SELF-EFFICACY, WORK COMMITMENT AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AS PREDICTORS OF WORK OUTCOMES
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Summary

Different lines of research have documented the existence of many cognitive factors that have motivational effects on human actions (e.g., George, 1992; Weiss & Adler, 1984), only a few cognitive determinants of behaviour have received consistent empirical support as the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986; Maddux, 1995). Self-efficacy may be viewed as a personal judgment of “how well one can execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations.” (Bandura, 1982). Expectations of personal efficacy determine whether an individual’s coping behaviour will be initiated, how much task-related effort will be expended, and how long that effort will be sustained despite disconfirming evidence (Bandura, 1986).

It has been observed that a strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well being in many ways. People with high assurance and capabilities approach difficult task as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. Such people quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failure or setbacks. Bandura (1986) believes that people high on self-efficacy attribute failure to inefficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills, which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression.

In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks which they view personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their
personal deficiencies, on the obstacle they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They fall easy victim to stress and depression (Bandura, 1991).

Commitment is another personal construct that affects our behaviour in the organization and a central concept in psychology (Morrow, 1993). It can be viewed as a willingness to persist in a course of action. Commitment in the workplace is also an important area to be considered at length. Major portion of an individual’s life revolves around organizations and investigations of commitment forms in the workplace are vital for understanding the psychology of human behaviour. Researchers have devoted voluminous efforts to studying commitment in the workplace (Cohen, 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Morrow, 1993). Several forms of work commitment have been proposed, measured and tested for antecedents as important work outcomes (e.g., job performance, job satisfaction, turnover). These are Organizational commitment, Occupational commitment or Career commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1991) viewed organizational commitment as, “a psychological state that characterizes the employees’ relationship with the organization and implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization. But they insist that the nature of the psychological state may differ depending upon the type of commitment. Meyer et al. (1993) have identified and distinguished three components of Organizational and Occupational commitment. These are affective, continuous and normative commitments. Occupational or career commitment has been referred to as “a person’s belief in and acceptance of the value of his or her chosen career, occupation, or line of work, and a willingness to maintain
membership in that occupation" (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1994). These different commitment forms have been found to have modest correlations with outcome variables such as performance and satisfaction.

Meeting obligations helps employees maintain the positive self-images of those who repay debts, avoid the social stigma associated with the reciprocity norm's violation and obtain favorable treatment from the organization. Accordingly, employees are motivated to compensate beneficial treatment by acting in ways valued by the organization. Eisenberger et al. (1986) suggested that employees form a general perception concerning the extent to which their employer values their contribution and cares about their well-being. Such perceived organizational support (POS) might be encouraged by employees' tendency to ascribe human-like traits characteristics to organization. (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS was found positively related to the perceived sufficiency of financial inducements and family oriented actions (Guzzo, Noonan and Elron, 1994); high quality employee supervisor relationships, favorable developmental training experiences and promotions (Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997); participation in goal-setting and receipt of performance feedback (Hutchison & Garstka, 1996).

The favourableness of job conditions such as promotion practices, reward system, fringe benefits and training opportunities was found to have a stronger relationship with POS when employees believed that these conditions represented dictionary actions of the organization rather than being the result of external constraints (Eisenberger et al., 1997). According to social exchanges accounts that emphasize the norm of reciprocity (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995; Rousseau & Parks, 1993), the organization's fulfillment of socioemotional needs should create an obligation to reciprocate with great work effort. The obligation to repay
organizational support with performance is considered to be a motive that drives work performance.

In the organization, work outcome is reflected through various measures such as task completion, quality, efficiency, time management, job satisfaction, job performance, turnover intentions etc. Work outcomes may be reflected through behaviours and actions as rated and evaluated by self, peers, subordinates or superiors. Randall et al. (1990) concludes that work outcomes can best be tapped in terms of concern for quality, sacrifice orientation, willingness to share knowledge and presence in the workplace. The various work outcome or performance appraisal methods suggested by Miner (1992) are appraisal by peers, subordinates, self-appraisal, ratings by superiors. Recent researches investigating antecedents or correlates of outcome variables have pointed to the need of more systematic studies by sampling specific outcome variables. Given this, the present study is aimed at investigating the role of self-efficacy, work commitment and perceived organizational support in work outcomes.

Objectives:

1. To study the relationship between self-efficacy and work outcomes.
2. To find the relationship between components of occupational commitment and work outcomes.
3. To find the relationship between components of organizational commitment and work outcomes.
4. To examine the relationship between perceived organizational support and work outcomes.
5. To examine the role of self-efficacy, work commitment and perceived organizational support in predicting work outcomes.
6. To examine the factorial structure of the measured variables.
Hypotheses:

1. Self-efficacy is likely to correlate positively with work outcomes.
2. Different components of occupational commitment are likely to correlate differently with work outcomes.
3. Different components of organizational commitment are likely to correlate differently with work outcomes.
4. Perceived organizational support would correlate positively with work outcomes.
5. Self-efficacy, work-commitment and perceived organizational support would contribute significantly in the prediction of work outcomes.
6. There is likelihood of overlapping factors among the measured variables.

METHODOLOGY

Sample: The sample of the study comprised 300 skilled industrial workers drawn from eight industrial units located in Sonepat, Delhi and Noida through cluster random sampling technique. All the participants were male with a minimum tenure of three years and educated up to 10th standard. The age of the selected participants ranged from 30 to 52 years with a mean of 41.3.

Measuring Instruments: Following psychological tests were administered on the selected participants:


**Statistical Analysis:** The obtained data were analyzed for Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach alpha, Pearsonian Correlation, Multiple Regression Analysis and principal component analysis. The results were interpreted in the light of proposed hypotheses, earlier researches in the area, and pertinent theoretical models.

**Main Findings:**

1. In tune with the hypothesis, self-efficacy correlates positively with all the three measures of work outcomes. It has shown very strong relationship with job performance (r=.52), followed by job satisfaction (r=.33). However, the correlation with intent to stay is low (r=.12) but significant at .05 probability level.

2. Two of the three components of occupational commitment have yielded significant positive correlations with work outcomes. Affective occupational commitment correlates highest with job satisfaction (r=.53). It correlations with job performance (r=.29) and intent to stay (r=.28) are of modest level. Correlations of normative commitment with job satisfaction, job performance, and intent to stay are .32, .25, and .26, respectively. The third component of OC, continuance occupational commitment has shown quite low association with job satisfaction (r=.13), job performance (r=-.06), and intent to stay (r=.12). With these findings hypothesis 2 was borne out clearly.

3. Affective and normative organizational commitment have yielded significant positive correlations with all the three work outcomes, Affective commitment
correlates .49 with Job satisfaction, .22 with job performance, and .30 with intent to stay. Similarly, normative commitment correlates .30 with job satisfaction, .20 with job performance, and .27 with intent to leave. Correlations of continuance commitment with work outcomes are quite low. It correlates -.6, .12, and .11 with job performance, job satisfaction, and intent to stay, respectively. Therefore, hypothesis 3 got accepted.

4. Perceived organizational support has yielded modest to upper modest correlations with work outcomes. Job satisfaction, job performance, and intent to stay correlate .41, .35, and .35, respectively. With these results hypothesis 4 got supported.

5. Results of stepwise regression indicate that self-efficacy, affective and occupational commitment, affective organizational commitment and perceived organizational support contribute significantly towards job satisfaction. These five predictors account for 47 percent of the variance in job satisfaction of industrial workers.

Job performance was significantly accounted for by self-efficacy, perceived organizational support and normative occupational commitment. These three predictors accounted for 37 percent of the variance in job performance.

The work outcome variable intent to stay was significantly predicted by perceived organizational support, affective organizational and occupational commitment, and continuance occupational commitment. These four variables explained about 19 percent of variance in intent to stay.

6. Structural analysis of measured variables located three factors with eigen values more than 1.00. One major factor of work commitment was defined by all the components of occupational and organizational commitment,
except continuance commitment. This factor is heavily loaded for POS, JS, and IN_ST. As continuance commitment parted its variance from the main commitment factor, its both the forms occupational and organizational commitment loaded heavily on factor 3 along with modest negative loading of POS. Second factor was characterized by self-efficacy, job performance and intent to stay.

**Suggestions and Implications:**

1. Since the self-efficacy of an employee has emerged as most effective variable for overall performance and work satisfaction, organizations should focus on this variable two fold. Self-efficacy partly being a variable of psychological predisposition, it should be tapped through personnel selection; and it partly being trainable, it should be enhanced through training programmes.

2. Likewise, perceived organizational support also plays pivotal role in work performance and job satisfaction. Both of them are important for an organization and employee as well. Therefore, organization should not only value the contribution of an employee but also let him or her feel that he/she is being valued. Every contribution of an employee need to be recognizes and facilitated the right way.

3. Consistent to Meyer and Allen’s findings, certain components of organizational and occupational commitments, specifically the affective, recognized to be contributing markedly toward all the three work outcome behaviours. These commitments, in major part, depend on their perceptions relating organization’s policies, work environment and certain non-financial rewards. Therefore, organizations should bank up on these organizational aspects to receive best out of their human resource.