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Abstract

In today's world, change is demanding the employees to be better prepared, open, and flexible in managing their daily tasks at work. For example, the issue of globalization, the issues of knowledge worker (K-workers), and knowledge economy (K-economy) are among the examples that change should always be taken into consideration by managers. However, bringing about change in organization is not an easy task. How to make employees bring about change in an organization has been of interest to researchers. In Saudi Arabia, change is a very important aspect that not only people, but also the Saudi government have raised awareness to. King Abdullah himself gave a remarkable speech to the Majlis al-Shura, the formal advisory body to the Saudi monarchy in Riyadh and stated that in 2013, women would be allowed to serve on the 150-member body. He added that by the beginning in 2015, they would also be permitted to vote and run for office in municipal council elections. This conceptual paper proposes a model that shows commitment to organization and leader charisma as antecedents to organizational change. In other words, this theoretical framework proposes that the more committed to the organization the employees are, the more they bring about change for sake of such organization well-being. It also shows that the leader plays an important role in making such employees more committed. The proposed theoretical framework serves as an insight to educational institutions and businesses in Saudi Arabia and spread awareness that enables them be more prepared to cope with change.
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1.1 Introduction
Organizations, in the past, secured the loyalty of their employees by guaranteeing job security. However, many organizations have responded to competitive pressures by downsizing, restructuring and transformation and thus create a less secure organization climate. A growing number of employees therefore feel that they are victims of broken promise. One of the challenges facing modern project organizations involves maintaining employee commitment. This project organization can achieve by developing a new “work contract”. In today project workplace, employee faces more ambiguity in their daily activities and decrease job security (Bergmann, Lester, De Meuse & Grahn, 2000).
Change is a painful process for almost any project organization. When the change impacts the core values and the established systems of a project organization, it is important to consider the emotional as well as technical aspects involved. Newman (2000) described two kinds of organizational change. The first kind of organizational change is incremental and is an adjustment of systems or structures but does not involve a change in core values of the company. The second organizational change is transformational, radical and fundamentally alters the organization. It is difficult and risky such as a change in leadership or an increase in organizational performance. Change can generate cynicism, fatigue and ‘burnout’ as well as reduce commitment and loyalty to the company.

A survey by Doyle, Claydon & Buchanan (2000), regarding organizational change, out of 92 managers (14 in the public and 14 the private sector firms), 59% of the managers agreed that people were more cynical when there was an unclear relationship between the change and the outcome to the organization. Fifty four per cent of the managers in the study also reported they did not have the luxury to reflect on what had been accomplished. Monitoring what had been learned from the change process was a difficult task for these managers as well. Fifty three per cent stated that they repeated mistakes implementing change due to lack of time to learn what had happened in the past. Managers cannot find the time to implement new technology or lack the resources to train their employees (Zell, 2001). Although conflict, tension, resistance and burnout are not a part of any best practice literature Doyle et. al, (2000) states these are natural components of the change process.

Workplaces are faced with endless change (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002) and effective management of that change is an important competency currently required by an organization (Paton and McCalman, 2000). The growing frequency and complexity of workplace project change requires employees to adapt to change without disruption; however, resistance to change is the more common reaction (Caldwell, 2004). As managers make decisions for coping with change, they must consider not only how the organization performance will be affected but also how employees will be affected.

2.1 Literature Review

2.1.1 Commitment

The literature defines commitment as an employee’s level of attachment to some aspect of work. Various authors have been instrumental in identifying types of employee commitment as critical constructs in understanding the attitudes and behaviors of employees in an organization. Meyer et.al. (2001) identify more than 25 employee commitment concepts and measures. The definition of employee commitment is based on an intrinsic exchange between the organization and employee as well as on emotional attachment between the employee and the organization. Bergmann et al (2000) performed an exploratory study of employees at a retail bank undergoing structural and cultural change. He found that change can detach an employee from the organization and large scale change can reduce an employee’s commitment to the company. If an organization focuses on the structural aspects of change alone by planning the technical aspects of the change and does not guide and support its personnel then there will be a lack of commitment on the part of the employees.

As stated in Solinger et al., (2007), it has been since 1990 when Allen and Myer proposed a three-level component model of organizational commitment. This model has been referred to
as ‘TCM’, based on the idea that organizational commitment comes in three distinct forms: affective attachment to the organization, perceived costs of leaving it, and a felt obligation to stay. These three forms, labeled affective, continuance, and normative commitment respectively, are referred to as “components” of organizational commitment. The affective component is defined as employees’ emotional component to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. The continuance component is defined as the perception of costs associated with leaving the organization. Finally, the normative component refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization. As such, the TCM ties together three separate streams of earlier commitment research (Becker, 1960; Buchanan, 1974; Kanter, 1968; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Salancik, 1977; Wiener, 1982; Wiener & Vardi, 1980). Common to these streams was the notion of a “psychological state that links an individual to an organization (i.e., makes turnover less likely)” (Allen & Meyer, 1990,p.14).

To date, the three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment can be regarded as the dominant model in organizational commitment research (e.g. Bentein, Vandenbergh, Vandenberghhe, & Stinglhamber, 2005; e.g. Cohen, 2003; Greenberg & Baron, 2003). Nevertheless, an accumulation of studies have shown that the model is not fully consistent with empirical findings (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Ko, Price, & Muller, 1997; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytskyy, 2002).

The TCM proposes that affective, continuance, and normative commitment—although different in nature—describe a link between the employee and the organization that decreases the likelihood of turnover. In the words of Allen and Meyer (1990,p.3): “Employees with strong affective commitment remain because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so”.

Three aspects are noteworthy when considering the presumed common conceptual ground of the three components. First, all three components are supposed to reflect a “psychological state” (i.e., want, need, ought) of an employee vis-à-vis the organization, which has made Allen and Meyer (1990) speak of attitudinal forms of commitment. Second, the three states are supposed to relate to the organization, reflecting the idea that organizational commitment should be seen as the “net sum” of these three psychological states. There is a more recent formulation of the TCM that retains the main ideas but proposes a motivational—rather than attitudinal—interpretation (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Luchak & Gellatly (2007) found that affective commitment was positively associated with work efforts and performance. When affective commitment is low, absenteeism and turnover will be high according to the findings of Paré and Tremblay (2007).

In the literature, different authors defined commitment construct differently. As indicated by Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), these definitions refer to a force that directs a person’s behavior. It is worth mentioning here that bringing about change is an important action. In this research, bringing about change is the dependent variable. Table 1 below highlights few definitions of commitment construct.
Table 1: Commitment Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“... a stabilizing force that acts to maintain behavioral direction when expectancy/equity conditions are not met and do not function”</td>
<td>Scholl (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... a force that stabilizes individual behavior under circumstances where the individual would otherwise be tempted to change that behavior”</td>
<td>Brickman (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “... an obliging force which requires that the person honor the commitment, even in the face of fluctuating attitudes and whims”</td>
<td>Brown (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “... the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”</td>
<td>(Mowday et al, 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organization; it will reflect the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organization”</td>
<td>(O’Reilly &amp; Chatman, 1986).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “... a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization”</td>
<td>Allen &amp; Meyer (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Meyer & Herscovitch (2001)

Organizational commitment has captured the hearts and minds of scholarly researchers for many years. Practitioners have been similarly enamored because of the desirable consequences attributed to high levels of organizational commitment such as increased effort expenditure, higher job satisfaction, decreased absenteeism, and more retention (Morrow, 2011). The extensive research conducted on organizational commitment has been systematically cataloged in multiple meta-analyses (e.g., Riketta, 2008). Organizational scholars and business leaders have long rendered special attention to Affective Organizational Commitment based on the belief that organizations with committed employees are more effective and employees who exhibit high levels of AOC are more productive and less likely to quit. The Individual level linkages between AOC and turnover and between AOC and performance are strongly supported in meta-analyses (Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran, 2005, Riketta, 2002 and Riketta, 2008). Business leaders are more likely to frame the importance of AOC in terms of attracting, motivating and retaining key talent (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, & Axelrod, 2001). Employees who are low in AOC are also more likely to miss work and engage in counterproductive behaviors such as theft, sabotage, and aggression (Luckak and Gellatly, 2007 and Meyer and Allen, 1997).

Given the benefits of high levels of AOC, one might presuppose that a great deal of effort has been put forth to develop strategies for enhancing and maintaining Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC). There has been consideration of how organizations can create so-called “high involvement” or “high commitment” workplace settings (e.g., Hom et al., 2009). And
there is something to be said for creating work environments where multiple work practices reinforce one another to produce such settings. However, in a narrower, more targeted way, how can organizations elevate the AOC levels among their members? Do we have evidence to support these strategies? Thus the extent to which AOC can deliberately be influenced is far from resolved. The answer to these questions calls for research and evaluation using standard research designs which enhance our confidence in causal relations. Surprisingly, of the hundreds— in not thousands – of studies conducted on AOC, comparatively few have investigated antecedents.

2.2 Factor That Influence Employee Commitment
To succeed in the face of increasing competition, organizations need improved productivity at all levels. This requires commitment on the part of all employees which can only be achieved through better management practices. Poor supervision and failure on the part of managers and supervisors to create a committed workforce can lead to the loss of valued employees. According to Madigan and Dorrell (2000), 41 percent of employees feel that their organization is not developing effective managers and supervisors. Van Dyne and Graham (1994) contend that various personal, situational and positional factors can affect the commitment of employees and consequently their attitudes and behaviour. Below is a brief description of the factors that influence commitment. These factors include the personal factors, the workplace factor, the subordinate-supervisor relationship, job characteristics, and positional factors.

2.2.1 Personal factors
A great deal of research has sought to determine whether certain types of employees are more likely to be committed to their employer. According to the results, some employees may simply be more predisposed to engage in citizenship behaviours than others. In particular, employees who are highly conscientious, outgoing (extroverted) and generally have a positive outlook on life (optimistic) are often more inclined to be more committed. Employees who are team oriented and tend to place the goals and concerns of the group above their own, typically also engage in more citizenship behaviours. Likewise, employees who are empathetic and value helping others (altruistic) may also be more inclined to display citizenship behaviours at work. Finally, certain employees tend to define their jobs more broadly than others. Thus for these employees, engaging in citizenship behaviours is simply seen as an integral aspect of their jobs (Bolino & Turnley, 2003)

2.2.2 Workplace Values
Shared values are a critical component of any covenantal relationship. Values that are noncontroversial (eg quality, innovation, cooperation and participation) are easy to share and can forge close relationships. If employees believe that their organisation values quality products, they will engage in behaviours that will contribute to high quality. If employees are convinced that their organization values participation, they will be more likely to feel as though their participation will make a difference. Consequently, they will be more willing to seek solutions and make suggestions to contribute to the organisation's success.

2.2.3 Subordinate-supervisor interpersonal relationship
As mentioned previously, the social exchange theory employs an interactions approach to workplace relationships where subordinates and supervisors engage in mutually beneficial transactions. Social exchange implies an informal contract between an employee and the project organization, and because the supervisor largely represents the project organization to the employee, trust in the supervisor is seen as pivotal to leader effectiveness and work unit productivity. Moreover, the supervisor’s behaviour is fundamental in determining the level of interpersonal trust in a work unit. Supervisor behaviours include sharing appropriate information, allowing mutuality of influence, recognizing and rewarding good performance and not abusing the vulnerability of others. Butler (1991) identified 11 supervisor behaviours as facilitating interpersonal trust, namely supervisor availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, receptivity and overall trust. The extent to which the supervisor displays these behaviours will thus largely determine subordinates' commitment level. It is interesting to note that only the perceptions of interactional fairness influence actual citizenship behaviours, although distributive, formal procedural, and interactional justice are related to organizational citizenship behaviours.

According to Moorman (2002), personal fair treatment by supervisors conveys more fairness information to employees than a more general assessment of the fairness of overall procedures. Perceived interactional fairness demonstrates to employees that the supervisor considers them valuable and important as individuals, whereas perceived formal procedural fairness focuses on the project organization as a whole. Fair procedures may be in place, but the practice of fairness by supervisors demonstrates that justice actually occurs.

### 2.2.4 Job characteristics

To the extent that a job is structured to provide regular feedback and autonomy as well as a sense of task completion, employees can monitor their own behaviour and gain an increased sense of personal control (Greenberger & Strasser, 1986). Personal control is an individual’s belief that he or she can effect a change in a desired direction. According to Lawler (1992), an increase in perceived control strengthens emotional bonds with an organization. A heightened sense of personal control thus has positive consequences for employee attitudes and behaviours at work.

Research has shown that employees engage in higher levels of citizenship behaviour when they have the opportunity to work on intrinsically satisfying tasks. However, citizenship levels (commitment) are likely to be markedly lower when employees are given repetitive, highly reutilized tasks to complete. In addition, bureaucratic rules and procedures that overly constrain workers may serve to inhibit acts of citizenship (Bolino & Turnley, 2003). Motivating job characteristics such as meaningful work, autonomy and feedback maximize the possibility for internal motivation.

According to Jernigan, Beggs and Kohut (2002), satisfaction with autonomy (perceived independence), status (sense of importance) and policies (satisfaction with organizational demands) are all significant predictors of commitment. Thus, specific characteristics of a job can increase an employee’s sense of felt responsibility, and subsequently, the sense of attachment to the project organization. Understanding how one’s job contributes to interdependent outcomes enhances feelings of embeddedness and accountability. Similarly, awareness of outcomes (feedback) can lead to a strong feeling of mutual responsibility. A job that allows a
high degree of autonomy and the absence of close supervision suggests a situation characterised by trust. Hence the freedom associated with autonomy and low monitoring is balanced by the reciprocal response of responsibility and commitment.

2.2.5 Organizational support
There is a significant association between employee commitment and the extent to which employees believe their organisation has their interests at heart. Organisations that are able to provide work-life benefits and other types of employee support are likely to elicit citizenship behaviour. According to research results, employees were more willing to go beyond the call of duty when they worked for organisations that offered support which enabled them to balance their work and family responsibilities more easily, assisted them through difficult times, provide them with benefits they could not afford, and helped their children do things they would otherwise not have been able to do (bursaries) (Bolino & Turnley, 2003).

2.2.6 Positional Factors
Positional factors include organizational tenure. Various researchers have studied the relationship between job tenure and employees’ relationships with organisations. The studies have shown that employees who have been with their employing organizations for a long time are more likely to have embedded relationships and strong organisational ties (Rousseau & Parks, 1993).

2.2.7 Hierarchical Job Level
Studies have consistently found socioeconomic status to be the single strongest predictor of commitment because high status tends to increase both the motivation and ability to be actively involved. In organisations, employees at high job levels generally have higher levels of organisational commitment than those at low levels. This is because positions of power allow people to influence organizational decision making, indicate high status, recognise formal authority and possibly competence, and show that the organisation recognises their competence and values their contributions. Employees in high level jobs have more freedom and choices in their behaviour on the job, and these choices enhance their sense of control and thus lead to increased affective commitment to the organisation. Managers are often not in a position to influence employees’ commitment because they do not have control over employees’ positional or personal situations. A manager can, however, manage the work situation in such a way that employee commitment is enhanced.

3.1 Leadership and Leader’s Charisma
Among the first to examine the role of leadership as a determinant of Affective Organizational Commitment (AOC) were Bateman and Strasser (1984), who did not detect any evidence to support leader behaviors as causal antecedents of AOC. Johnston, Parasuraman, Futrell, and Black (1990) looked at how changes in leader behavior, role stress and job satisfaction affected sales people’s AOC during their first 6 months of employment. Their results indicated that decreased in role ambiguity and increases in job satisfaction (but not changes in leader consideration, leader role clarification or role conflict) enhanced AOC. A third non-supportive findings for the importance of leadership was reported by Vandenberghe, Bentein, and
Stinghamber (2004) when they found that favorable perceptions of leader-member exchange increased which in turn led to higher levels of AOC. Likewise, an investigation into the role of leadership on AOC focusing on spiritual leadership theory (Fry, Vituacci, & Cedillo, 2005) was more supportive. This relatively new approach to leadership contends that three values, attitudes and beliefs of leaders (specifically vision, hope/faith, and altruistic love) can intrinsically motivate the leader and followers such as a sense of calling and a perception that one is valued by the organization are elicited. When this occurs, AOC, productivity and employee well-being purportedly result. Fry et al. (2005) test these ideas in a causal model framework using a military squadron and find support of the stipulated antecedents of AOC. Only the path between a sense of calling and AOC was non-significant. According to Ramchandran and Krishnan (2009), a leader and his leadership style are considered important determinants of employees’ commitment. Other researchers such as Lee (2005) stated that transformational leadership correlates significantly with organizational commitment, while transactional leadership does not have a significant relationship with organizational commitment. In a similar vein, Hayward et al., (2004) stated that transformational leadership has a moderate positive correlation with affective commitment, and a lower correlation with normative and continuous. The findings also indicated that no correlation was found between transactional leadership and organizational commitment components.

3.2 Type of Employee Commitment
Mayer and Lynne (2001) group employee commitment into three foci, as in Fig. 1: commitment to work/job, commitment to career/profession and commitment to organization.
3.2.1 Organizational Commitment
Rajendran & Raduan (2005) stated that there are two dominant conceptualizations of organizational commitment in sociological literature. These are an employee’s loyalty towards the organization and an employee’s intention to stay with the organization. Loyalty is an affective response to, and identification with, an organization, based on a sense of duty and responsibility.

One may use Herscovitch and Meyer’s (2002) definition: ‘the degree to which an employee identifies with the goals and values of the organization and is willing to exert effort to help it succeed’. Loyalty is argued to be an important intervening variable between the structural conditions of work, and the values, and expectations, of employees, and their decision to stay, or leave. Positive and rewarding features of work are expected to increase loyalty, which, in turn, will reduce the likelihood of leaving. Loyalty becomes stabilized with tenure, which partly explains the negative relationship typically found between tenure and turnover (Cacioppe, 2000).

Intent to stay is portrayed as effectively neutral, and focuses on an employee’s intention to remain a member of the organization (Hegen & Nason, 2001). It is much closer to economists’ ideas on how weighing the costs of leaving versus staying, decides the employee to leave or stay. Hagen and Nason (2001) defines this form of commitment as the employee’s expected likelihood of remaining employed in the same organization. As with loyalty, intent to stay stabilizes with tenure, and helps explain the negative tenure and turnover relationship. Theoretically, it is viewed as an intervening response to structural conditions of work, as well as conditions of work elsewhere, or to not working at all.

3.2.2 Career Commitment
Career commitment refers to identification with, and involvement in, one’s occupation. Much literature refers to similar or related concepts: occupational commitment (Mello et.al, 2002) professional commitment (Herscovitch and Meyer’s 2002), career salience (Adler and Corson,
2003) the cosmopolitan/local distinction (Hope, 2003) and professionalism (Cacioppe, 2000). Common to all these is the critical notion of being committed to one’s career, or occupation, rather than to the organization which employs one.

3.2.3 Work Commitment
Work commitment refers neither to the organization nor to one’s career, but to employment itself (Bard, 2002). This form of commitment relates terms like work motivation, job involvement (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), work as a central life interest (Rawden, 2003) and work involvement (Hope, 2003). Although work commitment is expected to be related to organizational commitment and career commitment, literature (Mowday, 1998) shows it to be empirically distinct from these two forms of commitment.

3.3 Employee Organizational Commitment
Meyer and Allen (1991) present these three approaches, as shown in Fig. 2, and define their three dimensional constructs as affective, continuance and normative commitment.
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Figure 2: type of employee commitment to their organization adopted from Mayer and Allen (1991)

3.3.1 Affective Commitment
According to Mayer and Allen (1991) Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization based on positive feelings, or emotions, toward the organization. The antecedents for affective commitment include perceived job characteristics where is task autonomy, task significance, task identity, skill variety and supervisory feedback, organizational dependability that mean extent to which employees feel the organization can be counted on to look after their interests, and perceived participatory management that mean extent to which employees feel they can influence decisions on the work environment and other issues of concern to them. The use of these antecedents is consistent with findings by researcher Rowden, (2002), that these factors all create rewarding situations, intrinsically conducive to the development of affective commitment. In addition, age and organizational tenure are considered to be
positively associated with affective commitment. It is hypothesized that employees with low affective commitment will choose to leave an organization, while employees with a high affective commitment will stay for longer periods, as they believe in the organization and its mission.

3.3.2 Continuance Commitment
Continuance commitment refers to commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization (due to the high cost of leaving). Potential antecedents of continuance commitment include age, tenure, career satisfaction and intent to leave. Age and tenure can function as predictors of continuance commitment, primarily because of their roles as surrogate measures of investment in the organization (Mayer and Allen, 1997). Tenure can be indicative of non-transferable investments that mean close working relationship with coworkers, retirement investments, career investments and skills unique to the particular organization. Age can also be negatively related to the number of available alternative job opportunities. Career satisfaction provides a more direct measure of career related investments, which could be at risk if the individual leaves the organization. In general, whatever employees perceive as sunk cost, resulting from leaving the organization, are the antecedents of continuance commitment.

3.3.3 Normative Commitment
Normative commitment refers to an employee’s feeling of obligation to remain with the organization where it based on the employee having internalized the values and goals of the organization. The potential antecedents for normative commitment include co-worker commitment where it including affective and normative dimensions, as well as commitment behaviors, organizational dependability and participatory management. Co-workers’ commitment is expected to provide normative signals that influence the development of normative commitment (Commerias and Fournier, 2002). Organizational dependability and perceived participatory management are expected to instill a sense of moral obligation to reciprocate to the organization.

3.4 Organizational Change
Everyone is aware of the reality that the world is in a constant state of change, and no one is exempt from this process. Increased competition, technological innovation, growing scarcity of resources, all exert a great pressure for anyone to adapt and survive. For any business enterprise, the proposition for change is always a difficult and expensive task and yet the ability to cope with pressing demands and developing technologies, becomes the essential ingredient for perpetuity. The very existence of most companies in today’s fast-paced generation depends on how well they respond to the change process or how they actually stay with the change.

3.4.1 Leader’s change-promoting behaviours and perceived leader charisma
What makes people perceive a leader as charismatic? In times of change, we (authors) suggest that perceptions of charisma depend on how extensively leaders demonstrate certain change-
promoting behaviors, which will define as efforts to promote and support change effectively (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). Those behaviors entail communicating with all affected by the change, making it clear that the change is really necessary, depicting the future, and removing obstacles that hinder accomplishing the communicated goals and vision (Kotter & Cohen, 2002). The literature on organizational change describes these change-promoting behaviors as targeting the collective that will undergo change (Herold et al., 2008). Researchers since Weber (1947) have explained that change encourages perceptions of charisma (e.g., Bligh et al., 2004 and Hunt et al., 1999), with empirical evidence coming from studies on charisma and crises. Crises reflect dilemmas requiring decisions that invoke change (Pearson & Clair, 1998). For example, U.S. presidents who faced substantial external crises were attributed with higher behavioural charisma (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991). Similarly, experimentally induced crisis situations, compared with non-crisis situations, compared with non-stress situations, also encouraged higher ratings of leader charisma (Halverson, Murphy, & Riggio, 2004).

However, in another study, the more crises the teams experienced, the less team members rated their leader as charismatic (Pillai & Meindl, 1998). Similarly, a negative relationship occurred between perceptions of a crisis in California and ratings of charismatic leadership for then-governor Gray Davis (Bligh et al., 2004). Additionally, a crisis situation decreased ratings of a leader charisma if participants experienced stress prior to the crisis manipulation (Halverson et al., 2004). We believe those mixed findings are partly because the studies failed to assess specific leader efforts to promote the changes caused by crises.

Leadership behaviors are important for the formation of charisma perceptions (Antonakis et al., 2011). Conger and Kanungo (1988) proposed in their three-stage model that followers perceive leaders as being charismatic when they display the following behaviors. First, the leader evaluates the status quo in terms of resources, constraints, and employees’ needs. Second, they formulate and communicate compelling goals for the collective. Third, the leader builds trust in these goals and demonstrates through exemplary actions how the goals can be accomplished. Followers then interpret those leader behaviors as expressions of charisma (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

It is suggested that the behaviors leaders engage in to promote change closely resemble the three types of behaviors prescribed in the Conger and Kanungo (1988) model. In particular, leaders’ change-promoting behaviors have key elements that can enhance charisma, such as “inspiration through vision, empowerment through involvement, and being sensitive to followers’ needs” (Herold et al., 2008, p.348).

Note that those behaviors are at a lower abstract level and focus on the particular change context (Kotter, 1996). For example, a leader promoting change makes it clear up front why the change is necessary and makes a case for the urgency of this particular change before implementation. Those two elements of change-promoting behavior are associated with the first type of behaviors in the Conger-Kanungo model. Moreover, change-promoting behaviors include describing what the team and work environment will look like after the change is completed in involving followers to increase their understanding and acceptance of the change, corresponding with the second and third behaviors in the model. Therefore, we expect that the
change-promoting behaviors, which match behavioural attributes specified by Conger and Kanungo (1988), can increase perceptions of leader charisma.

Leaders’ change-promoting behaviors often address teams as a whole and have therefore been conceptualized as a team-level variable (e.g., Herold et al., 2008), whereas charisma has been treated as both team-level (e.g., Wu et al., 2010) and individual-level variables (e.g., De Cremer and van Knippenberg, 2002, Hunt et al., 1999, Walumbwa et al., 2008 and Yorges et al., 1999). To change a follower’s attitudes and behaviors, a leader’s charisma (e.e., a team-level phenomenon) needs to be validated by individual followers’ perceptions (Antonakis et al., 2011). Our (authors’) specific interest in how team-leadership behaviors in times of change influence individual perceptions of leader charisma led us to follow previous studies (e.g., Awamleh and Gardner, 1999, Puffer, 1990 and Walumbwa et al., 2008) in conceptualizing charisma as an individual-level variable. Throughout this study, we (authors) use perceived charisma (or perceptions of leader charisma) to label the perceptual phenomenon of charisma. Thus, leaders’ change-promoting behaviors and followers’ perceptions of leader charisma reflect a top-down association between a group-level phenomenon and an individual-level variable (Mathieu and Chen, 2011 and Mathieu and Taylor, 2007).

In his article “Will Saudi Arabia Ever Change”, Eakin H. (2012) stated that on September 25, 2011, the aging ruler of Saudi Arabia, King Abdullah, gave a remarkable speech to the Majlis al-Shura, the formal advisory body to the Saudi monarchy in Riyadh. Beginning in 2013, the king said, women would be allowed to serve on the 150-member body; and beginning in 2015, they would also be permitted to vote and run for office in municipal council elections. The King’s speech was revolutionary. Thus, the king’s revolutionary speech was a deft maneuver to preserve the status quo. On the one hand, the monarch was appeasing one of the country’s most aggrieved constituencies – educated Saudi women- and openly acknowledging that the country’s political institutions must evolve. On the other hand, he left the Saudi system hardly more democratic than before, anb by raising the ire of religious leaders, reinforced the divide between the two groups- liberals and Islamists- that pose the greatest threat to the monarchy. “In effect, nothing has changed”, Mohammad bin Fahad Al-Qahtani, an economics professor and human rights activist, told Eakin (2012) in Riyadh in May, 2012. Eakin (2012) sees that change in Saudi Arabia is stressed by the king. He also stated that the Saudis are expecting change to happen by time. When a political change takes place, such a change will affect all sectors of the kingdom including business. This encourages the author to propose the theoretical frame work proposed in this conceptual research paper.

According to Lawson and Price (2003) effective leadership is required for the successful introduction and maintenance of change. People in positions of authority in organizations serve as role models for the rest of the company. Both top executives to line managers must lead the change and not just pay lip service to the new initiatives. All levels of the company must support and apply the new behaviors to create culture change in the corporate mind set. (Lawson & Price, 2003).

Change is often accomplished best by new leadership or the introduction of a change management team. A change agent “…is defined as and internal or external individual or team responsible for initiating, sponsoring, directing, managing or implementing a specific change initiative, project or complete change program.” (Caldwell, 2003) Change agents perform the key role of change in the organization and must be identified by more than just project drivers.
Caldwell (2003) said a successful change agent must have leadership, management, and consultancy and team skills. As leaders change agents must have vision and support the long range strategic goals of the change process. The change agent’s role as manager is to move the organization toward attaining the strategic goals of change. He also said consultancy means the change agent must have the expertise and project management skills to properly advise employees to implement the change process. Finally the team model for change agents is concerned with their ability to work with functional specialists, managers and employees throughout all levels of the organization. (Caldwell, 2003)

According to Gill (2003) change must be planned, managed, implemented, controlled and monitored but for truly successful change there must be effective leadership. Leading successful change “requires vision, strategy, the development of a culture of sustainable shared values that support the vision and strategy for change, and empowering, motivating and inspiring those who are involved or affected.” (Gill, 2003). Good management is a necessity for change management. Poor management of milestones, monitoring, planning or getting too caught up in the details of the process can prevent change from progressing. There is a distinction between management and leadership for change to be successful “…management produces orderly results which keep something working efficiently, whereas leadership creates useful change…” Leadership must take the organization “…on a journey from its current state to a desired future state…with all the problems that arise along the journey...” (Gill, 2003)

Leadership shows the way to change using one’s personality and skills to motivate people to work together toward a goal and develop a vision of the future. Envisioning where an organization must be in relation to its current status is the greatest challenge a leader faces. Effective leadership also must touch people on a spiritual level and communicate common shared values to the employees and the vision for the future. They must also possess emotional intelligence by displaying self control, self confidence and be able to relate to others in an appropriate manner. Lack of leadership to manage the transition from the old way of doing things to the new has lead to failure in new innovations in the technology industry (Zell, 2001).

In a study by Doyle, Claydon & Buchanan (2000), senior managers had a much more positive view of the change process than middle management. Senior managers speak of empowerment while middle managers see empowerment as fiction. This suggests that senior managers may be fulfilling roles as public relations presenting their organizations in the most favorable light and that they are sheltered from any ‘bad news’. Middle managers may be overstating problems to protect their own self interests. Leadership for the change process must be taken to all levels of management in order to be successful. Sending conflicting messages allows rumors to develop and only hurts the change process and damages the credibility of the change agents. Suggested human resource management agenda for change management are to establish central control over change initiatives schedules, have systematic preplanning and monitoring of the change process, develop stress management programs, focus on organizational communication, document the organizational learning from the change process and have damage control resources to prevent burnout (Doyle, et. al., 2000).

3.4.2 Perceived charisma and followers’ commitment to change
As stated in Nohe et al., (2013), when Max and Weber (1947) wrote about charismatic leaders, he envisioned men and women with exceptional, almost mystical, powers, who inspire their followers to support them ardently. Similarly, current researchers see charismatic leaders as set apart from ordinary people (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) and capable of fostering higher levels of employee and team performance in organizations (DeGroot, Kiker, & Cross, 2000). Although researchers have conducted a wide range of studies on charismatic leadership over the last half-century (for a review, see e.g., Walter & Bruch, 2009), several critical questions remain unanswered.

One of these questions is, What makes followers perceive leaders as being charismatic? Weber (1947; also see Bayer, 1999 and House, 1999) thought that the momentum of crises and change partly encourages such perceptions. Other scholars suggested that charisma's glow comes from certain leadership behaviors (Conger & Kanungo, 1988) or that observers assign leaders those attributes (Galvin et al., 2010 and Howell and Shamir, 2005). Yet, little research has combined those perspectives for an etiology of charisma (Walter & ZBruch, 2009).

Considering that so many studies have found that charisma engenders increases collective efforts and higher team performance (DeGroot et al., 2000 and Wu et al., 2010), another question is, how does that relationship occur? Specifically, we need a more nuanced understanding of how perceived charisma affects followers individually and then propels them to collectively achieve higher levels of team performance. In other words, the individual-level origins of team performance (i.e., bottom-up relationships) are not well understood (cf.Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

In their study “A multilevel study of perceived charisma, commitment to change, and team performance, Nohe et al (2013) addressed those two questions theoretically and empirically in an integrated multilevel model of charisma. Their model suggests that in times of organizational change, individual followers see change-promoting leaders as being more charismatic. Consequently, followers individually commit themselves to the focal change and this, in turn, increases their collective team performance. Commitment to change refers to “a mind-set that binds an individual to a course of action deemed necessary for the successful implementation of a change initiative” (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002, p.475). They field-tested this model in a company that was undergoing change. They assessed 33 team leaders and 142 subordinate team members, capturing team leaders’ behaviours, team members’ perceptions of team leaders’ charisma, team members’ individual commitment to change, and collective team performance during the change.

Notably, their model refers to charisma perceptions. They define charisma, as a construct, as “symbolic leader influence rooted in emotional and ideological foundations” (Antonakis, Fenley, & Liechti, 2011, p.376). This definition implies that the leader’s power is based on emotions and ideology but not on expert influence or reward as stressed in leadership style of task-focused or transactional leadership (Antonakis and House, 2002 and Antonakis et al., 2011). Vivid verbal and non-verbal communication tactics (e.g., metaphors, anecdotes, and body gestures) are typically viewed as means that leaders can use to arouse followers’ emotions, inspire them, and initiate collective action around a vision (Antonakis et al., 2011, En Hartog and Verburg, 1997 and Shamir et al., 1993). Followers validate a leader’s charisma through their perceptions of whether the leader acts in ways that make the leader appear to be charismatic or non-charismatic (Antonakis et al., 2011, Conger, 1999 and Keyes, 2002). Indeed, Conger and
Kanungo, 1987 and Conger and Kanungo, 1988 stressed followers’ perceptions as the ultimate determinant of leader influence, a position reiterated across the literature on charismatic leadership (e.g., Antonakis et al., 2011, Galvin et al., 2010 and Howell and Shamir, 2005). Therefore, the consequences of charismatic leadership depend on the extent to which followers attribute charisma to the leader (Antonakis, 2012, Conger and Kanungo, 1987, Conger and Kanungo, 1988, House, 1999, Shamir, 1999 and Yukl, 1999). Accordingly, research shows that perceived charisma relates to desirable outcomes such as cooperation among followers (De Cremer & van Knippenberg, 2002), helping behaviors (Den Hartog, De Hoogh, & Keegan, 2007), leader influence (Yorges, Weiss, & Strickland, 1999), and company stock prices (Tosi, Misangyi, Fanelli, Waldman, & Yammarino, 2004).

The study of Nohel et al., (2013) contributes to the leadership literature in three particular ways. First, they provide an etiology of perceived charisma, identifying leadership behaviors that, times of change, are associated with followers’ perceptions of leaders’ charisma. Second, they show that certain team leaders behaviors engender followers’ perceptions of leaders’ charisma. Second, they show that certain team leader behaviors engender collective team benefits through an individual-level mechanism comprising individual followers’ perceptions of charisma and commitment to change. Their study is among the first to model and test the multilevel mechanisms of charisma in teams specifically looking at the top-down relationship between leaders and individual followers and the bottom-up relationship between individual followers and their teams. Bottom-up processes refer to organizational phenomena that have theoretical origins at lower levels and emergent properties at higher levels (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000). Third, our multilevel model contributes to “the dynamic interplay between the individuals within a team and the team as a whole” (Chen, Kirkman, Kanfer, Allen, & Rosen, 2007, p.331). Our model is among the first to address both top-down and bottom-up relationships and thus to bridge micro and macro domains- arguably one of the biggest future challenges in management research (Aguinis et al., 2011 and Mathieu and Chen, 2011).

Nohel et.al., (2013) believed that followers who perceive leaders as charismatic will feel more committed to proposed changes. From a self-concept-based motivational perspective (Shamir et al., 1993), perceiving a leader as charismatic implies that followers have linked their self-concept to the mission articulated by the leader. Thereby, efforts and goals that are part of the leader’s mission increase in meaning and intrinsic motivational valence (Awamleh and Gardner, 1999 and Bono and Judge, 2003). As a result, followers are likely to identify with the change goals, thereby increasing their motivation and willingness to support the goal and commit to the change. Additionally, charisma perceptions cause followers to shift focus from self-interest to collective interest (Conger and Kanungo, 1987 and De Cremer and van Knippenberg, 2002). Consequently, followers should be more willing to contribute to the benefit of the organization and commit themselves to proposed changes.

Previous research has supported the individual-level linkage between charisma perceptions and feelings of commitment. For example, leader charisma makes followers feel a stronger “bond or linking of the individual to the organization” (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990,p.171). Commitment to change also results specifically from perceptions of transformational leadership (Herold et al., 208 and Michaelis et al., 2010), a leadership style that has charisma as a component (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).
3.4.3 Followers’ Commitment to Change and Team Performance

Nohe et al. (2013) suggest that increased individual commitment to change relates to overall stronger team performance, or “the extent to which a team accomplishes its goals or mission” (Bell, 2007, p.595). Team performance is an emergent construct that “originates in the behaviors of individuals, is amplified by their interactions, and manifests as a high-level, collective phenomenon” (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000, p.55). Bottom-up relationships can be “prominent in instances where higher-level phenomena have yet to fully crystallize or form...[such as] following a major organizational intervention” (Mathieu & Chen, 2011, p.616). We (authors) believe organizational change provides situations where emergent, bottom-up relationships can occur.

Commitment at the individual level is likely to affect team performance at the collective level through two pathways (Chen & Kanfer, 2006). First, individual commitment increases individual performance, which in turn increases team performance. Specifically, individual goal striving-ongoing processes in which individuals regulate their cognitions, affect, and actions to accomplish goals- can enhance individual performance (Marks, Mathieu, & Zaccaro, 2001). An individual committed to change will strive toward change-related goals, which in turn enhances individual performance. Furthermore, as many employees improve their individual performance, the results will aggregate to affect team performance. In line with this argument, Chen (2005) found that newcomers who felt more empowered showed a higher job performance, and their performance enhanced subsequent team performance.

In the second pathway, individual commitment affects team performance through team motivation, such that individuality felt commitment fuels team-level goal-striving processes (also called team action processes, Marks et al., 2001). Team-level goal striving involves “collective regulation of team activities during goal pursuit” (Chen & Kanfer, 2006, p.232) such as coordination of tasks among team members, monitoring of goals progress, and supporting members who need assistance. Heightened levels of team goal striving should increase team performance levels.

4.1 Proposed Theoretical Framework
The above-drawn theoretical framework explains the relationship between employee commitment and organization change. The independent variable in this research is employee commitment and the dependent variable is organization change. In the independent variable have three dimensions. The dimensions are affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

4.1.1 The Developed Hypotheses
Based on the theoretical framework, the hypotheses below are developed. The hypotheses highlight the relationship between the independent variable, namely employee organizational commitment (effective, continuance, and normative) and the dependent variable, which is organizational change. These statements are explained below:

H1: There is a positive relationship between leader’s perceived charisma and employee organizational commitment.
H1a: There is a positive relationship between leader perceived charisma and affective commitment.
H1b: There is a positive relationship between leader perceived charisma and continuance commitment.
H1c: There is a positive relationship between leader perceived charisma and normative commitment.
H2: There is a positive relationship between leader perceived charisma and organizational change.
H3: There is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational change.
H3a: There is a positive relationship between affective commitment and organizational change.
H3b: There is a positive relationship between normative commitment and organizational change.
H3c: There is a positive relationship between continuance commitment and organizational change.
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