CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A literature review is a body of text that aims to review the critical points of current knowledge and or methodological approaches on a particular topic. A well-structured literature review is characterized by a logical flow of ideas; current and relevant references with consistent, appropriate referencing style; proper use of terminology; and an unbiased and comprehensive view of the previous research and research gap on the topic.

The review of literature is presented in the following sub-headings for clear and easy understanding.

2.1 Socio-Economic Factors of Employees of IT firms.
2.2 Impact Socio-Economic Factors on Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment.
2.3 Factors affecting Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment.
2.4 Difference in Organizational Culture and Commitment levels of the employees.
2.5 Effect of various dimensions of Organizational Culture on Organizational Commitment.

2.1 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS OF EMPLOYEES OF IT FIRMS

Information, emerging within and outside the organization, took its final form and was used according to the structural, socio-psychological and geographical setup of organizations. The socio-psychological setup, better known
as ‘organizational culture,’ and its encounter with IT, resulted in unique uses, problems and intriguing issues.

Until the early 1990s, public sector organizations or units (PSUs) in India dominated the Indian economy in almost all the core sectors. With the advent of economic liberalization, PSUs were facing stiff competition from the private sector that consists of both multinational as well as domestic organizations.

Krishna and Brihmadesam (2006) collected information on consumption as an indicator of economic status and found a somewhat more diverse socio-economic profile, with about 15 per cent coming from what they classified as “lower” economic backgrounds, 40 per cent from “lower-middle”, 28 per cent from “upper-middle”, and 19 per cent from the “upper” category. Although their study shows that some people from lower and lower-middle class backgrounds have entered this profession, they still conclude that the majority of software engineers come from the middle class [17].

Upadhya (2007) examined in his study on Employment, Exclusion and Merit in the Indian IT Industry that most software engineers come from middle class, educated families [18].

Rothboeck et. al., (2001) in their study on labour in the new economy; the case of the Indian software labour market found that 44.1 per cent were from the metros and 43.4 per cent from other urban areas, while 8.4 were from semi-urban and 4.2 per cent from rural areas [19].

Fuller and Haripriya (2006) found that with regard to caste and community, 88 per cent of respondents were found to be Hindus while only 5 per cent were Christians and 2 per cent Muslims [20]. The predominance of Brahmins was not surprising, given their historical monopoly over higher education and formal sector employment, especially in south India.

Fuller (1999) found that 71 per cent employees from dominant agricultural castes [including some which were classified as other backward classes (OBCs)] constituted 15 per cent, bringing the proportion of respondents who came from upper or dominant caste groups to 86 per cent [21]. If it further included some of
the Christian respondents, such as Syrian Christians (a relatively wealthy landowning community in Kerala), the proportion was even greater.

Oommen and Meenakshisundararajan (2005) found that 84 per cent of the fathers in their sample were engaged in occupations that were usually identified as “middle class”. They were managers or executives in public and private sector companies (21 and 10 per cent, respectively), government officers (21 per cent), professionals such as doctors and university professors (18 per cent), and businessmen (13 per cent) [22]. Only 9 per cent had fathers in lower level clerical (white collar) or blue-collar jobs, and 3 per cent were from agricultural families.

Deshpande (2006) found that the first important factor was that software companies recruit primarily engineering graduates – although they also hired graduates and postgraduates with other computer-related degrees such as Master’s in Computer Applications (MCA) [23].

Deshpande and Yadav (2006) in their study, found the percentage of students from OBC, SC and ST categories graduating from engineering colleges (and from other professional and graduate courses) continued to be much lower than their percentage in the population, and that of higher castes correspondingly much higher. Further, upper caste Hindu youth were two to four times more likely to be graduates than were youth from the OBC, SC, ST categories and Muslims [24].

All these factors worked together to create a bias in the social composition of potential IT recruits. Apart from the inherent inequality in the pool of candidates that was created by the education system, there are certain features of the recruitment process that tend to favour middle class (and upper caste) candidates.

Parthasarathy (2005) found that the IT industry has grown because of liberalization neglects, the fact that it has all along received substantial support from the state, both directly in the form of various subsidies, tax holidays, provision of land and infrastructure, and other policy measures, and indirectly in
the form of the large pool of “knowledge workers” who are produced through state investments in higher education over several decades [25].

Robbins and Langton (2001) discusses role-related characteristics in terms of job characteristics, which refer to skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. If a job contains these elements, they are referred to as high involvement jobs [26].

“The high involvement approach relies on employee self-management and participative management styles, where employees at all levels are given authority to influence decisions considering their own work”. (Nijhof et. al., 1998)[27].

Role-related characteristics of organizational commitment were also discussed in terms of job scope or challenge, role conflict, and role ambiguity (Mowday et. al., 1982; Allen and Meyer, 1990) [28, 29]. These three qualities needed to be in balance with one another for an employee to feel a sense of satisfaction with what they were doing. If there was an insufficient amount of challenge involved with individual’s jobs, they tended to behave more negatively than someone who has a greater job scope.

Given this history, from a policy point of view one could make a case that the industry should give something back to the state and to the wider society. Yet, because of its central symbolic position in the current discourse on India’s new development path under liberalization, the IT industry has been able to sustain a large degree of autonomy from state regulation, in part by promoting its image as a “new” kind of industry – meritocratic, open, and socially committed – that is providing ample (and equal) opportunities to anyone willing to work hard enough to take advantage of them.

2.2 IMPACT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS ON ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Within an organization, culture was the expression of collective staff attitudes and shared values this enables them to believe in the organization’s
values and goals, and to want to keep working for that organization (Kono and Clegg, 1998) [30]. Particularly, organizational commitment was strongly correlated with good personal relations with colleagues. In particular, the culture of peers’ work relations has a significant influence on academic job satisfaction and commitment.

Martin and Siehl (1983) suggested that while organizational culture is used to transmit top management’s interpretations of the meaning of events throughout the organization, generate commitment to their practices and control behavior, three subcultures may exist, ‘enhancing’, ‘orthogonal’ and ‘counterculture’[31]. Cultural mechanisms can also be used to undermine top-management objectives, which she called ‘counter-culture’.

There has been, however, a tendency to consider organizational culture monolithically and to discuss the culture of a total organizational entity. Writings that are more recent have questioned such a unitary view and suggested a differentiation view of culture (Martin, 1992) [32]. This was compatible with the idea of organizational subcultures, first discussed by Turner (1971) [33], but elaborated more recently (Sackman, 1992) [34].

In addition to serving integrative functions, cultures can express conflicts addressing need for differentiation among organizational elements, the conflicting subcultures. Thus, Martin extended the OC concept by explaining how parallel cultures could exist within an organization and their understanding could help in conflict-management. Further implications are that as new generations and new entrants become a part of the organization, they will not only influence the dominant, but also the parallel forms of existing cultures.

 Employers normally expected that people with higher levels of job satisfaction would have higher levels of organizational commitment. The reason why satisfaction would lead to the commitment was that a higher level of job satisfaction might lead to good work life and reduction in stress (Drago et.al., 1992) [35].
Denison (2004) examined organizational culture in family and non-family firms and how it related to performance. It became increasingly clear that family business sustainability and accomplishment were rooted in something deeper, something beyond superficial explanation and it was their ‘positive’ culture [36].

Sirmon and Lane (2004) proposed a model of cultural differences and international alliance performance to explain the ambiguous findings regarding the influence of national cultural differences on alliance performance [37].

Lee, Yu (2004) investigated relationship between corporate culture and performance in Singaporean firms and also demonstrated empirically that a set of replicable cultural dimensions exist across organizations, implies that culture can be measured with repeatable, easily administered instruments that permit systematic comparisons[38]. Cultural Strength and innovation were found to be significantly correlated with sum insured in insurance industry, supportiveness was found to be related to growth in net profits in manufacturing industry and team orientation and task orientation were significantly correlated with staff turnover rates in hospitals. Some cultural dimensions were affected by industry membership while others were not.

Gordon (1991) developed the argument that organizational or corporate culture was strongly influenced by the characteristics of the industry in which the company operates. Within an industry, firms shared the industry driven cultural elements, which were influenced by industry characteristics and were based on assumptions about the competitive environment, customer requirements and societal expectations [39].

Walumbwa et. al., (2005) conducted a cross-cultural study examining how collective and self efficacy moderated the influence of transformational leadership on followers’ work related attitudes of organizational commitment and job satisfaction across different bank branches in India, U.S. and China. Results revealed that US ranked higher on self and collective efficacy while India scored higher mean for organizational commitment and there was no significant difference in the job satisfaction suggesting the influence of individualistic and collectivistic national cultures on organizational variables [40].
A descriptive research study was conducted to investigate the concepts of transformational leadership and organizational culture within the administrative levels of campus recreation programs of Big Ten and Mid-American Conference universities. (Weese, 1995)[41]. The researcher concluded that high transformational leaders direct programs that (a) possess stronger organizational cultures and (b) carry out culture-building activities, specifically the "customer orientation" function, to a greater extent than other leaders do.

Organizational culture has been a phenomenon of intense interest among practitioners and researchers since the early 1980s. It was also, however, a contested construct that has been variously conceptualized, defined and empirically pursued (Ashkanasy et. al., 2000; Martin and Frost 1999) [42, 43]. There was broad agreement, however, that organizational culture provides the ‘social glue’ that gives organizations coherence, identity, and direction. It was most frequently conceived of as a set of shared values and symbolic elements that provided a common meaning frame by which organizational members interpret and made sense of the organizational world they occupied and that this guided their thinking, feelings and behaviors.

Influential organizational culture writers such as Peters and Waterman (1982) suggested that it exerted considerable influence on commitment [44]. The reasoning was that since organizational culture consists of a set of shared values across an organization, this would included values about the nature and quality of organization-member engagement and relationships and that member feelings and attitudes with regard to the employing organization, including commitment, would therefore be influenced by the culture. There has, however, been little empirical research affirming this and one of the few empirical studies to address the issue (Lahiry, 1994) showed only a weak association between organizational culture and commitment [45].

Theoretically, conceiving of organizations as containing a single, homogenous culture and of organizational cultures globally and monolithically, has, as noted, increasingly been challenged and the notion of subcultures has been proposed. It was argued that, particularly in large, complex organizations,
members are likely to have identifications with groups at a sub-organizational level, focused around a range of possible factors.

Subcultures formed based on people has varied identification with different subgroups based upon factors such as occupational or professional identifications, work location/proximity, functional locus, or demographic factors such as age, ethnicity or gender. Subcultures influenced the attitudes and behavior of their members and this may be independent of the main culture effects (Nord, 1985) [46].

Conceptually, a subculture was a subset of a culture and thus was defined in a similar manner as consisting of the shared assumptions, values and practices of an identifiable group of people within an organization but at a sub-organizational level. In practice, the relationship between an organization and its subcultures was likely to be complex. Although conceptually a subset, organizational subcultures needed not in practice be isomorphic with the main culture.

Subcultures may be extensions of the main culture and/or in alignment with it, but they may not; alternative and even antagonistic relations were feasible (Brown 1995) [47]. As Trice and Morand (1991) suggested, subcultures were [48]:“Distinct clusters of understandings, behaviours and cultural forms that identify groups of people in the organization. They differ noticeably from the common organizational culture in which they are embedded, either intensifying its understandings and practices or deviating from them.”

Porter et.al. (1982) found that in an organizational context, commitment has been conceptualized as loyalty to, identification with, and involvement in a job, organization, or profession. Commitment to an entity is manifested by the belief and acceptance of its values and goals, willingness to exert considerable efforts on its behalf as well as a definite and relatively strong desire to maintain membership in the job, organization, or profession [49].
Commitment has been repeatedly identified as important for understanding work behavior and performance of employees in organizations (Rusbult and Farrell, 1983) [50]. In addition to demographic characteristics (Sakaran and Monday, 1981) and, work related characteristics and the socio-psychological characteristics of employees have been examined [51], albeit to a lesser extent (Reichers, 1985) [52]. Not only have variables apart from commitment been identified as related to job, organizational and professional commitment but the three commitment variables have been linked with each other (Weissnenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968) [53].

Demographic factors such as age, gender, marital status, education level and work experience have been found to be significantly related to organizational commitment (Dodd- McCue and Wright, 1996; Mannheim et. al., 1997; Morrow, 1993; Wiedmer, 2006) [54-57].

Salami and Omole (2005) found significant relationship between job tenure and organizational commitment [58]. However, Darwish (2000) found that education level and age were not significant predictors of job satisfaction and organizational involvement. Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion and regulate emotion in the self and others [59].

The negative effects associated with a lack of organizational commitment include absenteeism and labour turnover (Bennett and Durkin, 2000) [60]. These examples helped to demonstrate that workers who were committed to their organization were happy to be members of it. Therefore, employees who believed in the organization and are dedicated to what it stand for; intend to do what was good for the organization. This attitudinal approach reflected the nature and quality of the linkage between an employee and an organization.

Oliver (1990) described this employee-organization relationship in terms of the principle of exchange. Exchange theory was relevant to the attitudinal approach to commitment in that it was reasoned that employees offered commitment in return for the receipt (or anticipated receipt) of rewards from the organization[61].
Sundas et. al., (2009) in their study on relationship between organizational commitment and its determinants among private sector employees of Pakistan found that positive and significant relationship existed between work motivation, overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment [62]. Although both independent variables were strongly associated with organizational commitment, the impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment was relatively stronger than that of the work motivation on organizational commitment.

2.3. FACTORS AFFECTING ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational culture was known to be important for the success of projects involving organizational changes. Martinsons and Chong (1999) noted “even good technology can be sabotaged if it was perceived to interfere with the established social network” [63]. Their finding was supported by Cooper (1994), who suggested that when IT conflicts with an organization’s culture, the implementation would be resisted in one of two ways – either the system will be rejected or it will be modified so that it matches the existing culture [64].

A study by Wong and Fung (2005) identified three critical cultural factors and eight sub-factors that are affecting the innovativeness of organizations in Hong Kong. However, it is essential to identify the most critical factor and sub-factor in order to help organizations develop strategies of cultural changes [65].

Organizational culture was associated with an organization’s sense of identity, its goals, its core values, its primary ways of working and a set of shared assumptions. However, the static metaphorical view of culture as a glue binding the organization together overstated the integrating forces and understates the disintegrating forces, such as differentiation (inconsistencies between espoused values and actual behavior) and fragmentation (pervasive ambiguity) (Martin, 1995)[66].

Furthermore, the cultural trait, adaptability, reflected the importance of external orientation and flexibility in addition to the more traditional cultural
trait, consistency, which is associated with internal integration and stability (Denison and Mishra, 1995) [67].

Brudney and Coundry (1993) in their study pay for performance describe various variables that could affect performance. These were job and agency characteristics, attitudes towards merit pay, organizational trust and commitment, importance of monetary rewards, linkage between pay and performance and fairness of pay system [68].

Balfour and Wechsler (1996) pointed out that overall organizational commitment was an appropriate and significant aspect to focus for organizational productivity and performance. Another approach for managing employees’ performances was designing incentive programs more tactically in a way where organizational commitment is also addressed [69].

Such incentives could be short term focused on driving employee behavior toward achievement of a specific productivity (Feldman and Landsman, 2007) [70]. Thus, various efforts focusing on the correlates of pay satisfaction have centered on various individual and organizational variables (Sahnawaz and Juyal, 2006) [71].

When employees were sure that they would grow and learn with their current employers, their level of commitment to stay with that particular organization is higher (Okpara, 2004) [72]. In order to make employees satisfied and committed to their jobs, there was a need for strong and effective motivational strategies at various levels of the organization.

Nanda and Browne (1977) have tried to identify the factors important in analyzing the performance of employee at the time of hiring and they found that employees’ productivity depends on many factors including level of job satisfaction and motivation [73].

In today’s global economy, organizations incorporate programmes like total quality management, employee involvement, job enrichment, skill-based pay, gain sharing plans to gain a competitive edge (Moon, 2000) [74]. The objective of such interventions was to increase the firm’s productivity by
controlling employee behaviour on the job and actively contribute towards achieving organizational objective, and thus building strong organizational commitment (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001) [75].

One of the core objectives of the management was to increase the efficiency by getting maximized productivity at the minimum cost. However, motivation was considered crucial for good performance. Thus, job performances were typically determined by the motivation to work hard and high motivation means greater efforts and higher performances (Mitchell, 1982) [76]. Thus, it can be said that motivation was to push workers towards improved performance and increased productivity (Tung, 1981) [77].

Commitment was a more responsive approach by an organization, and job satisfaction was more of a response to specific facets of the job. Job satisfaction was placed as a central concept in work and organizational psychology, which mediated the relation between working conditions on the one hand and organizational and individual outcomes on the other hand.

Although intuitively convincing, working conditions, as the major cause of job satisfaction, have been challenged (Dormann and Zapf, 2001) [78]. Performance pay may be part of a human resource innovations associated with high-performance workplaces. Such workplaces may create greater feelings of belonging, esteem, satisfaction and commitment (Green and Heywood, 2007) [79] and it has been related with many job related variables.

Ayeni and Phopoola (2007) have found a strong relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. According to them Job satisfaction was mostly determine how well the organization meets employees expectations. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was very crucial now days because people now often did not prefer to stay with the same organization for long. It has become hard for the organizations to exercise influence on the employees for retaining them [80]. If employees exhibits different levels of job satisfaction and if this satisfaction leads to the organization commitment, obviously organizations would want to hire employees with the higher levels of organizational commitment.
Employers normally expected that people with higher levels of job satisfaction would have higher levels of organizational commitment. The reason why satisfaction would lead to the commitment was that a higher level of job satisfaction might lead to good work life and reduction in stress (Cote and Heslin, 2003) [81].

Allen and Meyer (1990) developed a measure of organizational commitment with three major components [82]: i) Affective component of organizational commitment refers to employees’ emotional attachment, identification and involvement in the organization; ii) the Continuance component refers to commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization; and iii) Normative commitment reflects an employee’s feeling of obligation to remain with the organization, i.e. persons with a strong sense of normative commitment remain in organizations because they feel they ought to do so (Omar, et. al., 2008) [83].

Fry et. al., (1998) suggested that commitment would increase in a flat organization where coordination and control were based more on shared goals than on rules and procedures and where employee participation is encouraged. This concept of de­formalization not only helps to improve organizational commitment but also organization efficiency [84].

Participation in decision-making must also be discussed in terms of organizational structures because large bureaucratic organizations tend not to be as proactive in trying to incorporate employee ideas into the decision making process (Lipsky, 1980)[85].

Committed employees contributed greatly to organizations because they perform and behave on achieving organizational goals (Sutano, 1999) [86]. Furthermore, commitment to organizations has been found to be positively related to such organizational outcomes as job satisfaction, motivation and attendance.

Similarly, if employees were highly satisfied with their work, coworkers, pay, and supervision and derive high level of overall job satisfaction with their
jobs they were more likely to be committed to the organization than if they are not satisfied. The focus on these two key concepts cannot be over stated because job satisfaction and commitment were primary determinants of employee turnover, performance, and productivity. Committed and satisfied employees were normally high performers that contributed towards organizational productivity (Samad, 2007) [87].

Abdullah et.al. (2007) found that the level of job commitment can also be influenced by various factors such as demography, pay, co-workers, work, supervision, company’s background and employees’ job satisfaction level. The findings also showed that 91.40 per cent of the respondents have high commitment towards their organizations [88]. The correlated relationship between commitment and job satisfaction is also significant at the value of $P<0.01$. The result of the hierarchical regression analysis test shows that work, supervision and co-workers, as well as pay are important elements that influence the level of employees’ commitment in SMEs.

The need for high organizational commitment was an important issue in any organization. This was because an employee who is highly committed towards his or her organization can be said to be productive, stable, and always strive towards fulfilling their organization’s needs as opposed to those who are less committed (Larkey and Morrill, 1995)[89]. Studies on job commitment have used various variables such as individual’s background, organization, employer, work, and job satisfaction.

The findings by Aizzat et. al., (2003) revealed that marital status (unmarried) qualification (degree) and pay have negative relationships with commitment towards organization [90].

According to a study done by Boles et al., (2007)[91], increased affective organizational commitment has been positively associated with valuable organizational outcomes, including job performance ratings, decreased intent to search for new jobs and reduced turnover (Bergmann, et.al. 2000; Johnston et al., 1987)[92,93]. Identification with the organizational goals may prompt an employee to react to the organization by supporting those goals. Workers may be
more likely to be committed to an organization which is in return committed to the employees that it cares about the employees and values them (Bolman and Deal, 2003)[94].

Ball (1997) argued that as employers take less responsibility, employees need to take control of their own development in order to maintain and enhance their employability [95]. Puah and Ananthram (2006) suggested, “Career development has a direct influence on the achievement of job satisfaction and career commitment. Highlighting its benefits for the organizations [96], Hartzenberg (2002) argued, “Organizations are expecting employees to assume greater responsibility for their own future as well as for organization’s success” [97].

The company policies placed an important role in providing career opportunities. It seemed that the organization might benefit from increasing commitment across all career stages. Increasing commitment in the early career stage was important for decreasing turnover and in the mid- and late-career stages for reducing absenteeism and increasing performance (Cohen, 1991)[98].

There were four broad categories of issues that affect commitment: personal characteristics, role-related characteristics, structural characteristics, and work experiences (Mowday et. al., 1982)[99]. These characteristics were embodied in the organizational commitment definition described by Mowday et.al., (1979)[100].

Morris et. al., (1993) argued that personal characteristics do not bear significant relevance in determining commitment compared with the other attributes that affect commitment [101]. In view of this contention, it can be argued that many issues can be more adequately explained through personal characteristics (i.e. age and education). For example, it is suggested that younger employees are more committed than older employees because they are highly motivated to start a career and are able to cope with change, whereas older employees are less committed because they are often disappointed and frustrated when structural instability due to change occurs.
Effective IT retention strategy would focus on four key categories of HR practices, namely, 1) distributive justice, 2) competence development and career paths; 3) recognition of performance, and 4) empowerment (Paré and Tremblay, 2000)[102].

Shelton (2001) suggested, “Companies cannot develop corporate universities and offer extensive opportunities for internal promotion, they can help people develop career goals and action plans to develop throughout their careers” [103].

The career opportunities did affect employee commitment with the organization. Career advancement, autonomy and measurability of output related to commitment indicated that the creation of job ladders and job flexibility would maximize commitment and thus minimize absenteeism and turnover.

2.3. DIFFERENCE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND COMMITMENT LEVELS OF THE EMPLOYEES

The theory of cultural differences was refined by House et. al., (2004) posited that cultural differences have significant effects on the development and operations of various professional practices, including accounting and external auditing [104].

Professionalism and uniformity were proposed by Gray (1988) as a framework to explain accounting development in various cultural settings [105]. These settings had been proposed by Hofstede based on four cultural dimensions of uncertainty avoidance, individualism, power distance, and masculinity.

Herbig and Dunphy (1998) highlighted the profound significance of culture for the adoption of innovative technologies when they hold that “existing cultural conditions determine whether, when, how and in what form new innovations will be adopted[106]. If the behaviour, ideas and material apparatus which must accompany the use of innovation can affect improvements along lines already laid down in the culture, the possibilities of acceptance are much greater.”
Hofstede’s dimensions of culture were often adopted in cultural IS research (McCoy 2003), because they were the most widely cited and used [107]. Given the critiques of Hofstede cultural dimensions, it can be seen as only one way of looking to culture within the IS discipline (Ali and Alshawi, 2005) [108].

The authors, in their paper, used concepts of Structurational Theory by Giddens (1984) to explore the impact of cultural dimensions as proposed by Ali and Alshawi (2005) on CRM implementation and operation within a multinational environment [109]. Walsham (2002) stated that structurational analysis could be used to analyze differences in cultural sub-groups and even individuals [110].

Organizational commitment has been associated with influencing many organizational and behavioral outcomes. Most frequently, organizational commitment has been used to predict withdrawal behaviors associated with workplace attendance. In a meta-analysis of 124 published studies, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that organizational commitment was positively correlated with job attendance and had a negative linear relationship to lateness and turnover [111].

This finding supports the results of several other studies on withdrawal and organizational commitment. Based on these works, one can conclude that an individual who is committed to an organization is more likely to remain at work. Because of the negative relationship between organizational commitment and observed withdrawal behaviors, workers with lower commitment levels may be expected to work fewer hours, on average, than their more committed counterparts in a given organization.

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) observed that organizationally committed individuals were more likely to exhibit organization-serving behaviors [112]. These behaviors were those that directly or indirectly benefit the organization, the work unit, or some other worker (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) [113]. If an employee works more hours on the job, he/she may be serving the organization, work group, or coworkers by that very action, regardless of the level of impact on the worker's other performance measures.
Even if the manager was not producing any measurable work results, he/she is available to co-workers to answer any medical records questions they may have, or to assist them with problems. Similarly, the manager's presence may be a motivating factor to other staff members. In this way, the manager was helping the organization, the work group, and his/her subordinates. When identifying the behaviors associated with high levels of organizational commitment, perhaps the most important category includes those behaviors associated with or demonstrating the willingness of the individual to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization.

On the other hand, a research done by Lok and Crawford (1999) concluded that period of holding a position did not have any significant relationship with commitment level and similarly [114].

According to Slocombe and Dougherty (1998), income or salary factor did not influence commitment level[115]. In parallel, Mitchell (2008) too identified that the education level is also another important determinant of commitment since it has the power to influence people’s values, wants and needs and makes them think and behave differently [116].

2.4. **Effect of Various Dimensions of Organizational Culture on Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment, a very powerful attitude linked to employee behaviors such as performance and retention, can be influenced by work experiences such as organizational support and leadership processes (Meyer et.al, 2002)[117]. These meta-analytic results quantitatively demonstrated that a positive or negative work environment could influence organizational commitment. Therefore, it was essential to explore many work experience variables (such as psychological climate) to fully understand how to intensify organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen’s (1997) tripartite theory of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) has been used as a theoretical base for many
organizational commitment research studies [118]. Affective commitment was defined as employees wanting to be a part of an organization; continuance commitment occurred when employees need to be a part of an organization based on the costs associated with leaving; normative commitment is should-based in terms of felt moral obligations.

This distinction acknowledged a lack of mutual exclusivity, indicating that the components may have additive or multiplicative effects on organizational outcomes when combined and studied together. A few studies have examined the combined influence of affective and continuance commitment. Gade et. al., (2003) demonstrated with an Army sample that high levels of both affective and continuance commitment resulted in the highest retention intentions [119].

It was presumed that organizational culture influences employees’ sense of engagement, identification and belonging. Such sentiments might reasonably be expected to impact on commitment.

Sommer (1995) also demonstrated a significant interaction between affective and continuance commitment, such that employees with high affective and low continuance commitment were most likely to remain in the organization [120]. This interaction suggests that feelings of sunk-costs from high continuance commitment can negate the positive effect of affective commitment on retention.

Conversely, Jaros (1997) did not find evidence of a significant interaction between affective and continuance commitment in the prediction of turnover intentions[121]. These inconclusive findings made it necessary to continue studying the important influences organizational commitment components may have on one another.

Gbadamosi (2003) associated commitment with identification, involvement and loyalty to ones organization, as well as a feeling of obligation to stay with ones organization[122]. In this regard, Armstrong (2003) argued that commitment is about identification with the goals and values of the organization, which manifested as a craving to belong to the organization and the associated readiness to display effort on its behalf [123].
In this study, we have adopted the concise definition of workers’ commitment given by Meyer et. al., (1993) is adopted in which commitment is viewed as “a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization”. According to Gbadamosi (2003), this view of commitment, which determines the likelihood that an organizational member will leave does not only propose a definition of commitment, but also its measurement.

The possible causes of employees’ resignation can be traced from organizational commitment (Steers, 1997)[124]. Organizational commitment was deeply influenced by the leadership style of managers, therefore, the leadership style of a manager was able to affect subordinates’ organizational commitment and organizational commitment was related to a person’s service attitude, passion, and willingness to work (Chen, 1995) [125].

Although the influence of organizational subculture on commitment was virtually absent in the research literature, there was an increasing body of work which suggested that there were multiple foci for member commitment, including work groups, supervisors and occupational groups.

Organizational commitment was considered one of the foremost important and crucial outcomes of the human resource strategies. In addition, the employee commitment was seen as the key factor in achieving competitive performance. Significant relationship has been identified between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Narimawati, 2007)[126].

The culture of isolation would increase dissatisfaction (Xin and MacMillan, 1999) and impact on their professional competence[127]. In addition, organizational commitment in a non-western context, pointed out that organizational culture moderates the relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Thus, the better organizational cultural values fit employees’ beliefs and values, the greater the organizational achievement (Boxx and Odom, 1991)[128].