



International Journal of Manpower

High involvement management practices as leadership enhancers
Olivier Doucet Marie-Ève Lapalme Gilles Simard Michel Tremblay

Article information:

To cite this document:

Olivier Doucet Marie-Ève Lapalme Gilles Simard Michel Tremblay , (2015), "High involvement management practices as leadership enhancers", International Journal of Manpower, Vol. 36 Iss 7 pp. -

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJM-10-2013-0243>

Downloaded on: 24 August 2015, At: 02:04 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 0 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 1 times since 2015*

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:532276 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Research on transformational leadership has linked this leadership style to several outcomes, such as employees' satisfaction, commitment, and performance (Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Lowe and Gardner, 2000). Although the research studies conceptualize transformational leadership almost exclusively from a universalist perspective (Bass, 1997), recent research however reminds us that context plays an important role on the effects of leaders' behaviors (Bass and Bass, 2008; Liden and Antonakis, 2009; Podsakoff *et al.*, 1996b). These authors hold that, if leaders' actions are analyzed without considering the conditions under which they take place, we will obtain only a partial view of reality, which could bias research findings. Within this perspective, the substitutes for leadership model (Kerr and Jermier, 1978) emerges as one of the most comprehensive attempts at identifying the factors moderating leaders' influence over their subordinates (Whittington *et al.*, 2004). This model proposes several contextual elements that can either reduce (i.e. substitutes, and neutralizers) or increase (i.e. enhancers) leaders' effectiveness. Up to now, limited research efforts has been devoted to the identification of leadership enhancers, as researchers have mainly focused on examining leadership substitutes and neutralizers.

Because they reflect the boundary conditions with which leaders must deal in their daily interactions with employees, human resource practices, and more specifically, those related to high involvement represent one such element that could enhance leadership effectiveness. Indeed, many studies have shown how such practices, no less so than leadership, could have a significant influence on several crucial outcomes for organizations and employees, such as higher levels of commitment, lower turnover, and increased productivity and profits (Wright *et al.*, 2005; Pfeffer and Veiga, 1999). Further, Purcell and Hutchison (2007) argue that where structured HR practices exist and are well known, managers are provided with techniques and

procedures to motivate employees and increase their performance. Other studies add that high involvement management represents an important tool supporting leaders in their actions (Lawler, 1986). High involvement management practices thus constitute significant organizational characteristics that are likely to moderate the leader's effectiveness.

The purpose of this research is thus to assess the moderating role of high involvement management practices on the relations between supervisors' transformational leadership and employees' affective organizational commitment, as expressed by an individual's emotional attachment to their firm (Meyer and Allen, 1997). This variable is one of the principal consequences associated with transformational leadership, and tested in the substitutes for leadership model (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1996a,b; Whittington *et al.*, 2004). More specifically, we argue that these practices (i.e., information sharing, power sharing, skill development, and recognition) will enhance the positive influence of leaders on employee commitment.

The contribution of our study is threefold: First, an important criticism that has been addressed in the substitutes for leadership literature is that the moderators proposed are rarely supported by a sound theoretical rationale (Villa *et al.*, 2003). By integrating the high involvement management model (Lawler, 1986) in this literature, our study provides a solid theoretical framework for explaining leadership effectiveness. Second, by focusing on the influence of high involvement management practices, our study broadens the application of the substitutes for leadership theory, a call that has been made by several researchers (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Whittington *et al.*, 2004). Finally, in practical terms, the results of this research will help immediate supervisors adjust their strategies to their organizations' practices and guide top managers in choosing practices that support these supervisors.

Transformational Leadership and the Substitutes for Leadership Theory

According to Burns (1978), transformational leaders encourage their subordinates to develop their full potential and orient their attitudes toward the good of the organization. Four broad dimensions are generally associated with this leadership style: (1) *Idealized influence* is exerted by leaders who preach by example, and who act as role models; (2) *Inspirational motivation* represents leaders' capacity to formulate a clear and shared vision, and to give employees a sense of purpose and challenge; (3) *Intellectual stimulation* is used by leaders who encourage employees to question the way they do things, to be innovative and creative, and finally, (4) *individual consideration* is displayed by leaders who consider their employees and who are sensible to their particular needs.

The substitutes for leadership theory proposes three types of moderators (substitutes, neutralizers, and enhancers), which reduce or increase leaders' effectiveness (Dionne *et al.*, 2005; Podsakoff *et al.*, 1996a). Originally, Kerr and Jermier (1978) suggested that the influence of supervisors' actions could be substituted or neutralized by contextual variables linked to the characteristics of subordinates, tasks, and organizations. Subsequently, Howell, Dorfman, and Kerr (1986) added enhancers to the traditional substitutes and neutralizers. While enhancers serve as positive moderators because they amplify the relation between leaders' behaviors and the consequences observed, neutralizers and substitutes reduce the leaders' influence. These two negative moderators do however differ to the extent that substitutes have a significant influence on the dependent variable, whereas neutralizers do not act on the latter.

Moderating Role of Perceptions of High Involvement Management Practices

According to the high involvement management model developed by Lawler (1986), four types of practices—information sharing, power sharing, skills development, and recognition—can favorably influence employees and their organization. This model implies that these

practices offer employees real and substantial sources of motivation and satisfaction (Lawler, 1992). They encourage employees to work harder, more intelligently, and more responsibly, thus helping firms gain a sustainable competitive advantage (Pfeffer and Veiga, 1999). One of the core components of the high involvement management model (Lawler, 1986) is to improve employees' organizational affective commitment. Indeed, studies generally report positive relations between the practices comprising this model and employee commitment (Lawler *et al.*, 1992; Simard *et al.*, 2005). The high involvement management model thus constitutes an interesting theoretical framework for analyzing the contextual elements influencing leaders' capacity to commit their employees to the organization. We shall now describe each practice of this model and justify its interactions with transformational leadership.

Information sharing practices represent the means organizations use to communicate with their employees. To be truly effective, these means must however provide for two-way communication. For example, the organization must share its vision and report its results and its future projects to the entire firm, as employees can hardly be expected to get involved if they do not properly understand the firm and the issues it faces (Lawler, 1992). Similarly, organizations that pay serious attention to the suggestions and concerns of their employees gather a wealth of information which can lead to more judicious decisions.

A number of elements indicate that these practices can interact with transformational leadership. First, Bass and Riggio (2006) explain that a leader's effectiveness will be improved when employees have access to important information. As information sharing practices favor commitment through the internalization of organizational goals and values by employees (Meyer and Allen, 1997), they provide a context which facilitates the role modeling and vision sharing efforts of the transformational leader. Moreover, research has shown that organizational

commitment develops in a climate where employees feel that their points of view are being heard and that they are valued (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1990). Although transformational leaders can provide this sense of support through individualized consideration (Bass and Bass, 2008), employees' commitment should be greater if they feel the same openness from the organization, which can be attained by organizational bottom-up information sharing mechanisms. Based on this line of argument, we propose that information sharing practices serve as an enhancer for transformational leadership. We therefore advance the following hypothesis:

H1: Information sharing practices moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' organizational affective commitment, making this relation stronger for those who perceive higher (vs. lower) information sharing in the organization.

While transformational leaders may foster employee commitment through role modeling and vision sharing, research also suggests that these leaders influence employee's commitment by involving them in decision making processes. Transformational leaders generally encourage employee participation and will not hesitate to delegate tasks to their employees (Bass and Riggio, 2006). Such treatment allows employees to feel more involved in their work and to thus develop a greater sense of commitment to the organization (Walumbwa and Lawler, 2003). However, the leader's influence is bounded by the latitude given to employees by the organization. In a context where the organization does not put in place practices that welcome employees' suggestions and provide them with autonomy, the efficacy of the leader should be attenuated. Conversely, power sharing practices, which foster greater employee participation through policies such as decentralized decision-making (Simard *et al.*, 2005), should reinforce the influence of transformational leadership on affective commitment. In sum, we advance that

power sharing practices serve as an enhancer for transformational leadership, leading to the following hypothesis:

H2: Power sharing practices moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' organizational affective commitment, making this relation stronger for those who perceive higher (vs. lower) power sharing in the organization.

Skill development practices refer to professional training and development offered to employees. Two main arguments can explain why transformational leadership and skill development practices are likely to mutually reinforce each other. First, a distinctive characteristic of transformational leaders is that they set challenging goals for their employees (Bass and Riggio, 2006). Where these objectives require the mastering of certain skills, it is essential that employees have access to development activities. Otherwise, their affective commitment might decline, for they will perceive the organization as not offering them the means to attain the goals set by their supervisors, which could be interpreted as a lack of commitment on the part of the organization. Second, transformational leaders help employees envision creative self-development pathways (Bass and Avolio, 1993). By looking at situations from different perspectives, they stimulate their employees' capacity for innovation and adaptation. As these skills are closely tied to the success of the high involvement approach (Lawler et al., 2001), the effectiveness of the leader should only be optimal if the firm offers activities to develop the related skills. The above discussion leads us to state that skill development practices act as an enhancer for transformational leadership. We therefore advance the following hypothesis:

H3: Skill development practices moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' organizational affective commitment, making this relation stronger for those who perceive higher (vs. lower) skill development in the organization.

Recognition practices refer to non-monetary rewards through which an organization shows its appreciation to employees for their work and performance (Paré and Tremblay, 2007). Such practices should constitute an appreciable leverage for transformational leadership for three reasons. First, transformational leaders foster employee identification with the organization's goals and values by providing a clear and inspiring vision (Bass and Riggio, 2006). By acknowledging employees' adherence and commitment to organizational goals through recognition practices, the firm indicates the importance of that vision, which should reinforce employees' attachment to the organization. Second, through role modeling, transformational leaders set an example by committing and devoting themselves to the organization. To the extent that employees perceive that their organization formally recognizes such efforts, they will be more highly motivated to follow this role model and commit to their organization. Third, by offering individualized consideration, transformational leaders offer what Brun and Dugas (2008) call existential recognition, i.e. employees' impression that the supervisor acknowledges their existence and takes their needs into account. Such recognition can also come from the organization through formal practices. Indeed, as Wayne et al. (2002) note, non-monetary recognition is seen by employees as an important discretionary reward, which shows that the employer values them. The presence of coherent and complementary sources of recognition in the workplace helps create a culture of recognition (Brun and Dugas, 2008), which can enhance employees' commitment. We thus advance the following hypothesis:

H4: Recognition practices moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and employees' organizational affective commitment, making this relation stronger for those who perceive higher (vs. lower) recognition in the organization.

Methods

Sample

For this research, an on-line questionnaire was sent to 346 employees in two different business units of a large Canadian financial firm. 219 of the questionnaires were returned and judged usable, for a satisfactory response rate of 63.3%. The sample was composed of men (41%) and women (59%), working as advisors or support staff. On average, they were 43 years old, had 13 years of seniority, and 43% of them held a university degree. Demographic comparisons of the 219 respondents to the 127 non-respondents (346-219) across the two business units were performed in terms of age, gender and tenure. Our results showed that the respondents sample was not significantly different from the non-respondents, indicating that non-response bias should not pose a significant problem in this study.

Measures

The items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1=completely disagree, 7=completely agree). When scales were not used in their entirety, items were selected based on the highest reliability coefficients presented by their authors.

Transformational leadership. Transformational leadership was measured using twelve items from the Podsakoff *et al.* (1990) scale. We used three items for each of the four dimensions composing transformational leadership, i.e., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Sample items were "My immediate

supervisor leads by example” and “My immediate supervisor has a clear understanding of where we are going”.

High involvement management practices. Perceptions of high involvement management practices were taken from two scales. Specifically, information sharing (five items), skill development (three items), and recognition (three items) were measured using the Tremblay *et al.*, (2010) scale. Sample items for these three scales are “Employees are well informed about the organization’s financial situation,” “My organization gives me the training necessary to perform well in my job,” and “Employees’ exceptional contributions are recognized by my organization,” respectively. Perceptions of power sharing practices (three items) came from the Hage and Aiken (1967) scale. A sample item for this scale is “Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer (reversed item)”.

Organizational commitment. Affective organizational commitment was measured using three items from the Meyer and Allen (1997) scale. A sample item for this scale is “I feel emotionally attached to this organization”.

Control variables. The effects of several control variables, including business unit, age, tenure, gender, education, and job position, were assessed. Coding for respondent demographic variables was based on the following specified ranges: gender (1 = male, 2 = female), education (1 = high school degree, 2 = college degree, 3 = bachelor degree, 4 = masters degree), and job position (1 = financial advisor, 2 = support staff).

Results

To ensure that our measures evaluated the six study constructs, and to confirm their distinctiveness, we conducted confirmatory factorial analyses using the maximum likelihood procedure. We first tested a 6-factor model in which all of the items were specified to load on

their respective factors (after reverse scoring the appropriate items). With the exception of a slightly low GFI, which can be overly affected by small sample size (Byrne, 2001), the indices suggested that the model provides a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 624.92$, $df = 358$, CFI = .95, GFI = .84, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .06). We then compared this model with a one-factor model in which all items were specified to load on the same factor ($\Delta\chi^2(15) = 1474.62$, $p < 0.01$), and a 3-factor model merging all the high involvement practices into one factor ($\Delta\chi^2(12) = 765.69$, $p < 0.01$). Our results confirmed that the 6-factor model, in which all our constructs correspond to separate factors, is significantly superior to these other models, and provides the best fit to actual data. Based on the results of these confirmatory factorial analyses, we constructed variables by averaging the items that defined each factor. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics, reliabilities and correlations for these variables.

Insert Table 1 about here

To verify our hypotheses, and following the procedures developed by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), we conducted multiple regression analyses with moderation effects while controlling for organizational unit, gender, age, education, job position, and organizational tenure. The independent variable (leadership) and moderating variables (high involvement management practices) were first centered on their respective means. The interaction variables were then created by multiplying the centered variables. Table 2 shows the results of the hierarchical regression. In total, three statistically significant interactions were found. Figure 1 provides graphical illustrations of all statistically significant interactions. Following the procedures outlined by Cohen *et al.* (2003), values for affective commitment were plotted at high

and low levels of high involvement management practices (i.e., one standard deviation below and one above the mean).

 Insert Table 2 and Figure 1 about here

Hypothesis 1 was supported, for information sharing practices moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment. Figure 1a and the simple slopes analysis reveal that the relation between leadership and commitment is stronger when information sharing is high ($\beta_{\text{high}} 0.43, p < 0.01$; $\beta_{\text{low}} -0.01, p: \text{n.s.}$). Hypothesis 2 was also supported, as power sharing practices moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and affective commitment. Figure 1b illustrates this interaction effect and confirms that transformational leadership ($\beta_{\text{high}} 0.44, p < 0.01$; $\beta_{\text{low}} -0.01, p: \text{n.s.}$) was more positively related to affective organizational commitment when decision making was highly decentralized. A statistically significant interaction effect was observed between skill development practices and transformational leadership on commitment. As shown in Figure 1c, the strength of the relation between leadership and commitment was lower when employees perceived that the organization developed their skills ($\beta_{\text{high}} 0.02, p: \text{n.s.}$; $\beta_{\text{low}} 0.40, p < 0.01$). This effect was contrary to what we anticipated. Hypothesis 3 was thus rejected. Finally, no statistically significant interaction was detected between recognition practices and transformational leadership, thus invalidating Hypothesis 4.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the moderating role of high involvement management practices on the relation between supervisors' transformational leadership and

employees' affective organizational commitment. By adopting a contingent perspective, this research contributes to the literature on transformational leadership, which has mainly been centered on a universalist perspective. Indeed, although Bass (1985) suggested that various situational characteristics might moderate the effect of transformational leadership, little empirical research has been done to date (Bass and Riggio, 2006).

This study also broadens the scope of moderators in the substitutes for leadership model by analyzing the effect of high involvement management practices which, to our knowledge, have never been considered in this model. This not only answers the call of many authors who have recommended considering new moderators in the substitutes for leadership model (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Whittington *et al.*, 2004), but also explores the role of enhancers, which have received far less attention in previous research than substitutes and neutralizers (Dionne *et al.*, 2005). As Villa *et al.* (2003) hold, enhancers play an important role in complementing the substitutes and neutralizers initially proposed in the substitutes for leadership model, for they enlarge the number of potential moderators and give the theory more meaning for managers.

Our results suggest that information and power sharing practices serve as enhancers of transformational leadership. In concrete terms, this means that the organization can support immediate supervisors who use this leadership style by giving more information to employees, by soliciting their opinions and suggestions and by increasing their decision latitude in their jobs. First, information sharing practices seem to contribute to organizational commitment by providing a facilitating and supporting context to transformational leaders. These practices can indeed help transformational leaders bring their employees to espouse the interests of the organization as they are more aware of its goals and feel respected thanks to the transparent and open communications they have with their employer. Second, our results also show that by

providing greater autonomy and involvement in decision making, organizations can maintain the effectiveness of transformational leaders who foster commitment through employee participation (Bass and Riggio, 2006). These results are consistent with previous studies, which conclude that a charismatic leader is particularly effective in situations allowing increased autonomy (Shamir and Howell, 1999). While our results support the enhancing effects of these practices hypothesized in this study, an interesting point worth noting is that in the absence of transformational leaders, commitment is higher in a low information and power sharing context. One possible reason for this is that providing employees with more responsibilities and autonomy without guidance as to what is expected from them may generate confusion and leave them unfocused and less committed. These results are in line with the argument of Purcell and Hutchison (2007) that the effects of good HR practices can be negated by weak leadership.

Contrary to our prediction, rather than enhancing transformational leadership, skill development seemed to play a substituting role. Although this was not the result we expected, it does corroborate some previous studies which observed that employees possessing high skill levels had a lesser need for supervision (Kerr and Jermier, 1978). As noted by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), when managing highly skilled and capable employees, it is most appropriate for leaders to adopt a “delegate” managing style, in which the leader plays a background role. This could explain the weaker relation observed between leadership and affective commitment when the organization strongly invests in skill development activities. Further research would be useful to provide a better understanding of this mechanism.

Finally, while we hypothesized that recognition practices would enhance the effect of transformational leadership on commitment, our results showed that these practices did not moderate this relationship. One explanation can be found in field theory (Lewin, 1943), which

asserts that employees will be more greatly influenced by proximal rather than distal factors. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) argue that certain HRM practices influence employees by sending strong signals and promoting shared perceptions among employees on what is important and expected from them. As their effectiveness lies in their capacity to build a strong organizational climate, this kind of influence should be interpreted as more distal by employees than the appreciative gestures of transformational leaders. In other words, employees should be more sensitive to leaders' recognition initiatives because they provide direct support and appreciation through individualized consideration. This proposition is coherent with the direct effects observed in our regression analyses, where transformational leadership is significantly and positively related to organizational affective commitment, while recognition practices are not.

This research has certain limitations. First, our study was conducted in two different business units of a single organization, which limits the possibility of generalizing our results. Future research should be conducted in various business settings to evaluate whether these results hold across industries and/or organizations. Second, the cross-sectional nature of our design prevents us from confirming the causality of the relations analyzed. Our results should thus be replicated using panel data analysis to address this issue. Another limitation of our study is that all our variables were evaluated by the same source (employees). Although high involvement management practices are conceptually distinct from transformational leadership, there is a possibility that in practice this distinction might be blurred by the fact that these practices are often executed by the supervisors. To address this concern, we conducted a single-common-method factor analysis (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003) to identify any possible method effects. We compared our measurement model with an alternative model containing an additional method factor. Results indicated that while this latter model presented a better fit than the

original model ($\Delta\chi^2(29) = 97.88, p < .01.$), only 0.4% of the variance was accounted for by the method factor, which is far less than the amount of variance observed in previous studies (Panaccio and Vandenberghe, 2011; Williams *et al.*, 1989). Moreover, all of the regression coefficients remained virtually identical after controlling for the method factor. Overall, these results, combined with the ones obtained from the confirmatory factor analyses, suggest that even if supervisors serve as the main channel of communication between the employees and the organization, employees are able to distinguish the organization's actions from those of their supervisors. This is consistent with past empirical research supporting the multifoci approach to employees' reactions (see Lavelle *et al.*, 2006, for a review), which suggests that employees maintain distinct perceptions about multiple foci at work, such as the organization or the supervisor. However, in order to completely rule out the possibility of common method bias, we recommend that future research measure high involvement management practices and leadership using multiple sources. Finally, it is possible that the relationships found in this study might be affected by omitted variables for which we did not control. For instance, in evaluating the influence of HIM practices on employees' well-being, Böckerman *et al.* (2012) controlled for employees' work and wage histories, variables which they argued could be highly correlated with unobserved worker traits that would be related to both the independent and dependent variables. Future research exploring the effects of HIM practices should account for the influence of such confounding variables.

According to Villa *et al.* (2003), strong moderators of leadership do exist, but we have yet to learn more about their effects. Our results support their view by showing that high involvement management practices play an important role in the influence leaders exert on their subordinates. These findings are also consistent with the assertion of Purcell and Hutchison

(2007) that managers' effectiveness depends in part on well-designed practices. We encourage researchers to pursue this notion by studying new leadership moderators and by focusing on enhancers that have attracted less attention than substitutes or neutralizers. In addition to the moderators suggested in certain previous studies (Villa *et al.*, 2003), we propose that researchers take a look at the potential effects of colleagues and clients, notably as sources of recognition, trust, and support. We see these variables as particularly promising moderators because: (1) they constitute a significant source of social contact for employees, to the extent that they reflect the quality of their interactions with colleagues and clients; and (2) they act independently of the efforts of supervisors.

It would also be interesting to study the moderating influence of high involvement practices on other leadership styles (e.g., transactional, laissez-faire leadership), as research within the substitutes theory has focused mainly on transformational leadership (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1996b). Finally, another research avenue would involve studying the moderating role of other high involvement management practices. Some models similar to the high involvement management model, such as the high performance system (Evans and Davis, 2005), evaluate practices such as selective hiring and teamwork, which are not included in the Lawler model (1986).

In conclusion, this research makes a theoretical and empirical contribution to the substitutes for leadership theory, by introducing perceptions of high involvement management practices as moderators of leadership. Our findings also have practical implications as they can guide organizations in choosing high involvement management practices that will support immediate supervisors in their efforts to engage their employees. Finally, work is taking up an ever increasing part of life in today's society, and as such, organizations must assume additional

responsibilities for their employees. In that regard, our findings indicate that implementing certain high involvement management practices and developing supervisors' transformational leadership can play a significant role on employees' commitment. The dividends such efforts should bring to the organization are quite significant for commitment has repeatedly been associated with employees' performance and well-being.

References

- Bass, B.M. (1985), *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, Collier Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Bass, B.M. (1997), “Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?”, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52, pp. 130-139.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1993), “Transformational leadership: A response to critiques”, in Chemers, M.M. and Ayman, R. (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*, Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 49-80.
- Bass, B.M. and Bass, R. (2008), *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (4th ed.)*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bass, B.M. and Riggio, R.E. (2006), *Transformational leadership*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Böckerman, P., Bryson, A. and Ilmakunnas, P. (2012), “Does high involvement management improve worker wellbeing?”, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, Vol. 84, pp. 660-680.
- Bowen, D.E. and Ostroff, C. (2004), “Understanding hrm-firm performance linkages: The role of the “strength” of the hrm system”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 29 No. 2, pp. 203-221.
- Brun, J.-P. and Dugas, N. (2008), “An analysis of employee recognition: Perspectives on human resources practices”, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 716-730.
- Burns, J.M. (1978), *Leadership*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.
- Byrne, B.M. (2001), *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications,*

- and programming*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G. and Aiken, L.S. (2003), *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Dionne, S.D., Yammarino, F.J., Howell, J.P. and Villa, J.R. (2005), "Substitutes for leadership, or not", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 169-193.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. and Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990), "Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 51-59.
- Evans, W.R. and Davis, W.D. (2005), "High-performance work systems and organizational performance: The mediating role of internal social structure", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31, pp. 758-775.
- Hage, J. and Aiken, M. (1967), "Relationship of centralization to other structural properties", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 12, pp. 72-92.
- Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K.H. (1982), "Leadership style: Attitudes and behaviors", *Training and Development Journal*, Vol. 36, pp. 50-52.
- Howell, J.P., Dorfman, P.W. and Kerr, S. (1986), "Moderator variable in leadership research". *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 88-102.
- Judge, T.A. and Piccolo, R.F. (2004), "Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, pp. 755-768.
- Kerr, S. and Jermier, J.M. (1978), "Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 22, pp. 375-403.
- Lavelle, J.J., Rupp, D.E. and Brockner, J. (2006). "Taking a multifoci approach to the study of

- justice, social exchange, and citizenship behaviors: The target similarity model”, *Journal of management*, Vol. 33 No. 6, pp. 841-866.
- Lawler, E.E. (1986), *High-involvement management*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lawler, E.E. (1992), *The ultimate advantage: creating the high-involvement organization*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A. and Benson, G. (2001), *Organizing for High Performance: Employee involvement, TQM, Reengineering, and Knowledge Management in the Fortune 1000*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A. and Ledford, G.E. (1992), *Employee involvement and total quality management: Practices and results in Fortune 1000 companies*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Lewin, K. (1943), “Defining the field at a given time”, *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 292–310.
- Liden, R.C. and Antonakis, J. (2009), “Considering context in psychological leadership research”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 62, No. 11, pp. 1587-1606.
- Lowe, K.B. and Gardner, W.L. (2000), “Ten years of the Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future”, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11, pp. 459-514.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1997), *Commitment in the workplace*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Panaccio, A. and Vandenberghe, C. (2011), “The relationships of role clarity and organization-based self-esteem to commitment to supervisors and organizations and turnover intentions”, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 41, pp. 1455-1485.
- Paré, G. and Tremblay, M. (2007), “The influence of high-involvement human resources

practices, procedural justice, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors on information technology professionals' turnover intentions", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 326-357.

Pfeffer, J. and Veiga, J. F. (1999), "Putting people first for organizational success", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 13, pp. 37-48.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Bommer, W.H. (1996a), "Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, pp. 380-399.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Bommer, W.H. (1996b), "Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 22, pp. 259-298.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommend remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88, pp. 879-903.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H. and Fetter, R. (1990), "The influence of transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader" satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 1, pp. 107-142.

Purcell, J. and Hutchinson, S. (2007), "Front-line managers as agents in the HRM-performance causal chain: Theory, analysis and evidence", *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 3-20.

- Shamir, B. and Howell, J.M. (1999), "Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 10, pp. 257-283.
- Simard, G., Doucet, O. and Bernard, S. (2005), "HRM practices and employee commitment: The role of justice", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 60, pp. 296-319.
- Tremblay, M., Cloutier, J., Simard, G., Chênevert, D. and Vandenberghe, C. (2010), "The Role of HRM practices, procedural justice, organizational support and trust in organizational commitment and in-role and extra-role performance", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 405-433.
- Villa, J.R., Howell, J.P., Dorfman, P.W. and Daniel, D.L. (2003), "Problems with detecting moderators in leadership research using moderated multiple regression", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 3-23.
- Walumbwa, F.O. and Lawler, J.J. (2003), Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes, and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 14, pp. 1083–1101.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., Bommer, W.H. and Tetrick, L.E. (2002), "The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, pp. 590-598.
- Whittington, J.L., Goodwin, V.L. and Murray, B. (2004), "Transformational leadership, goal difficulty, and job design: Independent and interactive effects on employee outcomes", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 593-606.
- Williams, L.J., Cote, J.A. and Buckley, M.R. (1989), "Lack of method variance in self-reported

affect and perceptions at work: Reality or artifact?”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 462-468.

Wright, P.M., Gardner, T.M., Moynihan, L.M. and Allen, M.R. (2005), “The relationship between HR practices and firm performance: Examining causal order”, *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 58, pp. 409-446.

Table 1
Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations among variables

	Means	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Unit	---	---	---											
2. Gender ^a	---	---	.34	---										
3. Age	43.03	7.96	.10	.09	---									
4. Tenure	12.99	9.66	.13	.23**	.51**	---								
5. Education ^b	---	---	-.16*	-.22**	-.30**	-.31**	---							
6. Job type	---	---	.31**	.36**	.05	.14*	-.38**	---						
7. Transformational leadership	4.82	1.09	.02	-.13	.03	-.19**	.10	-.10	(.92)					
8. Information sharing	4.44	1.26	.02	.01	.12	-.09	.07	.10	.57**	(.86)				
9. Power sharing	5.21	1.28	-.10	-.17*	-.02	-.07	.21**	-.12	.19**	.16*	(.76)			
10. Skill development	5.11	1.38	.21**	.14*	.04	.03	-.03	.06	.53**	.50**	.20**	(.92)		
11. Recognition	4.50	1.52	.15*	.12	.05	-.05	-.05	.21**	.41**	.60**	.07	.38**	(.88)	
12. Affective commitment	5.67	1.13	-.03	-.03	.18*	.15*	-.02	.08	.29**	.20**	.04	.26**	.23**	(.91)

N = 219.

^a 1 = male; 2 = female.

^b High school degree = 1; College degree = 2; Bachelor degree = 3; masters degree = 4.

*p < .05., **p < .01.

Table 2
Hierarchical regression results

Independent variables	Dependent variable Organizational commitment					
	Step 1 β	95% CI	Step 2 β	95% CI	Step 3 β	95% CI
<i>Step 1 - Control</i>						
Unit	- 0.06	(-.48, .21)	- 0.13	(-.62, .05)	- 0.13	(-.61, .03)
Gender	- 0.07	(-.53, .20)	- 0.08	(-.54, .16)	- 0.10	(-.57, .11)
Age	0.17*	(.00, .05)	0.13	(.00, .04)	0.10	(-.01, .04)
Tenure	0.09	(.00, .00)	0.16	(.00, .00)	0.22**	(.00, .00)
Job type	0.13	(-.08, .66)	0.13	(-.05, .67)	0.10	(-.13, .57)
Education	0.08	(-.11, .34)	0.09	(-.09, .35)	0.06	(-.13, .29)
<i>Step 2 - Main effects</i>						
Transformational leadership (Tfl)			0.23*	(.05, .42)	0.24*	(-0.48,0.21)
Information sharing (IS)			- 0.11	(-.27, .08)	- 0.05	(-0.53,0.20)
Power sharing (PS)			- 0.05	(-.17, .08)	0.01	(0.00,0.05)
Skill development (SD)			0.17*	(.00, .28)	0.12	(0.00,0.01)
Recognition (R)			0.14	(-.02, .23)	0.13	(-0.08,0.66)
<i>Step 3 - Interaction effects</i>						
Tfl X IS					0.38*	(.04, .31)
Tfl X PS					0.20**	(.05, .29)
Tfl X SD					- 0.23*	(-.23, -.03)
Tfl X R					- 0.08	(-.15, .06)
	F	1.86		3.67**		4.22**
	R ²	0.03		0.13		0.20
	ΔR^2			0.10		0.07

Notes: Standardized beta coefficients are provided.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Figure 1. Statistically significant interaction effects

