, the more intensive is the frequency of interaction for higher performance.

**Transformational Leadership and Participative Supervision and Employee Satisfaction**

Oldham and Cumming (1996) report that participative supervision is an important determinant of intrinsic motivation and creativity. Likert (1967) presented interaction as an intervening variables affected by such causal variable as leadership behaviour and organisational climate and as affecting such end result variables as job satisfaction, patispative supervision and organisational performance. In most recent research, participative supervision, morale and satisfaction are identical constructs For Vroom (1969) and Likert (1967) satisfaction exists when a person’s feelings of esteem are increased by good performance and decreased by bad performance. Lawler (1970) indicates that high moral exist when esteem and feelings of growth are tied to performance. In order to classify this problem of conceptualization, this study views satisfaction as employees feeling of contentment toward contextual factors of the organisation. Accordingly the following hypotheses are postulated.

Hypothesis V: The greater the performance attitudes of transformational leader, the more attention they pay to participative supervision.

Hypothesis VI: The more participative the supervision, the greater the employee satisfaction for increased performance.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY & RESEARCH DESIGN**

The hypotheses posed in the study were tested through a sample survey of Armcorp Nigeria Limited, Lagos employees during February to April, 2013. A sample survey methodology was considered appropriate for the study because it was considered economical in both time, money, and manageability.

The workforce population of Armorp Nigeria Limited is 938. Using Blalock’s (1972) model of deriving sample size: $n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$ therefore $n = \frac{938}{1+938(0.05)^2} = \frac{938}{3.345} = 280$. The sample size is 280. The model represents the following: $n$ is the sample size sought, “$N$” Population size, “$e$” is the level of significance and “1” is constant.
To ensure adequacy and representativeness of the sample, three hundred questionnaire were distributed using systematic random sampling model by Blalock (1972) every k'th element in the total list of elements is selected for inclusion in the sample at (1) the sampling interval and (2) the sampling ratio.

Selection of the Subjects

Armcorp Nigeria Limited employs about nine hundred and thirty eight workers. Among this figure, 5% are top management, 14% are middle management and 81% are low level workers, but not all the employees satisfied the criteria for inclusion in the survey population. An up-to-date list of the Armcorp Nigeria Limited employees was obtained from the Human Resources Department. The employees names were arranged in alphabetical order and every 4th name in the list was selected for the study.

Description of the Sample Population

Out of 300 questionnaires distributed among the employees, 280 useable questionnaires were utilized in the study. Fifty percent were men and fifty were women which includes:17% top management, 19% middle management and 64% low level employees’ were utilized in the study. The study had a comparative analysis of the sample in the terms of the distribution of major demographic variables such as age, sex, occupation, income and educational attainment and length of service. A comparative demographic characteristics of the sample is presented on table 1.

Table 1. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>Above 30</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Non Degree</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Under N300T</th>
<th>Above N300T</th>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Under 10</th>
<th>Above 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument

Data were collected through hand carried questionnaires. As the company has branch offices in six different geographical zones of Nigeria (North East, North West, South East, South West and South South). The instrument was derived and adopted from Job Description Survey (JDS) by Oldham and Hackman (1977) and Multi-Factor Leadership Questionaire (MLQ-5X) by Bass and Avolio (1991) and has proven to be effective in discrimination and predictive power among variables used in study. The questionnaire consisted of 34 items which indexed the study variables including demographic variables.
Variables of Study

The variables in the questionnaire are transformational leadership attitudes and practices, employee perception of belonging to work group, workgroup supportiveness, participative supervision, employee satisfaction with leader, job satisfaction, satisfaction with company, satisfaction with work group, satisfaction with pay, task and value similarities, employee commitment, and frequency of interaction. The biodata for the study include age, sex, educational attainment, occupation, income and length of service.

The internal consistency scores of the item scales are as follows: transformational leader’s attitude is the increased amount of supportive behaviour by a transformational leader was measured by four items regarding the way leaders feel and behave towards subordinates. By definition supportiveness explicitly relate to encouragement and approval of achievement at work goals, and supportiveness which reflects affiliative gestures of friendliness and respect without specific on job performance. Thus a composite score of the item measuring transformational leader attitudes was generated from the statement given by: (1) the respondents’ perception of their supervisor’s encouragement for achievement (items 7. 8 and 11); the degree to which the supervisors foster positive and productive organisational climate (items 9 and 10). The consistency reliability scores between the variables items 7 and 8 were 0.80; items 7 and 9 were 0.76; items 7 and 10 were 0.56; items 8 and 9 were 0.77; items 8 and 10 were 0.57; items 9 and 10 were 0.67.

Transformational leaders practices; were measured by the supervisors use of group approach and informal social relationships. Three items used to measure the transformational leader practices were: (1) the supervisor’s action toward employee who discovered a new method of doing a certain part of work in the department. (2) Supervisor’s behaviour towards complaint about how an employee handled a matter and (3) supervisor’s manner of handling an employee who discovered a better method of getting the work done effectively. These three items were highly correlated with one another (Pearson Correlation Coefficients). The reliability scores for transformational leader’s practices were items 11 and 12 = 0.76; item 11 and 13 = 0.50; and items 12 and13 = 0.61.

Work group Supportiveness: Three measures of workgroup supportiveness were correlated. Each used 5-points Likert scale format of 1= strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree. Although the three items correlated with one another, the two tasks oriented items: (1) “the people in my department often encourage each other to think of a better way to do the job in a manner that we would be proud of ” and (2) “the people in my department often encourage each other to think of better ways of getting the work done ” were stronger in their association (Pearson correlation 0.63); than the work group friendly gesture 0.36. However the three items were combined into a composite scale of workgroup supportiveness for the present study.

Participative Supervision: was measured by three questions asking employees’ level of influence and participation in what goes on in the department. For the three question, item 19 and 20 were stronger in their association (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.52) than item 18. The relative low correlation among the items were attributed to respondents biases in subjective evaluation of themselves.

Employee Satisfaction: This variable was measured by 5 item variables: satisfaction with the (i) supervisor, (ii) company, (iii) workgroup, (iv) pay and (v) satisfaction with the job.
Satisfaction with the Supervisor: was measured by three question asking the employee (1) whether their supervisor was the kind of person they would really like to work with; (2) extent to which they have confidence and trust in their supervisor and, (3) their overall satisfaction with their supervisor. The correlation coefficient among the variables items 21 and 22 were stronger in association 0.63 than items 22 and 23 were 0.41 (Pearson correlation coefficients).

Satisfaction with the company: was measured with 3 items such as: (1) employee’s feeling of loyalty towards the company; (2) employee’s willingness to change or remain in the company; and (3) overall feeling of commitment and pride to be the staff of the company.

Correlation Coefficients between items 24 and 25 were significant at 0.77; items 25 and 26 were significant at 0.68.

Satisfaction with Work Group: to measure work group satisfaction, employees were asked how well they liked the persons with whom they work. Distributions of responses were place on a 5-point Likert Scale of 1= I like them very much to 5= I don’t like them at all. The 5 items were considered to provide a reasonable basis for considering work group satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction: was measured by the use of Job Description Index (JDI) which assessed the extent to which a person is satisfied with his job. Such constructs as job involvement, intrinsic motivation, opportunities for personal growth and development, feelings of self-fulfillment, opportunities for independent thought; job enrichment, complexity of job and challenging job were listed for the employees to choose one or more as applied to them.

Satisfaction with Pay: was measured with one item question such as “considering your skills and efforts you put into the jobs, how satisfied are you with your pay?” The employee responses were placed on a Likert 5-point Scale of 1= very much satisfied and 5= very much dissatisfied these scales was estimated adequately for measuring employees satisfaction with pay.

Task and Value Similarities

To measure task and value similarities, questions soliciting of the employees similarities in these two constructs were placed on a five points scale of 1=to a great extent and 5=to no extent at all. The reliability of value and task similarity scores were 0.62 which was estimated as being strongly correlated.

Performance: members of management were asked to rate the performance of each employee on work quantity and work quality. The two constructs were strongly correlated. Workers were also requested to assess their contributions to the company and how their supervisors attitudes and practices may lead to their increased or decreased performance. The four items in the questionnaire items 31, 32, 33 and 34 were averaged to form the measure for employee’s performance. Items 31 and 32 were strongly correlated (Pearson Correlated Coefficients=0.72) and 32 and 33 were less correlated 0.42. The low relationship may be as a result of employees subjective assessment of themselves.

Results

The data were analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS). Percentages and chi-square were applied to obtain the distribution of some demographic data comparing the three group: top management (TM), middle management (MM), low level employees (LLE).
Table 2. Occupational Group by Age, Sex, Education, Income, and Length of Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
<th>Middle Management</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>123.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(178)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>117.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>173.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under N3000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>251.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above N3000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-10 years</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>129.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-10</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance p≤0.05

The table 2 indicates that each of the demographic variables is dichotomized and the chi-square statistics calculated for each dimension of the dichotomy. The correlations indicated that leaders who are older tend to foster supportive organizational climate by utilizing participative supervision. The variable sex was significantly correlated with age, education and income, but negative with occupation and length of service suggesting that the higher the occupation, the higher the educational attainment and income. Conversely, the negative correlation of occupation and transformational leaders attitudes suggested that the higher the occupation, the more a transformational leader was perceived as being task oriented, rather than fostering positive interpersonal interaction.

**Employee Commitment**

In order to ascertain the extent of the degree of commitment among the employees, the Pearson Chi-Square has an asymptomic significant probability of 0.047 which is close from the probable significant level of p≤0.05 meaning that there exists a high level of employees commitment to the organization, but partial commitment to the supervisor (0.28).

Hypothesis I: There is a positive relationship between Transformational Leadership and Employee Commitment to the organization.
To analyze the hypothesis, the zero order correlation, the independent variable, transformational leader, and employee commitment dependent variable was significant at $p \leq 0.05$. There was partial positive correlation between transformational leadership and employee commitment. A linear regression was conducted to predict the effects of transformational leadership on employee commitment, transformational leadership had partial effect on employee commitment ($0.028$); t-value is $0.09444$, $P \leq 0.05$. Table 3 provides additional information.

Table 3. Regression Coefficient Between Transformational Leader and the Employee Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>7.088 0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.078 0.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: From a Field Survey (2013)

There is partial support for the hypothesis by the data. Explanation to this partial relationship can be deduced from the point of view of Nigerian Society where emphasis on monetary gain had engendered corruption and other unethical work behaviours that employees commitment is propelled not only on the shared contributions and identification with the organization but by the quantum of monetary rewards they expected to realize through membership with the organization. The lack of correlation between the two variables can further be attributed to two factors: (1) the difficulty of testing the complex psychological state through simple self report questions and (2) the complexity of work environment which comprised individual perceptions; co-orientation and values. Thus, the hypothesis failed to support the works of Hur-yagba (2013); Burns, (1978); Bass and Avolio (1997); Dumdum et.al (2002); Judge and Bono (2000). Hypothesis I which states that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employee commitment was partially accepted.

Hypothesis II: which states that there is a direct positive relationship between transformational leadership and employee satisfaction was significant at $P \leq 0.39$. Employee satisfaction is a composite variable item as earlier indicated measured by such variable as satisfaction with supervisor, pay, organization, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with work group. There was significant relationships among these variables (Pearson Correlation Coefficients). When these variables were further examined in regression analysis, satisfaction with work group proved to be the greatest explanatory factor with respect to employee satisfaction. There was a positive correlation between transformational leadership and employee satisfaction ($0.04$). Transformational leadership has a t-value of $0.33$, $P<0.47$, Beta=0.35. Transformational leadership variable positively relates to employee satisfaction and work group supportiveness which increased performance. Group affiliation variable revealed significant relationships between peer supportiveness and frequency of interaction among work group members. Transformational leaders who foster supportive and productive interpersonal interaction were significantly related to satisfaction with the organization. These findings generally validate the underlying assumptions of the study that supportive transformational leaders attitudes and practices, appropriate group affiliation, and supportiveness mediate the effects of employee satisfaction and interaction potentials on employee perception of organization.
Work Group Supportiveness

In figure 1 the predicted correlation between transformational leader’s attitudes and employee satisfaction was supported by the data. (Pearson correlation coefficients 0.34, P≤0.05. When all the satisfaction and work group supportiveness variables were allowed to compete freely to enter into a stepwise regression, satisfaction with work group entered first, and explained 28% of the variance on this dimension. Satisfaction with pay explained 24% of the variation. The beta for
work group supportiveness was statistically significant. The betas for the remaining variables were significant.

Table 4: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis of Transformational Leader’s Behaviour With Employee Satisfaction and Work Group Supportiveness Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R2</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Change in r²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Group Supportiveness</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>23.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Pay</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>16.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Supervisor</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>14.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Work Group</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>3.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Agency</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) All correlation coefficients are significant at p≤0.05. (2) All the values were averaged

Table 4 indicates that when the factors are combined together, work group supportiveness explained 28% of the total variation in transformational leadership attitudes, satisfaction with the organization 14%, and job satisfaction 9% indicating that transformational attitudes are better explained by contextual factors as well as by economic factors. This was probably because the transformational leaders control the contextual factors which directly affect the employees’ feelings of contentment or discontentment. As predicted hypothesis II was supported by the data. The results of the study were consistent with the hypothesis and therefore accepted.

Hypothesis IV which suggests that the greater the value and task similarities among group members the more intensive the frequency of interaction for increased performance was supported by the data. The zero order correlation coefficients between the two variables (value similarity and task similarity) was 0.68. The association between value similarity and frequency of interaction was 0.61 and between task similarity and frequency of interaction was 0.38 (Pearson Correlation Coefficients). This result indicated that value similarity explained 60% of work group interpersonal interactions.

Figure 2: Correlagram of the Variables Value Similarity, Task Similarity and Frequency of interaction with work Group Satisfaction.
Source: From a field Survey 2013.
Figure 2 adds additional information. When all the variables (task and value similarities) were allowed to compete freely to enter into a stepwise regression, value similarity entered first and explained 67% of the variance on this dimension. Table 5 presents the multiple regression analysis of frequency of interaction by value similarity. Task similarity variable was not in the equation as the beta was not significant (beta=0.00225).

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis of Frequency of Interaction with Value Similarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Multiple R²</th>
<th>Simple r</th>
<th>Change in r²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Similarity</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>161.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) All values were averaged; (2) Level of significance was set at p≤0.05

Furthermore, the simultaneous effects of the two factors on value similarity were determined by Multiple Regression. The two factors when combined together determined 89% of the variation in work group supportiveness and 11% in satisfaction with work group indicating that work group supportiveness is better explained by similarity in values. The beta for the satisfaction with work group is satisfactorily significant (B=0.245), and clearly indicated that the value similarity increases performance. Conversely, the beta for work group supportiveness was also significant (B=0.141) and indicated a simultaneous increase in values similarity. The findings were consistent with the postulated hypothesis and had implications for the negative attitudinal and behavioral patterns.

Figure 3. The Correlogram of value similarities with Workgroup Supportiveness and Satisfaction with Workgroup.
Source: From a field survey 2013.

H5: The greater the performance attitudes of transformational leaders the more attention they pay attention to participative supervision.

Hypothesis V suggested that participative supervision correlates positively with employee satisfaction which mediates to increase performance was supported by the data. The composite of employee satisfaction were significant at 0.21.
Table 6: One Way Analysis of Variance Between Participative Supervision and Employee Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>155.9113</td>
<td>1.4436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>155.9529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = degree of freedom, Source: from a field survey, 2013.

Analysis of Hypothesis V: which suggested that the greater the performance attitudes of transformational leaders the more attention they pay to participative supervision was supported by the data. Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.68, indicating a significant association. This indication means that as transformational leader pay attention to participative supervision, performance increases. There was positive correlation between the two variables (Pearson Correlation Coefficients 0.49). Hypothesis V and VI are thus consistent with the data. Table 7 provides correlation matrix for the variables.

Table 7: Correlation Matrix between Transformational Leader Attitudes, Participative Supervision and Employee Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Transformational Leader Attitudes</th>
<th>Participative Supervision</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leader Attitudes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: From a field Survey, 2013.

DISCUSSION

Many researchers suggest that transformational leadership affects work attitudes and behaviors at both individual and organizational level (Divir et al., 2004). The results of this research are consistent with works of other researchers that transformation leadership style affects employee satisfaction and group supportiveness.

Out of six hypotheses postulated for the study, five are accepted and one is partially rejected. Interestingly, employee commitment was not influenced by transformational leader, but the employees were found to be committed to the organization. Perhaps their commitment to the organization was as a result of high unemployment rate in Nigeria or due to lack of skills to look for work elsewhere. However based on the works by Chou (2013), Gumusluoglu and ilsev (2007), and Yusuf and Nzelibe (2012) that transformational leader’s behavior directly affect subordinates morale, intrinsic motivation, satisfaction and commitment one would expect transformation leadership behavior to be a highly significant predictor of employee commitment.

However analysis and interpretation of the study suggest that transformation leaders behavior do not relate to employee commitment due to the following factors: 1) the complexity of individual values and perceptions. 2) the difference in employee orientation which are accentuated by the distinct nature of organizational life. 3) emphasis on money by most Nigerians workers coupled
with undesirable work ethics and corruption propel workers to care less about what their leaders do but focus attention on other ways of making money. The finding is valuable for two reasons. First, work should be redesigned to provide high level of accountability and responsibility so as to achieve a satisfactory work environment that elicits commitment. Second, individual personal life and affiliations should be integrated into organizational goals. This can be achieved if transformational leader can create opportunities for the individuals to set their own target for achievement work standard, and personal growth.

Hypotheses two, three, four, five and six were all significant and accepted. Invariably transformation leader has most positive impact on work group supportiveness, suggesting that if employees perceive their leader as fostering positive organizational climate, they internalize peer affiliation and influence in ways to facilitate organizational functioning. This finding is reversed for workers who perceive their leaders as not fostering positive work environment. In such a case the work group establishes behavior and structures to negate the perceived effect of leaders’ attitudes.

Along the same lines, the interaction between workers with similar values and tasks (Hypothesis IV) shows that employees who perceive their work values and task description to be identical tend to have greater influence on each other for higher performance.

Hypothesis V examined the degree a transformation leader utilizes work group approach as well as participative supervision of management. Although employees in the sample perceive their leaders as neither consulting nor involving them in the decision that affect their work, participative supervision has most positive impact upon job satisfaction. This indicates that where an alternative source of guidance exists, leaders may be most effective with participative system of management rather than with an autocratic style.

Most of the workers perceive themselves as being satisfied with their supervisor and prefer to work with him, however; they do not have confidence nor trust in him. Such condition lead to lack of employee commitment to their leader, negative organizational climate and dissatisfaction among organizational members. These findings, thus, are consistent with the works of Nzelibe and Moruku (2010), Nzelibe and Yusuf (2012).

The demographic variables have significant effects on employee satisfaction, work group affiliation and supportiveness. Women and older men are satisfied with work environment, supervisor and are not as much concerned with the extrinsic rewards as they are with intrinsic reward. Work group affiliation and supportiveness are more important to them than any other factors, suggesting that they may go to great length to ensure positive and viable work environment.

The result of income and occupation have tentative conclusions; 1) employees with high occupational status and income are more satisfied than those with low occupational status and income. 2) older male employees are satisfied with income and occupational status than young men. It may be because the younger male employees have most relevant skills powered by ICT and innovative ideas with much propensity for thinking big, wild dreams, ambition for affluence and good life. Some of the obvious inferences which can be derived from the discussions are: 1) transformation leader and employee relationships are the best significant predictors of organizational climate. 2) the best predictor of employee satisfaction is work group supportiveness. 3) the influence of grapevine interactions is stronger than the formal structure in developing a refined and complex perceptions of organizational attribute including organizational
climate. 4) if transformation leaders make effort to harness employees confidence and trust through participative supervision will enhance a more satisfied workforce and productive work environment.

The study thus has valuable theoretical contributions in the area of organizational behavior. First the study challenges the claim that transformation leadership positively relates to employee commitment and at the same time strongly supports positive and productive non competitive organizational climate, where workers develop and grow through rules and relationship. Second the study attempts to advance description of transformation leadership in African environment (Yusuf and Nzelibe, 2012). Perhaps, greater insight into organizational processes in contemporary African environment has been proffered.

Methodically, the composite scales developed and tested in the study provide some guidelines for future studies. It has been shown that employee satisfaction with work group supervisor, organization, pay, and job satisfaction are more discriminating indicators in determining his satisfaction with organizational climate. Second, the hand carried questionnaires and direct observation employed in this study seem much appropriate in third world countries such as Nigeria where postal services are inefficient and individuals are very ignorant about survey research. It offers a great deal of information to agencies which face the problem of improving employees’ psychological states, attitudes, work ethics and organizational climate.

Furthermore, the important cultural affiliation “ethnicity or tribalism” needs investigation to determine whether work group affiliation emerges along “ethnic” or “tribal” sentiments. A comparative study of Sex differences of transformation leadership styles need investigation to provide more insight into gender differentials of transformational leader.

All in all, this study is one of so many works needed in the area of transformation leadership in African environment. It is very much needed especially as most African countries are being ravaged by poverty, high rate of unemployment, low workers morale and low productivity. This study, thus, provides foundation for further studies in transformational leadership as veritable instrument for improving employee satisfaction, commitment, workgroup supportiveness and improved performance in Nigeria.
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