



## EXPLORING THE DEMOGRAPHIC IMPACT ON LEADERSHIP STYLES, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND MOTIVATION

**Muhammad Saqib Khan**, Lecturer, Institute of Business Administration, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, KP, Pakistan

**Dr. Farhat Ullah Khan**, Assistant Professor, Institute of Business Administration, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan

**Dr. Khalid Rehman**, Lecturer Institute of Business Administration, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, KP, Pakistan

**Dr. Irfan Ullah Khan**, Lecturer Institute of Education & Research, University of Lakki Marwat, KP, Pakistan

**Muhammad Waseem Khan**, Department of Commerce, Virtual University, Pakistan

**Dr. Asghar Ullah Khan**, PhD in Mass Communication from Department of Communication & Media Studies, Dera Ismail Khan

**ABSTRACT-** The universities (higher institutions) are vital as they produce diverse expert (employees) to diverse sectors of each country. The academic institutions like functions in universities supply expertise, training and personnel to industries. The leadership is found through the different professionals and academicians as very essential and significant theme in organizational behavior. The attributes of the worker/manager/leader comprise, gender, age, designation, tenure/ experience, educational level, marital status, institution/department and domicile. The literature uncovered that gender has just a little impact on the transformational and the transactional leadership conduct, however the interaction of gender and education created reliable contrasts in representatives' appraisals of the leadership practices. The demographic characteristics, for example, age, gender, experience and professional status ominously affect institutional workers' appraisals of their institutions and on the subordinates' view of the leadership style (Curran, 2009). Therefore, the literature on leadership, commitment and demographic provided the diverse results.

**Keywords:** Leadership Styles, Motivation, Organizational Commitment & HEIs

### I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership has ended up being an interesting subject for analysts. The present study investigates leadership and organizational commitment in HEIs. It's essential for experts at college level to know about fruitful practices as well as kindred staff members such examination reveals insight onto effective practices while performing their duties at higher education level over investigating leadership styles and aptitudes. This examination uncovered constructive leadership abilities as professionals may manufacture associations with understudies, partners and associates and well realize how to successfully lead while working in HEIs. Today, universities part in developing nations is confronting difficulties from an active situation described through quick innovative variation and better demand. As leadership gets to be basic to the survival of associations, both the transformational and transactional styles are found to have imperative effect on novelty, lead to enhanced objective matched conduct regarding subservient, promote organizational alteration, and a soul of faith as well as serving supporters to surpass their performance years.

The demographic variables have been widely explored in developing countries due to its critical role in determination of group mean differences in responses of the sample from population (respondents) concerning the research variables under considerations. Keeping in view the existing trends in research, this study also aimed at exploring the personal characteristics of the respondents concerning the research variables under study. This research study aims to explore the relationship among different research variables, like leadership, organizational commitment and motivation, as well as demographic attributes of individual. This research study explores the impact of individual personal characteristics of leadership on organizational commitment and motivation. Faculty members of 13 public sector universities of KP, are population of this this study. As population of present research if known (finite) population, so finite formula for sample size  $(380+138+82+218+634+508+100+111+ 255+122+212+135+194=3089)$  has been used for current research study. The sample-size =  $[SD2/ ((E2/Z2) + (SD2/N))] = [.752/ ((.892/1.962) + (.752/3089))] = n = 512$ .

### Problem Statement

The problem addressed in this research is related with the examination of group mean differences in opinion of respondents from particular context regarding the leadership styles, organizational

commitment and motivation. The organizational commitment depends upon interdependence of certain constraints like leadership styles, motivation and demographics (personal characteristics) those which are strongly linked rather inter-related with one another. In this research, problem highlighted is focused on the crushing role of Demographics variables (Personal Characteristics of leadership) in connection between the organizational commitment and leadership styles and motivation in the context under considerations.

### Research Questions

- To investigate role of the demographics (personal attributes) regarding leadership style and commitment level of academicians.
- To examine the determining role of the academicians' personal characteristics on styles of leadership in higher education institutions.
- To examine determining role of academicians' personal features on the organizational commitment in "higher education institutions".

### Research Objectives

- To examine the group mean differences in responses of the respondents concerning the research variables under considerations.
- To test role of demographics (individuals' characteristics) respecting leadership styles, motivation and commitment levels of the academicians.

### Research Hypothesis

Table 1 Hypotheses of Study

Individual demographic group have different of opinion about the leadership styles.	T-Test	H
Respondents' female group is higher scoring than respondents' female group (gender).	T-Test	H <sub>1</sub>
Respondents' local group is higher scoring than respondents' non-local group (domicile).	T-Test	H <sub>2</sub>
Married respondents' group is scoring higher than un-married group (marital status).	T-Test	H <sub>3</sub>
Respondents' social sciences group is higher scoring than natural science (department).	T-Test	H <sub>4</sub>
Respondents of professor group is scoring higher than respondents' group (designation).	ANOVA	H <sub>5</sub>
PhD respondents' group is scoring higher than respondents' other group (qualifications).	ANOVA	H <sub>6</sub>
The 49-60 respondents' group is scoring higher than other group of the respondents (age).	ANOVA	H <sub>7</sub>
13-24 respondents' group is scoring higher than other group of respondents (experience).	ANOVA	H <sub>8</sub>

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The leadership is defined as respecting the influence process, personality, responsibility and the position an instrument to get apprehensive objectives (Barlow, Jordan & Hendrix, 2002). The leaders who provided proper direction by improving futuristic vision for organization and leader interactive way with employees would inspire employees to overwhelmed the difficulties. The leadership is quite seasoned and up-to-date issue. The leadership has been thus given distinctive definitions by diverse authors (Bateman & Snell, 2002). Leadership has been widely explored in different context with different input and output variables however, the limited research studies are available about critical role of personal characteristics in determining group mean differences in responses concerning leadership styles, organizational commitment and employees' motivation in the higher educational context in developing countries like Pakistan.

### *Transformational Leadership*

It is the style wherever leaders encouraged employees to exceed self-interests for organizational goodness, beliefs, and perceptions and increase the employee's motivation (Burns, 1978). In the meanwhile, Burns asserted that transformational leaders motivate employees by putting an extra struggle

for going elsewhere what employees hoped. According to (Bass,1985) transformational leaders elevated and heighten employees' understanding level and assisted transform servants' individual beliefs to be harmonized with group intentions. The transformational leadership works upon the motivation of workforces working under the leaders' supervision would respect and trust on their leaders and they might be active to perform an extra-role conduct and such type of leadership was positively linked with the important task-relating attitude along with employees' behavior like performance, job satisfaction and trust on the leader (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). The literature revealed that four mechanisms of the transformational leaderships are there: individualized consideration, the intellectual stimulation, idealized influence and inspirational motivation.

### ***Transactional Leadership***

(Bass,1985) found that transactional leadership generate base for associations among followers and leaders as per descriptive responsibilities, agreeing expectations, to provide acknowledgment and prizes to get performance which is desired and craved. Transactional leadership denotes to a number of agendas pertaining leadership and background that gathering the exchange occurs between the employees and the leaders that brings a mutual profit to them (Avolio & Bass, 1991). Transactional leaders refer to active craft in interior of the leaders and subservient wehre leader circles specific purposes, shades improve and discriminate rewards which may be usual on objective achievement (Dvir, Eden, Avolio & Shamir, 2002). The related literature portrayed that transactional leader in framework, has a feeling for hazard evasion, gives contemplation on time needs and effectiveness and for most part wiry to practice over-substance as the means for preservation mechanism (Avoid & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). Three dimensions are incorporated in Boss model regarding leadership comprise as unexpected reward, management by exception active, leadership and free initiative behavior.

### **Leadership in Higher Educational of Pakistan**

The educational leadership is the way to achievement of the educational association, the motivation behind this study was to distinguish issues confronted by educational leaders to deal with nature of universities (higher educational institutions) in Pakistan. Leadership has been found anenthusiastic theme for analysts (Yousef, 2001). Numerous investigators focused on leadership styles in various organizations, professional settings. In passing, it was seldom observed among teaching faculties of higher education institutions in Pakistan ((Riaz, Akram & Ijaz, 2002). On that occasion, it turned to studying leaders' conduct. The current research work has focused on target to determine main leadership styles in the universities of Pakistan. The education, in Pakistan, field is facing significant difficulties. It perceives significance of leadership for professional advancement in education (Riaz & Haider, 2003). The sustainable leadership is organization with others as opposed to one-individual operation. Besides, the compelling leaders in higher education lead by means of groups in frameworks that are web-like and non-progressive (Amey, 2006).

### **Organizational Commitment**

The study regarding organizational commitment has explored and determined its exact aspects with different definitions every kind of the commitment (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990). A model regarding the organizational commitment has been proposed in literature which combined certain research streams they proposed that researchers might clearly and well comprehend employees' association with organization over analysis and assessment of three distinctive mechanisms regarding organization commitment concurrently (Stoner, Freeman & Gilbert, 1995). The effectiveness of the institutions depends on some factor which are accountable for effective functioning of the academic institutions. Among these dynamic factors, the important most is the phenomenon of organizational commitment. It is the commitment which makes institutional workforces as enthusiastic and inspired to perform committedly (Irfan, Nawaz & Saqib, 2013). Incidentally, with respect to organizational commitment, role of leadership style is phenomenal. For this purpose, diverse leadership styles have been explored to examine its impact upon commitment level of workforces (Irfan, Nawaz, Saqib & Naseem, 2014).

### **Employees' Motivation**

The driving force in satisfying and pursuing individuals' needs is the motivational behavior; it influences behavior in chasing some outcomes; it is procedure which accounts for employees' course, perseverance of efforts and passion toward achieving the objective, motivation focuses on the common direction and strength of individuals' deeds (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). This period is of high significance due to the encouraged behavior which occurs contemporary, its focus is on future; motivation is basic instrument to regulate task behavior of employees. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are critical in employees'

lives (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). If workforces of an institution aren't encouraged to do their concerned duties then no institution may get success and cannot attain the target (Bénabou & Tirole, 2003). The motivation plays dynamic and leading role in determining the behavior and attitude of concerned employees in the academic institutions. The literature revealed that employees' needs, supervision, effort, working environment, responsibilities, employee's development, feedback, rewarding and fairness as well as equity are the main elements and aspects which contribute to motivate employees (Hennessey & Amabile, 2005).

### Demographic Impacts

The attributes of worker/manager/leader comprise, gender, age, designation, tenure/experience, educational level, marital status, institution/department and domicile. The literature uncovered that gender has just a little impact on transformational and the transactional leadership conduct, however interaction of gender and education created reliable contrasts in agents' appraisals of the leadership practices (Belout & Gauvreau, 2004). In the few studies, it was accounted for that demographic characteristics, for example, age, gender, experience and professional status ominously affect institutional workers' appraisals of their institutions and on the subordinates' view of the leadership style (Curran, 2009). Therefore, literature on leadership, commitment and demographic provided the diverse results. The literature proposes that few components represent generational contrasts in the dispositions and conduct of the faculty members. The age and educational level were recognized as imperative factors. The literature likewise recommends that level of education influences individuals' qualities, needs and needs and makes them think and act in unexpected way. Age, then again, tend to give more prominent or lesser level of articulation of individuality in the employees with the more youthful eras realizing quite good exhibiting personal practices (Galanou, 2010).

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this section, details are presented by researcher with respect to the methodology, population and selection of sample, tool development, questionnaire design, data collection methods, and measurement, the reliability of instrument and the validity of data and statistical tools for data analysis. Moreover, ethical consideration and the mediation process are also included by the researcher in the current section. The present research study philosophy is positivism which recognizes that reality exists and the researchers are aiming to further explore the same realities by smearing different statistical techniques and tools on already collected data through the questionnaire by conducting the field study (survey) (Sekaran & Bougie, 2013). The research methodology, both exploratory and descriptive design of research are used by the researchers. The research methodology is the broader term while the research design is used for a specific project/study. Numerous researchers suggested that survey is active tool for data collection with respect to aspects (primary and secondary). In this research, the interest of the population is involved the entire 'teaching faculty' of selected universities in universities of KP, Pakistan.

### IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are main section, which shows the primary contribution of scholars in concerned studies on research. The descriptive and the inferential statistics are the two main section of the findings chapter. In this section, decisions were made regarding the rejection and acceptance of hypotheses of study. The current section comprises main parts like descriptive statistics about demographic and research variables, tests of normality distribution about research questions and variables, data reliability, factor analysis about questionnaire, association (correlation analysis), regression (cause-&-effect), mediation exploration and test of significance (demographic groups differences among). The output tables are interpreted with the level of significance by showing its significance and insignificance which helps the researcher to "find out answers of research questions and to reach the conclusion more comprehensively".

Table 2 The Cross Tabulation (department, Gender & Qualification)

Department			Qualification			Total
			Master	M. Phil	PhD	
Social Sciences	Gender	Male	125	125	49	299
		Female	20	28	0	48
	Total		145	153	49	347
Natural Sciences	Gender	Male	12	37	50	99

		Female	2	15	10	27
	Total		14	52	60	126
Total	Gender	Male	137	162	99	398
		Female	22	43	10	75
	Total		159	205	109	473

Table 3 The Cross Tabulation (Domicile, Gender & Designation)

Domicile			Designation				Total
			Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
Local	Gender	Male	96	105	16	12	229
		Female	33	12	2	0	47
	Total		129	117	18	12	276
Non-local	Gender	Male	99	51	2	17	169
		Female	18	10	0	0	28
	Total		117	61	2	17	197
Total	Gender	Male	195	156	18	29	398
		Female	51	22	2	0	75
	Total		246	178	20	29	473

Table 4 The Cross Tabulation (Domicile, Marital status & Designation)

Domicile			Designation				Total
			Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
Local	Marital status	Married	72	77	17	12	154
		Unmarried	57	40	1	0	90
	Total		129	117	18	12	276
Non-local	Marital status	Married	82	56	0	17	155
		Unmarried	35	5	2	0	37
	Total		117	61	2	17	197
Total	Marital status	Married	161	135	14	29	309
		Unmarried	85	43	6	0	127
	Total		246	178	20	29	473

### H<sub>1</sub>: Female group is scoring higher than Male

Table 5 T-test application on Gender-Based Groups

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Male	398	5.1512	.69251		
	Female	75	5.2254	.51881	8.353	.004
Transactional Leadership	Male	398	4.8274	.66167		
	Female	75	4.7727	.62406	.308	.579
Motivation	Male	398	5.3012	.70000		
	Female	75	5.0022	.73652	.788	.045
Organizational commitment	Male	398	5.0604	.71956		
	Female	75	5.0656	.73427	.012	.913

The table above shows among the demographic groups the mean differences regarding gender. The gender was categorized into females and males. The analysis shows responses differences of males and females regarding research variables under study (transactional leadership, transformational leadership, organizational commitment and motivation). The results in above table shows males and females have similar opinions regarding the transformational leadership (.004) and motivation (.045) because these two variables show the significance in the analysis. The other two research variables, transactional leadership (.579), and organizational commitment (.913) have shown no significance in the results. Consequently, from the above analysis, it is decided that the hypothesis # 5 is partially accepted.

**H<sub>2</sub>: “Social group is scoring higher than Natural Science”**

Table 6 T-test application on Department-Based Groups

	Department	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Social Sciences	347	5.2022	.64462		
	Natural Sciences	126	5.0549	.72041	6.511	.011
Transactional Leadership	Social Sciences	347	4.8511	.67709		
	Natural Sciences	126	4.7297	.58536	2.426	.120
Motivation	Social Sciences	347	5.2772	.77715		
	Natural Sciences	126	5.1896	.49504	17.429	.000
Organizational commitment	Social Sciences	347	5.0289	.71240		
	Natural Sciences	126	5.1502	.74021	4.064	.044

The table above shows among the demographic groups the mean differences concerning the department which was categorized into the social sciences and natural sciences. The findings show responses differences of natural sciences and social sciences respondents regarding research variables under examination (organizational commitment, motivation, transactional leadership and (transformational leadership). The results in the above table shows the social sciences and natural sciences respondents have similar opinions regarding the transformational leadership (.011), motivation (.000) and organizational commitment (.044) because these three variables show significance in analysis. The only one research variables, transactional leadership (.120) has shown no significance in results. Thus, from above analysis, it is absolute that hypothesis # 6 is partially accepted.

**H<sub>4</sub>: The “Local group is scoring higher than Non-Local”**

Table 7 T-test application on Domicile-Based Groups

	Domicile	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Local	276	5.1831	.65457		
	Non-local	197	5.1348	.68721	.137	.712
Transactional Leadership	Local	276	4.8809	.72797		
	Non-local	197	4.7317	.52744	26.158	.000
Motivation	Local	276	5.2246	.83939		
	Non-local	197	5.2947	.48440	61.283	.000
Organizational commitment	Local	276	5.0510	.75114		
	Non-local	197	5.0754	.67847	5.465	.020

The table above shows that among demographic groups, mean differences regarding domicile. The domicile was categorized into the non-local and local. The analysis shows responses differences of local and non-local regarding research variables under study (motivation, transformational leadership, the organizational commitment and transactional leadership). The results in the above table shows the local and non-local respondents have similar opinions regarding the transactional leadership (.000), motivation (.000) and organizational commitment (.020) because these three variables show the significance in the analysis. The only one research variables, the transformational leadership (.712) has shown no significance in results and remained insignificant in the output. Thus, from analysis above, it is concluded that the hypothesis # 7 is accepted partially.

**H<sub>4</sub>: “Married group is scoring higher than Un-Married”**

Table 8 T-test application on Marital Status-Based Groups

	Marital status	N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Married	309	5.0339	.65987		
	Unmarried	127	5.3574	.65757	.092	.762
Transactional Leadership	Married	309	4.8022	.65638		
	Unmarried	127	4.7920	.63325	.051	.821
Motivation	Married	309	5.2937	.65951		
	Unmarried	127	5.1726	.79184	12.346	.000

Organizational commitment	Married	309	4.9973	.70910		
	Unmarried	127	5.1670	.77742	3.139	.047

The table above shows that among the demographic groups mean differences regarding marital status. The marital status was classified into married and un-married. The analysis shows the responses differences of married and un-married regarding research variables under study (transformational leadership, transactional leadership, organizational & commitment motivation). In the table above, the results show married and un-married respondents have similar opinions regarding transformational leadership (.762) and transactional (.821) because these two variables show insignificance in analysis. The two research variables, motivation (.000) and organizational commitment (.047) have shown significance in analysis. It means that the marital status showed the significance on two variables (motivation and organizational commitment) while other two variables (transactional leadership & transformational leadership) remained insignificance in the analysis. Thus, it is concluded, from above analysis, that hypothesis # 8 is partially accepted.

**H<sub>5</sub>: “PhD group is scoring higher than other Group”**

Table 9 Qualification-Based Mean Differences (ANOVA)

		Sum2	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Between Groups	1.344	2	.672	1.509	.222
	Within Groups	209.312	470	.445		
	Total	210.657	472			
Transactional Leadership	Between Groups	.607	2	.303	.705	.495
	Within Groups	202.210	470	.430		
	Total	202.816	472			
Motivation	Between Groups	7.961	2	3.981	8.052	.000
	Within Groups	232.353	470	.494		
	Total	240.314	472			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	4.160	2	2.080	4.052	.018
	Within Groups	241.291	470	.513		
	Total	245.451	472			

The table above shows that among demographic groups, mean differences, with regard to the qualification which further was categorized into “Master, M. Phil & PhD”. The analysis shows responses differences of the qualification-wise about research variables (transactional leadership, transformational leadership, organizational commitment and motivation). The outcomes in table above shows respondents qualification have similar opinions about transformational leadership (.222) and transactional (.495) because these two variables show insignificance in analysis. Thetwo research variables, motivation (.000) and organizational commitment (.018) have shown significance in analysis. It means that the marital status showed the significance on two variables (motivation & organizational commitment) while two variables (transactional leadership and transformational leadership) remained insignificance in the analysis. Consequently, from analysis above, it is decided that the hypothesis # 9 is partially accepted.

**H<sub>7</sub>: “Professor group is scoring higher than other Group”**

Table 10 Designations-Based Mean Differences (ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Between Groups	1.156	3	.385	.863	.460
	Within Groups	209.500	469	.447		
	Total	210.657	472			
Transactional Leadership	Between Groups	3.121	3	1.040	2.443	.043
	Within Groups	199.696	469	.426		
	Total	202.816	472			
Motivation	Between Groups	2.162	3	.721	1.419	.236
	Within Groups	238.152	469	.508		
	Total	240.314	472			

Organizational commitment	Between Groups	3.774	3	1.258	2.441	.044
	Within Groups	241.677	469	.515		
	Total	245.451	472			

The table above shows the groups mean differences between demographic regarding designation. It was considered into "lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor and professor". The analysis shows responses differences of designation-wise about research variables (transformational leadership, the transactional leadership, the organizational commitment & motivation). The results in above table shows respondents designation have similar opinions regarding transformational leadership (.460) and motivation (.236) because these two variables show insignificance in analysis. The two research variables, transactional leadership (.043) and organizational commitment (.044) have shown significance in analysis. It means that designation showed significance on two variables (transactional and organizational commitment) while the two variables (transformational leadership and motivation) remained insignificance in the analysis. Consequently, from analysis above, it is determined that hypothesis # 10 is accepted partially.

**H<sub>7</sub>: "13-24 group is scoring higher than other Group"**

Table 11 Experience-Based Mean Differences (ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Between Groups	1.112	3	.371	.829	.478
	Within Groups	209.545	469	.447		
	Total	210.657	472			
Transactional Leadership	Between Groups	.640	3	.213	.495	.686
	Within Groups	202.177	469	.431		
	Total	202.816	472			
Motivation	Between Groups	3.243	3	1.081	2.139	.045
	Within Groups	237.071	469	.505		
	Total	240.314	472			
Organizational commitment	Between Groups	2.450	3	.817	1.576	.194
	Within Groups	243.001	469	.518		
	Total	245.451	472			

The table above shows mean groups differences amid demographic about the experience. The designation was classified into 1-10, 11-20, 21-30 and 31-40. The analysis shows responses differences of the experience-wise about the research variables (transactional leadership, motivation, transformational leadership and organizational commitment). The results in above table shows respondents experience have differences in opinions about transformational leadership (.478), organizational commitment (.194) and transactional leadership (.686) since these two variables show insignificance in the analysis. The only research variables, motivation (.045) has shown significance in analysis. It means that experience showed insignificance on three variables (transformational, transactional & organizational commitment) while one variable (motivation) remained significance in the analysis. Consequently, from analysis above, it is decided that the hypothesis # 11 is accepted partially.

**H<sub>8</sub>: "49-60 group is scoring higher than other Group"**

Table 12 Age-Based Mean Differences (ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Transformational Leadership	Between Groups	15.978	4	3.994	9.603	.000
	Within Groups	194.679	468	.416		
	Total	210.657	472			
Transactional Leadership	Between Groups	4.373	4	1.093	2.578	.037
	Within Groups	198.443	468	.424		
	Total	202.816	472			
Motivation	Between Groups	11.926	4	2.982	6.110	.000
	Within Groups	228.387	468	.488		
	Total	240.314	472			

Organizational commitment	Between Groups	18.464	4	4.616	9.517	.000
	Within Groups	226.987	468	.485		
	Total	245.451	472			

The table above shows the demographic groups between mean differences regarding the age. The age was classified into 20-30, 31-40, 41-50 and 51-60. The analysis shows responses differences of age group regarding research variables under study (transactional leadership, transformational leadership, organizational commitment and motivation). The results in above table shows the age group respondents have similar opinions about transformational leadership (.00) the transactional leadership (.037), the organizational commitment (.000) and the motivation (.000) because these four variables show the significance in the analysis. So, from analysis above, it is decided that the hypothesis # 12 is accepted.

### Summary Statistics of Demographics

Table 13 Summary Table (Demographic Impacts)

Variables	GDR	DPT	DOM	MST	QUA	DSG	EXP	AGE	Results
Transformational Leadership	.004	.011	.712	.762	.222	.460	.478	.000	3/8
Transactional Leadership	.579	.120	.000	.821	.495	.043	.686	.037	3/8
Motivation	.045	.000	.000	.000	.000	.236	.045	.000	7/8
Organizational Commitment	.913	.044	.020	.047	.018	.044	.194	.000	6/8

### V. CONCLUSION

Regarding the demographic impact regarding group mean differences, ANOVA and t-tests application were applied on demographic variables eight (8) to test the hypotheses. The findings reveal that there are salient variances in respondents' opinion on six (department, gender, designation, age domicile and qualifications) demographics while two variables (marital status and experience) have seemed insignificant in carrying the mean group differences. The present study showed that almost all variables showed their significances on all research variables (transactional & transformational leadership, the motivation and organizational commitment). These findings of demographics were also validated by the previous research results about the demographic groups mean differences. It is hence concluded that behavior differences on basis of six mentioned above demographics must be taken really by the concerned authorities in the institutions.

### REFERENCES

1. Avoid, B. J., Waldman, D. A., and Yammarino, F. J. (1991). Leading in the 1990s: The four i's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 15(4), 9-16.
2. Barlow, C.B., Jordan, M., & Hendrix, W. H. (2002). Character Assessment: An Examination of Leadership Levels. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(4), 563-584.
3. Bass, B. M. and Avoid, B.J. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Sampler set. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
4. Bateman, T. S., & Snell, S. A. (2002). *Management: Competing in the New Era* (5th Edition). The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
5. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row, New York.
6. Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating High Achievement: High School Principals' Reflections on Their Successful Leadership Practices. *Journal Of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-580.
7. Durga D. P., & Prabhu N.R.V. (2012). The relationship between effective leadership and employee performance. 2011 international conference on advancements in information technology with workshop of ICBMG 2011, 20.
8. Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avoid, B., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: a field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 735-744.

9. Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
10. Ebrahim, S., & Ali, H. (2014). The Relationship between Social Capital and Organizational Commitment of Employees in Zanzan Education Organization: (A Case Study). *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 3 (5), p- 166-177.
11. Emanuel, C., & Beatrice, I., & Heijden, M. (2005). Organizational Commitment, Public Service Motivation, and Performance within the Public Sector. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 31 (2), 241-274.
12. Emery, C. R., & Barker, K. J. (2010). The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 11(1), 77-90.
13. Galanou, E.i (2010). The Impact of Leadership Styles on Four Variables of Executives Workforce. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (6), p- 3-16.
14. Irfan, U. K., Nawaz, A., Farhat, U. K., Naseem, B. Y. (2013). The Impact of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction on the ITL of Academicians in HEIs of Developing Countries like Pakistan. *Industrial Engineering Letters*, 3(9), 18-26.
15. Irfan, U. K., Nawaz, A., Farhat, U. K., Naseem, B. Y. (2014). The impact of Organizational Commitment on the ITL among the Academicians in HEIs in Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 88-99.
16. Lincoln, J. R. & Kalleberg, A. L. (1990). Culture, control and commitment: A study of work organizations in the United States and Japan. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.
17. Riaz T., Akram M.U., Ijaz H. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership style on affective employees' commitment: an empirical study of banking sector in Islamabad (Pakistan). *The Journal of Commerce*, 3(1), 43-51.
18. Riaz, A. & Haider, M. (2003). Role of transformational and transactional leadership on job satisfaction and career satisfaction. *Business and Economic Horizons*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp. 29-38.
19. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 134-146.
20. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55 (1), 219-234.
21. Stoner, J. A. F., Freeman, R. E. & Gilbert, Jr, D. R. (1995) Management (6edn). *London: Prentice-Hall International*.
22. Yousef, D. A. (2001). Organizational commitment: a mediator of the relationships of leadership behavior with job satisfaction and performance in a non-western country. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 15(1): 6-24.