

Employee Commitment (EC) and Leadership Styles (LS): An Evaluation of the Evidence Post-COVID and Suggestions for the Future

Dr. Pavithra Salanke^{1*}, N. Jayashree², A. Nagaraj Subbarao³ and Dr. Anshu Rani⁴

^{1*}Associate Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Dayananda Sagar University, Bangalore, India

²Assistant Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Dayananda Sagar University, Bangalore, India

³Professor, School of Commerce and Management Studies, Dayananda Sagar University, Bangalore, India

⁴Associate Professor, REVA Business School, REVA University, Bangalore, India

E-mail: ¹pavithra.salanke@gmail.com, ²jayash21088@gmail.com, ³dean-cee@dsu.edu.in, ⁴anshu.rani@reva.edu.in

ORCID: ¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6106-3214>, ²<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2850-8917>,

³<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1986-1658>, ⁴<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9459-5604>

(Received 26 October 2025; Revised 24 November 2025, Accepted 08 December 2025; Available online 05 January 2026)

Abstract - Leadership styles and their impact on employee commitment (EC) have been the subject of a re-evaluation as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which has substantially altered workplace dynamics. This study examines the association between leadership styles—transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire—and different aspects of employee commitment in Indian workplaces following the pandemic. A quantitative research design was employed to collect data from 312 employees across various sectors using structured surveys. Statistical analyses, such as correlation, regression, t-tests, ANOVA, and post hoc (Duncan's) tests, were utilized to investigate the associations. The results indicate that transformational leadership positively affects both affective and normative commitment, whereas transactional leadership impacts continuance commitment. Demographic variables, including age, gender, and job tenure, were identified as moderators of the LS-EC relationship. This study emphasizes the necessity for adaptive leadership models in organizational contexts following COVID-19 and offers recommendations for HR practitioners aimed at promoting sustainable employee engagement. These insights are particularly pertinent for emerging economies such as India, where leadership practices must adapt to swift changes in the workplace.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Leadership Styles, Quantitative Research, Post-COVID, Indian Organization

I. INTRODUCTION

The pandemic has substantially disrupted the lives of all individuals, as is widely known. It has led to crisis situations on both a personal and professional level for the human race, resulting in significant human suffering worldwide. The failure of enterprises has resulted in an irreversible increase in human insecurities and job losses of an exponential magnitude. Organizations have to adapt to a new normal in order to handle the challenges and grow their businesses from fresh angles (Alrowwad et al., 2020). In order to increase employee commitment, those who were opposed to the distributed work culture were required to re-evaluate and modernize their leadership styles.

The primary purpose of organizations is to accomplish predetermined objectives and goals within a predetermined framework. It is impossible to overstate the importance of human factors (employees) in achieving these goals and objectives (Gberevbie, 2017). The issue is that organizations are limited in their ability to fully utilize human resources in order to achieve their established objectives, as they are only able to utilize all of their financial, physical, and technological resources to the utmost extent (Jain & Duggal, 2015; Trisiana, 2024). Leadership is the initial factor that affects employees' commitment, as it pertains to the manner of a leader and its impact on the organizational workforce's commitment to performance (Yasir et al., 2016). Various factors, such as access to benefits for employees, a pleasant workplace, an organization's basic principles, possibilities for career progression, recognition, and employee involvement, have been identified as contributing to improved employee and organizational performance (Popli & Rizvi, 2016; Armstrong & Taylor, 2020).

The nature and efficacy of leadership within an organization are frequently inextricably linked to the success or failure of businesses and the overall morale of their workforce. Leadership is not merely a managerial function; it is a dynamic interpersonal process that influences the way employees perceive their roles, responsibilities, and value within the organization. These styles whether transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, or servant have a significant influence on organizational commitment, employee engagement, and attitudes. A positive leadership style that is consistent with the values of employees and recognizes their contributions can increase their sense of purpose and belonging, thereby increasing their dedication to the organization's objectives. Stress, ambiguity, and a sense of disconnection from the workplace may be experienced by employees who are subjected to ineffective leadership. These adverse effects frequently manifest as increased absenteeism, reduced

productivity, and increased turnover intentions. Effective managers use tact and other social skills to encourage people to achieve at their maximum levels by showing a genuine interest in the long-term development of their workforce. Employee demotivation and decreased commitment would be among the effects of these leadership strategies. The tendency is commonly apparent when such employees emotionally disassociate themselves from the organization and are hesitant to quit it for any reason (Nasurdin, Ahmad & Razalli, 2014). Leaders foster a culture of loyalty, resilience, and enduring dedication, even during difficult periods, such as those that have ensued since the COVID-19 pandemic (Bose & Ghosh, 2025; Sadulla, 2025). Considering the fast-paced changes in organizations following COVID-19, this study seeks to assess how various leadership styles affect employee engagement in Indian businesses. It also aims to comprehend the impact of demographic variables on this relationship and to provide evidence-based recommendations for leadership development in the changing workplace.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Employee Commitment (EC)

Continuous change is a reality in the workplace, and businesses increasingly require personnel who can handle it effectively. Managers must consider not only how the change will impact the firm's performance, but also how it will effect employees. Meyer and Allen (1991) describe commitment as the psychological condition that determines employees' interactions with the organization and whether or not they choose to stay members. They presented a three-component model as the most effective framework, with each component representing one of the qualities listed below: emotional participation, continuing involvement, and cognitive commitment. Employee commitment to change predicts behavioral support more strongly than organizational commitment (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). A corporation may function optimally in the current climate if everyone is committed to accomplishing specific personal and company goals. It can be an effective technique for improving an organization's performance.

Building employee engagement is critical for an organization to achieve its strategic objectives. Corporate culture is critical in improving employee commitment to the company, however not all corporate cultural measures influence employee commitment. Employee commitment to the organization is enhanced by employee involvement in decision-making, creativity, cooperation, work flexibility, and the organization's ability to adapt to changing circumstances (Nongo & Ikyanyon, 2012). Employee commitment predicts organizational growth and development. Employee attitudes and behaviours will change as a result of the implementation of employee commitment aspects such as performance evaluation, training and development, and equitable remuneration schemes. These elements surely increase employee dedication, which improves the firm's success (Gul, 2015). Organizational commitment, unlike normative commitment, has a diverse impact on productivity (Đorđević et al., 2020).

Leadership Styles (LS)

Management, in Peter Drucker's words, is doing things correctly; leadership, acting morally. Strong leadership is essential for organizations to function, and leaders are found at every level. They inspire confidence in others around them by providing direction, inspiration, and clarity. There is an increasing consensus in the leadership literature that there is no one good performance approach (Higgs & Rowland, 2003). The environment for innovation management is likely to be influenced differently by different leadership philosophies depending on how employees are engaged and committed (Bel, 2020).

Leadership theories have developed over time. It all began with the Great Man hypothesis at the turn of the 20th century, emphasizing distinctive leadership qualities. When incumbent leadership theory was eventually criticized, various tactics such as team-based styles of leadership, unforeseen circumstances, contextual, path-goal beliefs, and other approaches began to gain traction (Beyer, 2012). Depending on the situation, a leader should be able to manage each follower individually and either remove obstacles to self-actualized independence or set boundaries for freedom. As a result, leaders require various working styles. Moreover, when the conditions vary, the leaders should hold numerous distinct approaches in their leadership toolkits (Reunanen & Kaitonen, 2016).

Several types of effective leadership predict employee engagement in several long-term studies (Kadhim & Jasim, 2022). The Full Range of Leadership (FRL) model asserts that the greatest leadership philosophies for motivating employees, influencing their attitudes and behaviors, and increasing productivity include transformative and transactional leadership. According to longitudinal research, various positive leadership philosophies, directly and indirectly, influence work engagement by raising job resources and lowering job expectations (Schaufeli, 2015). Leadership, according to management scholars, may impact company culture and is a crucial component of organizational and social success. In addition to having a direct bearing on how the organization and its personnel learn, organizational culture is a crucial mediator in the relationship between leadership style and organizational learning (Hosseini et al., 2019; Amit, 2018).

Employee Commitment (EC) and Leadership Styles (LS)

Leadership style is a multifaceted technique for determining a goal, inspiring people to act, and providing encouragement and enthusiasm to accomplish stated goals. Leaders and HR managers will recognize the fundamental leadership tenets that have a beneficial influence on employees' commitment to companies. The right leadership style and particular demographic factors increase the likelihood of achieving employees' commitment (Abasilim, Gbervbie & Osibanjo, 2019). Construction organizations view employee commitment as a significant mediating factor in the relationship between a transformational leadership style and staff performance (A. Mahfouz et al., 2020). Leadership philosophies and organizational commitment can be mediated by job fulfilment. Academic staff's level of job satisfaction will

typically rise, and organizational commitment will be elevated if university management acknowledges, encourage, and reward them. The leadership style and quality used by university administrators contribute to employee happiness, increasing organizational commitment (Mwesigwa, Tusiime & Ssekiziyivu, 2020).

According to some research, there is a link between different organizationally and personally valued job outcomes and transactional and transformational leadership styles (Jackson et al., 2012). Transformational leadership enhances workers' capacity to absorb knowledge and their perception of and use of external information sources more in cultures with low uncertainty avoidance than compared to cultures with high uncertainty avoidance (Flatten et al., 2015). In contrast, in countries like Korea, transactional leadership style behaviors emphasize that norms and processes to preserve order in the workplace are effective (Clugston et al., 2000). Employee engagement and transformative leadership style are mediated by emotional competence. Employee engagement at work is best served by leaders who exhibit transformational leadership traits such as encouragement, emotionality & motivation (Milhem et al., 2019).

Transactional Leadership Style (Transact LS)

A leader is said to be adopting a transactional style of leadership when they use rewards and penalties to motivate followers to follow directions. By creating agreements that, if consistently adhered to over time, would result in benefits for the follower, these leaders motivate their followers (Whittington et al., 2009). As a leadership strategy, transactional leadership—also referred to as executive leadership—focuses on organizational efficacy, structure, and direction. Additionally, managers look for new ways to increase employee involvement and, consequently, positive change. Some of these strategies include lowering turnout requirements, improving occupational performance, and creating organizations that are more focused (Fesharaki & Sehhat, 2018). The transactional leadership style was a strong and positive predictor of the company Citizenship Behavior feature, which is an atmosphere that is supportive of the company both internally and externally (Rodrigues & Ferreira, 2015).

According to research that demonstrates the transactional leadership style has a strong positive impact on employee performance in the organization, it is generally positively and significantly associated with the performance-related giving of positive incentives in case of completing the objectives set or offering unfavorable rewards when the offender does not reach the intended goal (Brahim et al., 2015). The safety atmosphere, which promotes three types of successful behaviors—adherence to safety standards, safety involvement, and dangerous behaviors—is how active transactional leadership has an influence (Córcoles & Stephanou, 2017). By focusing on the interactions between the leader and followers, it draws attention to the self-interested basis of the relationship (Alrowwad et al., 2020).

Thus, the following hypothesis was framed

H1: In the Context of the Indian workplace post-COVID, we can observe there is a significant correlation exists between the transactional style of leadership (Transact LS) & Employee's commitment (EC) (Umamaheswari & Sathianathan, 2020).

Transformational Leadership Style (Transform LS)

Charismatic leadership is another name for transformational leadership. It is based on the ideals of a leader who has the power to influence followers' behaviour or individual efforts. Inspirational, significant, and motivating are some characteristics of transformational leaders (Muhammad Shahzeb Khan et al., 2012). Transformational leaders offer a long-term goal focusing on the higher-order intrinsic requirements of their followers. By consistently encouraging their workers, these leaders use motivation to help them perform to the best of their ability and increase their confidence (Engelen et al., 2012). Five factors influence transformational leadership: idealized impact or imputed charisma, idealized effect or charismatic behaviour, inspired determination, cognitive stimulation, and thoughtful contemplation (Gilbert, Horsman & Kelloway, 2016).

Studies on the two-path mediation function of employee trust in leadership in the link between transformational leadership and organisational change capability put an emphasis on change management and leadership (Cao & Le, 2022). Transformational leadership & worker's emotional commitment is significantly correlated. By fostering workers' disclosure & reliance-based confidence in leaders, transformational leadership practises help managers strengthen the ability of small and medium-sized firms to adapt to change. The impact is also influenced by how transformational leadership seems to spectators, who may be thought of as carrying out various administrative responsibilities (Ashikali & Groeneveld, 2015). For certain economic tasks that call for challenging presumptions, taking calculated risks, and approaching problems in fresh ways, transformational leadership may be appropriate. The development of individual creative thinking is greatly influenced by transformational leadership practises since they stimulate the minds of the employees (Çekmecelioğlu & Özbağ, 2016).

H2: In the Context of Indian workplaces Post-COVID, we can observe there is a significant correlation amongst transformational leadership style (transform LS) & employees' commitment (EC).

Laissez-faire Leadership Style (Laissez LS)

Another reasonably common leadership approach is laissez-faire, French for "to let things do". The laissez-faire philosophy is viewed as being at the democratic transformation poles (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen, 2003). Laissez-faire leadership involves followers in decision-making and gives them a sense of belonging to the business process, which empowers them and motivates them to focus on attaining the organization's goals (Abid, Zahra and Ahmed, 2016). In order to be adequately

understood, laissez-faire leadership needs to be treated from a neutral standpoint.

H3: In the Context of the Indian Workplace Post-COVID, we can observe there is a significant correlation exists between the laissez-faire leadership style (laissez LS) and Employee's commitment (EC).

The Gap in the Literature Review

Despite the increased global interest in leadership dynamics following COVID-19, there is a noteworthy lack of empirical research on the relationship between leadership styles (LS) and employee commitment (EC) in the Indian workplace context. The existing literature does recognize a substantial correlation between LS and EC; however, the results are not wholly consistent. These inconsistencies raise concerns regarding the generalizability and applicability of previous research, particularly in culturally diverse and evolving environments such as India. Additionally, the Indian context has paid scant regard to the function of demographic variables—including age, gender, experience, and organizational tenure—in moderating this relationship. The necessity of further investigation is underscored by this lack of clarity. Consequently, the objective of the current investigation is to re-evaluate and revisit the relationship between employee commitment and leadership styles in Indian organizations that have experienced a post-pandemic period, while also taking into account the moderating impact of demographic factors.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The article's objective is to analyze how leadership style & employees' commitment are related to each other and to figure out which particular leadership style sub-variables have a stronger association between employees' commitment in the Context of Indian workplaces post pandemic situation. To achieve these objectives, a cross-sectional research design was adopted. This is reinforced by the observation that ratings of the independent (LS) and dependent (EC) variables were gathered roughly concurrently and without any intention of influencing or changing the variables under examination. 243 respondents were used using a systematic sampling method. The organization's personnel self-administered two sets of standard questionnaires to gather data. Avolio, J.B. and Bass, M.B. (2004) designed Multifactor Leadership Style Questionnaire & and Allen (1997) developed questionnaire on organization commitment have been used in the research. The Questionnaire has 3 components where 1st section captures the demographic details, 2nd section evaluates the leadership styles, and 3rd section assessed the level of employees' commitment they demonstrated.

Correlation analyses was used to explore relationship from the data gathered and to validate the hypotheses 0.05 level of significance was considered. The reliability test was conducted using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha for MLQ was 0.78 and OCQ was 0.83 and it confirms the data's consistency. Hence, we can say that the data consistent and substantially good enough for further analysis and interpretation. To ascertain the association

between leadership styles (LS) and employees' commitment (EC), regression & correlation was used with the aid of the SPSS software.

TABLE I DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Variable	Count	%
Gender. Female	68	28
Gender. Male	175	72
Age:20-30 years	141	58
Age:31-40 years	51	21
Age:41-50 years	36	15
Age:51-60 years	15	6
Marital status. Single	148	61
Marital status. Married	95	39
Education. Diploma	112	46
Education. Bachelor's Degree	85	35
Education. Master's Degree	46	19
Current Exp.< 5 years	51	54
Current Exp.5-10 years	22	21
Current Exp.> 10 years	24	25

On the above analysis from table I with reference to demographic factors the findings indicate that 28% respondents are female, and 72% respondents are male. 58% of respondents fall under the age group of 20-30 years, 21% fall under the age group of 31-40 years, 15% fall under the age group of 41-50 and 6% fall under the age group of 51-60 years. From the above table, we can infer that most of the respondents were single 61% and the majority of the respondents had a diploma as their highest qualification, i.e., 46%, 19% respondents had a master's degree, 35% respondents had a bachelor's degree. 54% of respondents had experience of less than five years, while 21% and 25% had experience of five to ten years or more, respectively.

Data Analysis

The researcher used regression and correlation studies to investigate how employee commitment (EC) and leadership styles (LS) interacted. An independent samples t-test revealed significant differences in employee engagement based on gender and leadership style. Additionally, differences in LS and EC were examined across several demographic characteristics such as marital status, age, educational attainment, years of service, and work status utilizing Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Duncan identified specific group variances in employee commitment levels and leadership styles using a post hoc test. Cohen's (1988) guidelines facilitate the comprehension of correlation coefficients as follows: Values up to 0.28 signify a negligible influence; values ranging from 0.28 to 0.49 denote a moderate effect; values over 0.49 represent a substantial effect.

In Table II, The theory seems to be validated by correlation data, indicating a substantial, modestly positive association between Transform LS and EC ($r = .372$, $p = .0000$, $p < .05$). The hypothesis is disproved since the Transact LS exhibits a negligible feeble undesirable association with worker's commitment ($r = -.033$, $p = .757$, $p > .05$). Furthermore, the results indicate a negligible but positive link between a Laissez LS and EC ($r = .098$, $p = .335$, $p > .05$), indicating the hypothesis can be recognized and accepted.

TABLE II CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT (EC) AND LEADERSHIP STYLES (LS)

	Transform LS score	Transact LS score	Laissez LS score
EC	.372*	-.033	.098
Significance. (two-tailed)	.000	.757	.335
N	243	243	243

Source: Author's Analysis.

Note: *Significant at 5% ($p < .05$).

Regression was used to calculate the percentage of the variance in EC that the LS accounted for. The independent variables were examined for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factors (VIFs). For the transform LS, transact LS, and laissez LS, the VIFs were 1.046, 1.045, and 1.006 respectively. Since the VIFs were fewer than 10, there is no proof that the predictor variables are multicollinear. The three leadership styles may have contributed to 14.9% of the difference in employees' levels of commitment, according to the adjusted R^2 of .148 that was found.

TABLE III REGRESSION OUTPUT

Statistics change									
Model	R	R ²	R ² Adjusted	S E.	Changed R ²	F change	df1	df2	Sig. F change
1	.383 ^a	.148	.1191	3.50782	.148	5.337	9	232	.0021
ANOVA ^a									
Model			Sum ²	d.f.	Mean ²				Sig.
1	Regression		197.966	9	66.655		5.436		.002 ^b
	Residual		1144.352	232	13.306				
	Total		1341.321	241					
Unstandardized co-efficient Standardized Co-efficients Collinearity statistics									
Model		B	SE	β	t	Sig.	Tolerance	Variance	
1	(Constant)	11.441	7.502		1.526	.1311			
	Transform LS score	0.226	0.059	.377	3.860	.0001	.956	1.046	
	Transact LS score	-0.103	0.097	-.103	-1.062	.2912	.957	1.045	
	Laissez LS score	2.556	3.539	.068	0.7223	.4722	.992	1.006	

Source: Author's Analysis.

Note: a depicts the dependent variable EC. & b depicts the Predictors like Transform LS score, Transact LS score, and Laissez LS score (constant).

fits the data. According to the findings, only the transform LS ($\beta = .226$, $t = 3.86$, $p = .000$, $p < .05$) significantly positively correlates with EC. As a result, there is a strong connection between employee dedication and transform LS.

From the above analysis we can see that p-value of .002 ($p < .05$), and the value of 5.336 exhibits how well the model

TABLE IV LS SCORES VARYING WITH THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	Count	\bar{X}	S.D.	S.E.	t.	F	p
Gender. Male	175	58.33	7.19	1.36	-1.63	N.A.	0.108
Gender. Female	68	61.17	8.07	0.97			
Age.20-30 years	141	62.66 ^a	7.92	1.04	NA	4.98	0.002*
Age.31-40 years	51	55.86 ^b	6.38	1.36			
Age.41-50 years	36	58.00 ^a	6.18	1.71			
Age.51- 60 years	15	59.00 ^a	9.59	4.80			
Marital status. Single	148	63.22 ^a	6.10	0.82	NA	21.62	0.000*
Marital status. Married	95	54.48 ^b	7.20	1.13			
Education. Diploma	112	49.50 ^b	10.97	5.48	NA	21.38	0.000*
Education. Bachelor's Degree	85	66.14 ^c	3.53	0.54			
Education. Master's Degree	46	60.67 ^a	7.05	2.35			
Current Exp.< 5 years	51	63.55 ^a	7.00	0.98	NA	11.53	0.000*
Current Exp. 5-10 years	22	55.45 ^b	7.84	1.67			
Current Exp. >10 years	24	58.00 ^b	6.83	1.39			

Source: - Author's Analysis.

Note. A significant difference in the LS score is indicated by a different superscript letter ($p < 0.05$), while a comparable superscript letter indicates no significant variation in the (LS) score ($p > .05$), or NA. When $p < 0.05$, values are significant.

The commitment of employees is not significantly correlated with other leadership philosophies, such as transact LS and laissez LS ($p > .05$). which is demonstrated in Table III.

Table IV displays the variations in the LS scores based on the demographic factors. The findings show substantial variation in leadership style (LS) ratings depending on the respondents' age ($F = 4.98$, $p = 0.002$, $p < 0.05$), marital status ($F = 21.62$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), Education ($F = 21.38$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), current experience ($F = 11.53$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$). In comparison to the other categories, the results suggest that respondents who are between the ages of 20 and 30 and who are single, diploma degree, or have less

than five years of experience received the highest leadership style scores.

Based on demographic factors, Table V shows how employee commitment varies. Corresponding to the age ($F = 3.73$, $p = 0.015$, $p > 0.05$), Education ($F = 6.75$, $p = 0.000$, $p > 0.05$), and current experience of employees ($F = 7.64$, $p = 0.001$, $p > 0.05$), results show a substantial difference in

employees' commitment. Employee commitment did not differ significantly depending on the gender where ($F = 1.23$, $p = 0.214$, $p > 0.05$) or employees' Marital status where ($F = 1.36$, $p = 0.257$, $p > 0.05$). The employees who provided the highest ratings on commitment were those between the age group of 31 years – 40 years and who had the current experience in the organization between 5-10 years (Please refer Table V).

TABLE V EC SCORE VARYING WITH THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	Count	\bar{X}	S.D.	S.E.	t.	F	p
Gender: Male	175	25.13	4.21	0.79	1.23	NA	.214
Gender: Female	68	24.11	3.53	0.42			
Age:20-30 years	141	23.84 ^a	2.96	0.39	N.A.	3.73	.015*
Age:31-40 years	51	24.14 ^a	4.33	0.92			
Age:41-50 years	36	22.38 ^b	4.45	1.23			
Age:51- 60 years	15	23.75 ^a	4.93	2.46			
Marital status: Single	148	24.95	2.72	0.37	N.A.	1.36	.257
Marital status. Married	95	23.88	4.81	0.76			
Education. Diploma	112	20.00 ^b	1.15	0.58	N.A.	6.75	.000*
Education. Bachelor's Degree	85	26.05 ^a	1.58	0.24			
Education. Master's Degree	46	21.67 ^b	4.33	1.44			
Current Exp.< 5 years	51	25.04 ^a	2.89	0.40	N.A.	7.64	.001*
Current Exp. 5-10 years	22	25.55 ^a	3.25	0.69			
Current Exp. >10 years	24	23.00 ^b	4.74	0.97			

Source: Author's Analysis.

Note: When the superscript letters are different, there is a significant difference in the commitment score ($p > 0.05$), however when they are same, there is no significant

variation in the commitment score ($p > 0.05$). *Values are significant when $p > 0.05$. NA stands for not applicable.

TABLE VI CORRELATION AMONGST LS AND EC ACROSS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

	R	p	Observation
Gender: Male	-.140	.476	Insignificant
Gender: Female	.484	.000*	Significant
Age: 20-30 years	.474	.000*	Significant
Age: 31-40 years	-.232	.298	Insignificant
Age: 41-50 years	.270	.372	Insignificant
Age: 51-60 years	.699	.301	Insignificant
Marital status: Single	.533	.000*	Significant
Marital status: Married	.007	.966	Insignificant
Education: Diploma	.130	.411	Insignificant
Education: Master's Degree	-.203	.257	Insignificant
Education: Bachelor's Degree	.625	.072	Insignificant
Current Exp: < 5 years	.363	.009*	Significant
Current Exp: 5-10 years	-.208	.352	Insignificant
Current Exp: > 10 years	.534	.007*	Significant

Correlations amongst leadership styles, levels of employee commitment amongst the workforce's demographic factors are presented in Table VI. Results show a significant optimistic relationship amongst LS and EC between female where ($r = .484$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), Age.20 to 30 years where ($r = .474$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), marital status. Single where ($r = .533$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), respondents who had current experience in the organization < than 5 years where ($r = .363$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), and employees who had current experience in the organization with > 10 years where ($r = .534$, $p = 0.007$, $p < 0.05$).

IV. CONCLUSION

The primary goal of this study is to investigate the relationship between leadership styles (LS) and employee commitment (EC), as well as to evaluate the impact of demographic characteristics in the Indian environment. The results suggest a positive correlation between LS and EC in India. Among the diverse leadership styles, transformational leadership exhibits a moderately strong positive correlation with employee commitment. This leadership (LS) approach prioritizes individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation, thereby promoting comprehensive growth of leaders and encouraging employees to achieve higher expectations.

The necessity for consistent investment in innovative leadership can frequently be obscured by the rapid expansion of primary business operations. Nevertheless, the absence of adaptive leadership becomes increasingly apparent as development slows as a result of diminishing returns. Investment in leadership development, particularly in accordance with national cultural values, is imperative for Indian organizations at this critical juncture. This commitment may not be sustainable in the long term, despite the fact that many employees presently exhibit it, often as a result of economic pressures and limited job opportunities. Indian firms are at risk of being eclipsed by global competitors who innovate more effectively within local markets if they fail to make strategic investments in leadership. Traditional advantages are likely to diminish as India's market competition intensifies and its population continues to expand. The ethical crossroads that leaders will encounter will become more prevalent, necessitating a decision between principled action and imminent gain. Ethical standards frequently commence to erode through rationalizations that substantiate isolated unethical decisions. As a result, ethical leadership is on the brink of significantly impacting employee commitment and defining leadership styles.

Leadership effectiveness continues to be significantly influenced by organizational culture. The significance of supportive leadership has been emphasized by the COVID-19 pandemic. Employees regard supportive leaders as those who offer constructive feedback, respond to individual requirements, provide encouragement, and assist with tasks. Although all aspects of organizational culture are influenced by leaders, supportiveness is particularly important and is strongly linked to a positive work environment. In a country that is undergoing rapid change, such as India, there is a pressing need for leaders who prioritize high performance and excellence while simultaneously promoting psychological safety in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abasilim, U. D., Gbrevbie, D. E., & Osibanjo, O. A. (2019). Leadership styles and employees' commitment: Empirical evidence from Nigeria. *Sage Open*, 9(3), 2158244019866287. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019866287>
- [2] Abid, G., Zahra, I., & Ahmed, A. (2016). Promoting thriving at work and waning turnover intention: A relational perspective. *Future Business Journal*, 2(2), 127-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbj.2016.08.001>
- [3] Alrowwad, A. A., Abualoush, S. H., & Masa'deh, R. E. (2020). Innovation and intellectual capital as intermediary variables among transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), 196-222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2019-0062>
- [4] Amit, P. P. (2018). A Study on the Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Job Satisfaction. *International Academic Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management*, 5(1), 36-62. <https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJOBHRM/V5I1/1810003>
- [5] Armstrong, M. and Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. 15th ed. London: Kogan Page.
- [6] Ashikali, T., & Groeneveld, S. (2015). Diversity management in public organizations and its effect on employees' affective commitment: The role of transformational leadership and the inclusiveness of the organizational culture. *Review of public personnel administration*, 35(2), 146-168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x13511088>
- [7] Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- [8] Bel, R. (2020). Leadership and innovation: Learning from the Best. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 29(2), pp.47-60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.20308>
- [9] Beyer, B. (2012). Blending Constructs and Concepts: Development of Emerging Theories of Organizational Leadership and Their Relationship to Leadership Practices for Social Justice. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(3).
- [10] Bose, T., & Ghosh, N. (2025). Evaluating the Economic Implications of Remote Work Adoption Post-Pandemic. *International Academic Journal of Innovative Research*, 12(3), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.71086/IAJIR/V12I3/IAJIR1218>
- [11] Brahim, A.B., Ridic, O. and Jukic, T. (2015). The Effect of Transactional Leadership on Employees Performance - Case Study of 5 Algerian Banking Institutions. *Economic Review: Journal of Economics and Business*, 13(2), pp.7-20.
- [12] Bruce Avolio, J., & Bernard Bass, M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and Sample Set*. Mind Garden.
- [13] Cao, T.T. and Le, P.B. (2022). Impacts of Transformational Leadership on Organizational Change capability: a two-path Mediating Role of Trust in Leadership. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 33(2), pp.157-173. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejmb-06-2021-0180>
- [14] Çekmecelioglu, H. G., & Özbağ, G. K. (2016). Leadership and creativity: The impact of transformational leadership on individual creativity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.11.020>
- [15] Clugston, M.J., Howell, J. and Dorfman, P.W. (2000). Does Cultural Socialization Predict Multiple Bases and Foci of commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26(1), pp.5-30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(99\)00034-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(99)00034-3)
- [16] Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- [17] Đorđević, B., Ivanović-Đukić, M., Lepojević, V., & Milanović, S. (2020). The impact of employees' commitment on organizational performances. *Strategic Management-International Journal of Strategic Management and Decision Support Systems in Strategic Management*, 25(3). <https://doi.org/10.5937/straman2003028d>
- [18] Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & Van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: a meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569>
- [19] Engelen, A., Gupta, V., Strenger, L. and Brettel, M. (2012). Entrepreneurial Orientation, Firm Performance, and the Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 41(4), pp.1069-1097. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312455244>
- [20] Fesharaki, F. & Sehhat, S. (2018). Islamic Human Resource Management (iHRM) Enhancing Organizational Justice and Employees' Commitment. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 9(1), pp.204-218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-03-2017-0029>
- [21] Flatten, T., Adams, D. & Brettel, M. (2015). Fostering Absorptive Capacity through leadership: a cross-cultural Analysis. *Journal of World Business*, 50(3), pp.519-534. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.08.010>
- [22] Fugate, B.S., Stank, T.P. & Mentzer, J.T. (2008). Linking Improved Knowledge Management to Operational and Organizational Performance. *Journal of Operations Management*, 27(3), pp.247-264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jom.2008.09.003>
- [23] Gbrevbie, D.E. (2017). *Public Administration: A Conceptual Perspective*. 1st ed. Ibadan, Nigeria: Cardinal Publishers.
- [24] Gilbert, S., Horsman, P. & Kelloway, E.K. (2016). The Motivation for Transformational Leadership Scale. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(2), 158-180. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-05-2014-0086>
- [25] Gray, J.L. & Starke, F.A. (1988). *Organizational Behavior : Concepts and Applications*. 3rd ed. New York: C.E. Merrill Pub. Co.

- [26] Gul, Z. (2015). Impact of Employee Commitment on Organizational Development. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 117–124.
- [27] Herscovitch, L. & Meyer, J.P. (2002). Commitment to Organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 474–487. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.474>.
- [28] Higgs, M.J.D. & Rowland, D. (2003). Is Change changing? *Henley Working Paper Series*, HWP 0313.
- [29] Hosseini, S.H., Hajipour, E., Kaffashpoor, A. & Darikandeh, A. (2019). The Mediating Effect of Organizational Culture in the Relationship of Leadership Style with Organizational Learning. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 30(3), 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2019.1680473>.
- [30] Jackson, T.A., Meyer, J.P. & Wang, X.-H. (Frank) (2012). Leadership, Commitment, and Culture. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 84–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812466919>.
- [31] Jain, P., & Duggal, T. (2015). The role of transformational leadership in organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research*, 2(5), 1–11.
- [32] Kadhim, S. S., & Jasim, E. O. (2022). The Effect of Workplace Democracy on Improving Employee Performance: An Analytical Study of the Opinions of a Sample of Employees at the General Company for Grain Trade / Diwaniya Branch. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(2), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJSS/V9I2/IAJSS0917>
- [33] Khan, M. J., Aslam, N., & Riaz, M. N. (2012). Leadership styles as predictors of innovative work behavior. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9(2), 17–22.
- [34] Mahfouz, S. A., Awang, Z., Muda, H., & Bahkia, A. S. (2020). Mediating role of employee commitment in the relationship between transformational leadership style and employee performance. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(2), 624–637. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8270>
- [35] Martínez-Córcoles, M., & Stephanou, K. (2017). Linking active transactional leadership and safety performance in military operations. *Safety science*, 96, 93–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2017.03.013>.
- [36] Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), pp.61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z).
- [37] Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: theory, research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, Calif. Sage Publ.
- [38] Milhem, M., Muda, H. & Ahmed, K. (2019). The Effect of Perceived Transformational Leadership Style on Employee Engagement: The Mediating Effect of Leader's Emotional Intelligence. *Foundations of Management*, 11(1), 33–42. <https://doi.org/10.2478/fman-2019-0003>.
- [39] Mulugeta, A. & Hailemariam, E. (2018). Employees' Perception Towards Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment in Public Organizations. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.29322/ijsrp.8.6.2018.p7846>.
- [40] Mwesigwa, R., Tusiime, I. & Ssekiziyivu, B. (2020). Leadership styles, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Academic Staff in Public Universities. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), pp.253–268. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2018-0055>.
- [41] Nasuridin, A.Mohd., Ahmad, N.H. & Razalli, A.A. (2014). Politics, Justice, Stress, And Deviant Behaviour In Organizations: An Empirical Analysis. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(2), 235–254.
- [42] Nongo, E.S. & Ikyanyon, D.N. (2012). The Influence of Corporate Culture on Employee Commitment to the Organization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(22). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n22p21>.
- [43] Popli, S. & Rizvi, I.A. (2016). Drivers of Employee Engagement: the Role of Leadership Style. *Global Business Review*, 17(4), 965–979. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150916645701>.
- [44] Reunanen, T. & Kaitonen, J. (2016). Different Roles in Leadership Styles in Modern Organization. In: *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management, Training and Education. Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 251–262.
- [45] Rodrigues, A. de O. & Ferreira, M.C. (2015). The Impact of Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Psico-USF*, 20(3), pp.493–504. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-82712015200311>.
- [46] Sadulla, S. (2025). Effect of Pranayama on lung function in post-COVID rehabilitation among middle-aged adults: A clinical study. *Journal of Yoga, Sports, and Health Sciences*, 1(1), 24–30.
- [47] Schaufeli, W.B. (2015). Engaging Leadership in the Job demands-resources Model. *Career Development International*, 20(5), pp.446–463. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-02-2015-0025>
- [48] Toegel, G. and Conger, J.A. (2002). *Grounding Leadership Theory and Research: Issues, Perspectives and Methods*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, pp.175–198.
- [49] Trisiana, A. (2024). A Sustainability-Driven Innovation and Management Policies through Technological Disruptions: Navigating Uncertainty in the Digital Era. *Global Perspectives in Management*, 2(1), 22–32.
- [50] Umamaheswari, A., & Sathianathan, J. (2020). Implementation of Sap Success Factors (SF) Employee Central. *International Academic Journal of Science and Engineering*, 7(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.9756/IAJSE/V7I1/IAJSE0701>
- [51] Wheatley, M.J. (2002). *Turning to One another: Simple Conversations to Restore Hope to the Future*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- [52] Whittington, J.L., Coker, R.H., Goodwin, V.L., Ickes, W. and Murray, B. (2009). Transactional Leadership Revisited: Self-Other Agreement and Its Consequences. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(8), pp.1860–1886. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00507.x>.
- [53] Yasir, M., Imran, R., Irshad, M.K., Mohamad, N.A. and Khan, M.M. (2016). Leadership Styles in Relation to Employees' Trust and Organizational Change Capacity. *SAGE Open*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016675396>.