ROLE OF EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT IN ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

G.P. Mishra*

*T*HE study leads us to believe that in the eyes of employees they do a lot for their organization and they also have emotional involvement in their organization, however, their management has very little involvement in their growth and development. As a result there is no reason why they should be willing to make sacrifice for their organization and continue with their organization. This sounds quite logical, particularly for the managements who hold the view that "no one is indispensable to the organization, or men may come and men may go, organizations continue".

Different researchers to suit their models have defined organizational commitment. Becker (1960) defined Organizational Commitment in terms of exchange considerations and presented side bets theory. Etzioni (1961) suggested a typology based on member compliance with organizational directives and spoke of moral involvement, calculative involvement and alienative alignment.Kanter (1968) thought of continuance commitment, cohesion commitment and control commitment. Salanick (1977) thought of attitudinal commitment as the organizational behaviorist point of view. Attitudinal commitment focuses on the process by which people come to think about their relationship with their Organization. In many ways it can be thought of as a mind set in which their own goals and values are congruent with those of the Organization (Buchnan, 1974, Nowday et al, 1982, Sheldon, 1971, Balaji, 1985).

As early as 1974, it was concluded that an acceptable definition of the concept was lacking (Buchnan, 1974). As late as 1991, Cooper and Hartley concluded that there is a pressing need to examine the concept of Organizational commitment critically.

The most commonly studied type of Organizational commitment is attitudinal or psychological which is defined by Porter and Smith (1976) as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular Organization. Conceptually it can be characterized by at least three factors:

(a) A strong belief in and acceptance of the Organizations' goals and values

(b) A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the Organization and

(c) A strong desire to maintain membership in an Organization (Mowday et. al., 1982)

Mowday et al., classified the approaches to Organizational commitment in two broad categories – Attitudinal and Behavioral Commitment.

Attitudinal Commitment

According to this view Organizational Commitment is a bond between an individual and the Organization. If the bond reflects an individual's identification, it is referred to as attitudinal commitment. This view

* Associate Professor, GSBA, Greater Noida, India.

is represented in the definition of Mowday et. al. (1982), Buchnan, (19740, Allen and Myer, (1990). Allen and Meyer conceptualize attitudinal commitment as a psychological state that reflects employee's relationship with the Organization.

Behavioral Commitment

The behavioral perspective focuses on "Overt" manifestations of commitment (Mowday et. al., 1979). Examples of such commitment are extra attendance, tenure and performance. In this type of commitment committed behavior is distinguished from normative or general expectations, in the sense that it goes beyond such expectations. It reflects willingness to involve in extra role behavior for benefits of Organization as a whole while performing assigned roles fully and willingness to make sacrifice for Organization (Bhagatwar, 1989). According to Salancik (1977) an individual becomes bound by his actions and through these actions he tries to sustain his own involvement.

Entire distinction between attitudinal and behavioral commitment seems to be natural. Attitude reflects behavior which reflects actual action on the part of an individual. A high positive correlation is expected between attitude and behavior. However some times we find attitude discrepant behavior. The perceived disparity does not necessarily mean that there is no correlation between them. It simply implies that there are certain constraints inhibition due to which an individual is forced to behave in an attitude discrepant manner. Not only that but several times there is a disparity between stated attitude and real attitude of a person. It would be mere appropriate to say that generally individual's behavior is more in tune with his real or true attitude and discrepant with the stated attitude. We can hardly reach a person's true attitude. Unfortunately we have to depend on verbal reports of a person to know his attitude.

There are certain areas in which an individual is likely to make attitude discrepant statements. In response to a statement " I am willing to do anything and every thing for my organization", most of the individual are likely to give a highly positive response, and this is indeed the case in a number of investigations. The simple question is "Who prevents you from doing it?" When they are asked to state the extra role behaviors they engaged in during there tenure they can hardly point out any significant contribution. On the contrary in certain other areas they do not hesitate to give their true answers. For example if we ask them "What are the chances that you would leave your organization if certain incentives are offered to you in some other organization, without causing any inconvenience to you". If they say 'high chances' this can be accepted as a true reflection of their attitude. On the contrary if they say 'little or no chances at all' it may be accepted with certain reservation. Their statement may or may not reflect their true attitude.

Probably the entire confusion about exact connotation and criteria of organizational commitment is due to the fact that researchers and managements have never made a distinction between organization specific goal and common organizational goal. Development of human resources is the common organizational goals. This is for which people join an organization, and if they don't they should. If they do not, it is the responsibility of management to orient and help them in the realization of this goal. Obviously, then those who feel they are getting the opportunity for their growth and development will continue, whereas others will quit or express their desire to quit if they get opportunity in other organization.

An individual assesses Opportunity for growth and development during the course of his association with his organization. If he finds that he is getting such opportunity, he will be willing to make sacrifices for his organization, but if he is disillusioned with his present organization he is more likely to change the organization and join some other organization for various other considerations. This is substantiated by the fact that there is a growing tendency among employees to change organization for

salary and various other considerations. This growing tendency is a reflection of the fact that any ways if managements are uniformly indifferent towards our growth and development, why not change organization for money, promotions, status, and such other considerations.

There is an evidence from some studies that employees who are highly committed to their organizations perform better in a variety of jobs than those who are less committed (Mowday, Porter and Dubin, 1974; Allen and Meyer, 1987). Several of these studies have found that highly committed employees are more likely to remain with their employer in the face of alternative opportunities, than are their less committed counterparts (Koch and Sters, 1976: Porter et al., 1974). In fact, these studies have shown organizational commitment to be a better predictor of turnover than individual differences in job satisfaction. Finally, it has been suggested that the extent of commitment among the employees can serve as a useful indicator of overall organizational effectiveness, especially if it is a goal of the management to employ individuals who identify with and involved in the organization (Buchanan, 1974, Schein, 1990; Steers, 1995).

Despite a variety of studies into organizational commitment, several problems still remain. First, because few studies have approached the topic in a systematic and comprehensive fashion, little information is available to assist in the development of appropriate theories about organizational commitment. Second, the absence of cross-validation investigations into appropriate theories of organizational commitment has meant that the external validity of many studies remain in doubt. Third, because the majority of previous studies treated employee commitment as a dependant variable, very little is known about the consequences of commitment for either individuals or their organizations. Finally, and most relevant for the present study, a thorough search of the literature has revealed no investigations into the causes of consequences of organizational commitment among quality managers, those persons in the organization with primary responsibility for ensuring that the organization's goods or services meet appropriate standards of performance.

An organization commitment is the emotional attachment and involvement of employees with their organization, that mediates the effect that certain personal, job and work factors have on specific outcomes: i.e., as a state within the individual that provides the means whereby these factors impact on various outcomes.

In the present study the criteria used are behavior commitment, affective commitment, job attributes and working experience.

Drawing largely on 'Buchanan (1974) and Patchen (1990), the model suggests that commitment is also influenced by what has happened to employees during their tenure in the organization, particularly how pleasant or unpleasant employees have found such experiences. These experiences are viewed as a major socializing force and hence an important influence over the extent to which employees feel emotionally involved and attached to the organization which is typically seen as the sources of these experiences. According to Buchanan (1974) and Patchen (1990), there are four distinguishable kinds of experiences that can be expected to separately influence employee commitment; these are (1) the attitudes of individuals towards the informal groups in the organization to which they belong. (2) The felt dependability and reliability shown by the organization towards individuals, (3) the perceptions of individuals of their general importance of the organization, and (4) the extent to which individuals feel their expectations have been met by the organization since they joined it.

When we go through the literature on organizational commitment it becomes apparent that little consensus exists with respect to the meaning of commitment. As the area grew and developed, researches from various disciplines ascribed their own meaning to the topic, thereby increasing difficulty involved

in understanding this construct (Mowdey, porter and steers, 1982). Several researchers have suggested typologies to organizational researches on commitment. Three such typologies presented by Etzioni (1961) and Salancik (1977) highlight the nature of this problem. Etzioni classified commitment in to three forms as (a) moral involvement, (b) calculative involvement, and (c) alienative involvement. There is which includes (a) continuance commitment, (b) cohesion commitment, and (c) control commitment. Staw and salancik speak of two types as organizational behavior approach and social psychological approach. In fact none of the typologies captures the basic idea of commitment. All of them infact refer to affiliation or attachment, the terms which are very far from the connotation of term "commitment".

Consistent with the claim of Buchanan (1974) that organizational commitment is mainly a function of the various experiences, both positive and negative, individuals have had at work , the multiple correlation between commitment and work experiences was highest (R=0.69, F=22.83, P<0.001).

Methodology

The present study was not intended to evaluate effectiveness of any particular organization. Thus it was not necessary to collect data from any particular organization. Initially it was decided to have a sample of about two hundred managers and executives from different organizations, enough to be called a large sample. Effort was launched in the same direction, however the target could not be completed for various reasons. Data were collected are of a large number, but several of the forms had to be rejected, as they were incomplete in various ways. Almost a little above hundred had not given any information on demographic available, which itself is a reflection on Organizational Effectiveness however they were not eliminated from the sample, because it was not intended to study the effect of demographic variables on Organizational effectiveness.

There were a number of respondents who either did not answer some of the sections or eliminated some items from a particular section or multiple sections. As a result such respondents had to be deleted from the final sample. At the end final sample consisted of 33 managers and executives, whose forms were complete in all aspects.

The managers and executives were drawn from middle and lower management levels. Average age of respondents was 38 years with a S.D. of 9.345. Their average salary was Rs. 256495 per annum. There were only two in the total sample who had remained with same Organization right from the beginning of their career. Number of the Organizations changed averaged 2.115. Average length of service was 12.5 years.

Discussion

These results suggest that, among the quality managers, commitment to the organization was affected by personal interaction, job attributes, and work experiences, the most important influence on the extent of managerial commitment was the nature of their prior experiences, what had happened to the quality managers at work since joining the organization, quality managers who felt committed to their organization were significantly less likely to went to leave the organization than their counterpart who did not feel committed to same extent, In addition, committed quality managers attended work much more regularly than did their less committed counterparts, however there was no difference between the level of performance of quality managers who felt committed to their organization and those who did not as reflected in the performance ratings each manager received from his or her immediate superior. A combined interpretation of these finding leads us to believe that in the eyes of employees they do a lot for their organization and they also have emotional involvement in their organization, however, their management has very little involvement in their growth and development. As a result there is no reason why they should be willing to make sacrifice for their organization and continue with

their organization. This sounds quite logical, particularly for the managements who hold the view that "no one is indispensable to the organization, or men may come and men may go, organizations continue".

There are criteria limitation in the study for one, because of the correlation nature of the investigation, the possibility of "reverse causality" effects can not be ruled out, although the results are consistent with differences in commitment being brought about by the independent variables, there is no guarantee that the same results will be found among quality managers working in very different circumstances from those for the present study.

References

Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990), The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization, *The Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, p.18.

Balaji, C. (1985), Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: Which Explains Intent to Quit Better? *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 3, p.24.

Becker, H.S. (1960), Notes on the Concept of Commitment, *American Journal of Sociology*, 32 - 40, p.66.

Bhagatwar, P.A. (1989), The Role of Leadership and Job Satisfaction, Growth and Comfort Model, A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of I International Council of Psychologists, San Francisco, California, USA.

Buchnan, B. (1974), Building Organizational Commitment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19.

Buchanan, B**.** (1974), "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organization" *Administration Science Quarterly*", 16, pp.234-249.

Etzioni, A. A. (1961a), Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization, Free Press, NY.

Mowday R.T. and Porter, L.W. (1979), The Measurement of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, l.W. and Steers, R.M. (1982), Employee Organizational Linkages Academy Press, New York.

Mowday, R.T., L.W. Porter and R. Dubin (1974), "Unit Performance, Situational Factors, and Employee Attitudes in Spatially Spatially Units", Organizations Behaviour and Human Performance, 12, pp.231-248.

Porter, L., Crampon, W. and Smith, F. (1976), Organizational Commitment and Organizational Turnover: A Longitudinal Study, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, pp.87-98.

Patchen, M. (1990), Participation, Achievement and Involvement in the Job, prentice hall, Englewood cliffs, N.J.

Salanick, G.R. (1977), Commitment and Control of Organizational Behavior and Belief In B. Stees and G. Salanick (eds). New Directions in Organizational Behavior (1-21), Chicago, St. Clair Press.

Sheldon, M.E. (1971), Investment and Involvement as Mechanism Producing Organizational commitment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, pp.143-150.

Steers. R. (1995), "problems in the Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness" *Administrative Science Quarteerly*, 37, pp.546-558.