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Background of Organizational Commitment

In today’s competitive world each employee has to be committed to the organization’s objectives for the organization to perform at peak levels. Employees have to think and act as entrepreneurs and prove their worth.
Organisational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997) has been shown to be an attitude of great importance for organisation. Commitment leads to several attitudes and behaviours that are beneficial to the organisation, like organisational citizenship behaviour, and reduced absenteeism or turnover (Watson and Papamarcos, 2012).

The new world of work brings new challenge to modern organisations. Changes in every aspect of life – genetics, reality, society, truth and sovereignty have deeply challenged our world. One of these challenges involves maintaining employee commitment in the business environment. According to Miner (2013) employees are facing more ambiguity in their daily activities and decreased job security. Employee need and expectations changed as they no longer have the assurance of continued employment. The importance of work life balance, a safe working environment, pleasant working conditions and access to training and development are example of the change in employee’s needs. Demographic trends suggest that the situation might become worse. Research suggest that the age profile of the population as a whole is getting older and young people entering into employment are exhibiting a much more critical attitude towards the traditional notion of work.
When we talk about organizational commitment, what, exactly, do we mean by "organization"? During the 1970s and 1980s, researchers of organizational commitment did not explicitly define what "the organization" was that employees were committed to. Organizational commitment was "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization." They said organizational commitment was "global" and a response to "the organization as a whole." It included the organization's "goals and values" but not "specific and tangible aspects of the work environment (e.g., pay, supervision, etc.)." Beyond "goals and values," little was said concerning what it was about an organization that inspired employees' commitment.

Educational institutions like other organizations are established to serve specific purposes and to carry out designed missions. To this end, they provide resources, infrastructure, and necessary training to their faculty and non-teaching workforce to enable them to accomplish goals and objectives directed toward the greater mission. In a reciprocal way, it is important that such employees share the vision of their organization, be committed to its mission and goals, and give unreservedly of themselves in order to attain these purposes. There is nothing less than a revolution taking place in the
way work is organized and managed these days all over the world. Organizations are adopting practices that until recently would have been rejected as impracticable, idealistic or downright unthinkable. Control systems are being simplified and bureaucracies dismantled. Responsibility for action is being pushed downward. The results are increased productivity and improved quality, and decrease in defective output, absenteeism, employee turnover and formal grievances. Innovation and change have become a way of life.

Researches in the past have shown by the workers towards the organization. Commitment, which is encapsulated by the phrase “giving all of yourself while at work”, is concerned with the level of attachment and loyalty to an organization. Organizational commitment in the fields of organizational behaviour and Industrial/organizational psychology is, in a general sense, the employee's psychological attachment to the organization. It can be contrasted with other work related attitudes, such as job satisfaction, defined as an employee's feelings about their job, and organizational identification, defined as the degree to which an employee experiences a 'sense of oneness' with their organization. Commitment is the totality of internalized normative
pressures to act in a way that meets organizational interests is viewed as a normative motivational process clearly distinctive from instrumental-utilitarian approaches to the explanation of work behaviour. Organizational identification and generalized values of loyalty and duty are viewed as its immediate determinants. Thus commitment can be influenced by both personal predispositions and organizational interventions. The sense of belongingness to the organization has been recognized as one of the most powerful forces that bind people together. Managers create this by ensuring that the workforce is simultaneously informed and involved in sharing the success. The sense of excitement about the work is built through pride, trust, accountability and finally confidence in management, which is enhanced by attention of authority, dedication and competence.

The characteristics of contemporary work-life thus underline the importance of the organizational commitment of employees, as organizational commitment has been found to be associated with a series of important organizational outcomes, such as well-being; job performance, and reduced risk of long-term sickness absence. Researchers claim that organizational commitment to the educational institutes is an important concept in the analysis of educational life. On this point, researchers such shared a common
view that teachers’ perceptions of the workplace or the quality of workplace will influence the motivation and commitment of teachers work in there. This ultimately will affect the quality of education provided in educational institutes. Despite its intuitive appeal, commitment is a complex phenomenon. Interest has been focused on four main issues. These are: the focus or target of commitment the definition, and measurement of commitment; the cause of variation in commitment and the consequences of commitment. The picture is made more complex by the presence of two rather different theoretical streams, one concerned with commitment as an attitude and the other with commitment as behaviour. In an organizational set up, the employees’ feelings and attitudes may change according to the treatment given to them by their superiors. A favourable social framework fosters employee’s loyalty towards the organization. Educational institutions like other organizations are established to serve specific purposes and to carry out designed missions. To this end, they provide resources, infrastructure, and necessary training to their faculty and non-teaching workforce to enable them to accomplish goals and objectives directed toward the greater mission.
In a reciprocal way, it is important that such employees share the vision of their organization, be committed to its mission and goals, and give unreservedly of themselves in order to attain these purposes.

Teaching is more than the presentation of facts; it includes the dedication of both heart and time. Teacher commitment has been identified as one of the most critical factors for the future success of educational institutions. The level of teachers’ commitment is considered to be a key factor in the success of any educational undertaking as it heavily influences teachers’ willingness to engage in cooperative and critical practice. The educational organization is one of the most important social institutions in a society. The effective and directive positions of an educational organization in a society firmly depend on its perfect coordination in the direction of social expectations. The effectiveness level of an organization necessitates adequate organizational formation, satisfactory sources, consistent policies based on scientific and technological developments and qualified employee with healthy working conditions, and also its aim should be directive for social needs.

Human being is, of course, much more important in the educational organizations than in other organizations. Because s/he participates at any position of the input process- output circle of the educational organizations,
“input” is students, “process” is teacher and “output” is a qualified work. Besides attitudinal alteration is the aim that students are charged with. Then, it is possible to assert that the most important element is human being and the output is attitude in educational organizations.

The importance of employee commitment is quite evident if one considers prior research into the relationship between commitment and performance (Lok and Crawford, 2012). Organization that can successfully foster the commitment of their employees enjoy several distinct competitive advantages. They are able to execute their business strategies more successfully and are more flexible and adaptive to changing market conditions. They have an enhanced reputation in the market place and hence can attract and retain the best talent.

According to Edward (2013) in high commitment organisations, employees deliver value in three distinct ways:

- Persistence-longer tenure, reduced absence, improved punctuality, reduced stress
- Citizenship- more ethical behaviours, spontaneous ambassadorship, more proactive support for others
Performance- greater productivity, enhanced customer service, improved quality, higher outputs

Various definitions are used to coincide with the theory, but from the definitions, a common theme has emerged. Of the variety of definitions, a common theme was “the view that commitment is a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The purpose of organizational commitment is “to provide a better understanding of the commitment process and allow practitioners to scrutinize carefully the reports of more in-depth qualitative analysis of what did or did not work in other organizations and to evaluate what programs are most likely to work for them” (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

The concept of organizational commitment originated from research data on commitment by Simon (1945), Etzioni (1961), and Kanter (1968). Barnard emphasized the importance of the congruency between individuals’ motives and the organizational goals. An individual’s decision to join an organization is based on the belief that the organization can fulfill a personal need. If at any time the organization falls outside a “zone of indifference” and there is a lack
of imbalance between inducements and contributions, the individual may leave the system (Barnard, 1938). Barnard (1938) believed that organizational effectiveness is dependent on individuals’ Commitment to cooperate toward the organizational goals. Maintaining the commitment of individuals is imperative to an effective organization. Simon (1945) extended Barnard’s ideas to include decision making as an important entity. Simon believed that an organization’s survival was the result of individuals making decisions based on the organization’s best interest. Simon labelled this choice as identification. Identification was described as “the process whereby the individuals substitutes organizational objectives…for his own aims and the value indices, which determine his organizational decisions” (Simon, 1976). Identification describes three elements: 1) personal interest in organizational success, 2) a sense of ownership of the organization, and 3) focus of attention. Etzioni (1961) referred to the positive involvement of an individual to an organization as commitment. Etzioni (1961) further identified the three kinds of involvement: alienate involvement, calculative involvement, and moral involvement. Alienative involvement was considered an negative involvement and was also considered coercion. Calculative involvement focused on the equitable exchange between the individual and
organization. Moral involvement involved the individual internalizing the organization’s goals, norms, and values and was considered a high commitment zone. Like Etzioni, Kanter (1968) believed that organizational commitment incorporated more than one approach. Kanter (1968) identified the behavioural requirements of organizational commitment as: 1) continuance (commitment to system survival), 2) cohesion (attachment to social relationship), and 3) control (attachment to organization). Kanter evolved organizational theory in his reasoning that all three areas of organizational commitment must be maintained simultaneously. Early researchers of commitment have provided a foundation for contemporary theories. The following section offers contemporary theories of organizational commitment.

**Contemporary Theories of Organizational Commitment**

**The Becker’s ‘Side-Bet’ Model (1960)**

The first contemporary theory of organizational commitment was the “side–bet” theory put forth by H.S. Becker in 1960. The “side-bet” theory believed that

“Commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity” (Becker, 1960). Becker
(1960) concentrated on what he termed the “side-bet” theory, which attempted to explain the process by which employees attach themselves to organizations through investments such as time, effort, and reward. These investments, however, have costs, which reduce to some degree an employee’s freedom in his or her future activity. Through investments, employees get locked into organizations because of costs associated with leaving the organization (e.g. pension plans, seniority, and firm specific knowledge). It is believed that (Becker, 1960): Side-bets constraining behaviour also comes into existence through the process of individual adjustment to social positions. A person may also alter his pattern of activity in the process of conforming to the requirements for one social position that he unfits himself for other positions he might have access to (p. 37). Becker’s work was criticized in that the “side-bet” model only identified the behaviour of the individual. Commitment was seen as an exchange between the individual and organization for certain rewards or payments (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979). Research in organizational commitment began to be distinguished as pertaining to either attitudinal commitment or behavioural commitment. Attitudinal commitment research focused on the process by which people come to think about their relationship with the organization. In many ways it
can be thought of as a mind set in which individuals consider the extent to which their own values and goals are congruent with those of the organization. (Meyer & Allen, 1997) Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) described attitudinal commitment as the extent to which an individual and the organizational goals are congruent.

Attitudinal commitment studies considered the antecedents and consequences of commitment. The objective of studies on attitudinal commitment was to prove that the results of a strong commitment were lower absenteeism (Iverson & Buttigeg, 1999; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Somer, 1995), lower turnover (Lee & Maurer, 1999; Somers, 1995; Steers, 1977), and higher productivity (Angle & Perry, 1981; Meyer, Allen, and Smith, 1993; Meyer, Paunonen, Gettality, Goffin, and Jackson, 1989). Another objective was to determine what personal characteristics and conditions contribute to the development of high commitment. “Behavioural commitment relates to the process by which individuals become locked into a certain organization and how they deal with this problem” (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The objective of behavioural commitment research was to discover the conditions in which individuals become committed to the organization.
The Mowday, Porter, Steers, and Boulian Model (1979) Mowday, Porter, Steers, and Boulian began to theorize about organizational commitment in both attitudinal and behavioural contexts. Mowday et al. (1982) described organizational commitment as the relative “strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization, which is characterized by belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization” (p. 27).

Organizational commitment as defined by Mowday et al. (1979) has three major components: 1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goal, 2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and 3) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership.

Building on Mowday and his colleagues’ organizational commitment theory, O’Reilly and Chatman reviewed individual psychological attachment to the organization.

The O’Reilly and Chatman Model (1986)

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) attempted to clarify the construct of organizational commitment. Commitment was defined as the psychological attachment felt by the individual for an organization, which reflects the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts the characteristics or
perspectives of the organization. There are three independent bases for psychological attachment: compliance, identification, and internalization. O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) described commitment as: the basis for one’s psychological attachment to an organization may be predicted on three independent foundations: (a) compliance or instrumental involvement for specific, extrinsic rewards; (b) identification or involvement based on a desire for affiliation; and (c) internalization or involvement on congruence between individual and organizational values.

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) believed compliance occurred when the attitudes and beliefs of an organization were adopted by an individual to gain specific rewards. Identification occurred when an individual respects the beliefs and values of the organization without adopting them as their own. Internalization occurred when the attitudes and beliefs of an organization are the same as the individual. Through criticisms of their work and continued research, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) restructured their framework to acknowledge two dimensions, compliance and normative, a combination of internalization and identification. During the time O’Reilly and Chatman began their work on organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1997) also began their work on organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen’s model
was conceptualized by the Becker model (cost attachment) and the Mowday, Porter, Steers, and Boulian model (affective attachment).


Meyer and Allen first identified two dimensions of organizational commitment: affective attachment and cost attachment. After continued research, however, Meyer and Allen identified another dimension, which was obligation. The three distinct components of organizational commitment identified by Meyer and Allen, then, were affective orientation, cost-based orientation, and obligation or moral responsibility. Meyer and Allen identified three themes and common definitions. Meyer and Allen’s three component model will be used to guide the present investigation and will be discussed in the following section.

**Morrow’s model**

Another recommendation of Morrow (1993) was for conceptual re-evaluation of work commitment. Little research has tried to explore the relationships among the forms of work commitment. A notable exception is Randall and Cote (1991) who examined the interrelationships of work commitment forms, proposing and examining a preliminary theoretical model. Morrow (1993)
argued that the nature of interrelationships among forms of work commitment needs to be resolved as soon as possible since evidence that one form of work commitment can moderate relationships involving other forms is beginning to accumulate (Hunt and Morgan, 1994; Witt, 1993). Morrow (1993) suggested that one way to think about the interrelationships among the commitment forms is to locate each within a series of concentric circles, with work ethic innermost, followed by career commitment, continuance organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, and on the outermost circle, job involvement. The concentric circle model facilitates thinking about the composition of a given employee's work commitments. Morrow argued that no assumptions can be made regarding the size of each circle or even the size of the entire model. A high level of one form of work commitment does not imply that less commitment must exist elsewhere: one does not have a fixed amount of loyalty to distribute among objects. According to Morrow, commitment forms are positioned in this manner to reflect the idea that the inner circles are more dispositional, cultural, and cohort-based in nature and therefore relatively stable over time. The outer circles are thought to be more situationally determined and therefore more subject to change and
influence. Morrow argued that the inner circles impact the outer circles. Work ethic endorsement, as an illustration, would be expected to exhibit a stronger relationship with career commitment than affective organizational commitment, controlling for other factors (Morrow, 1993). While Morrow mentioned specifically that a given commitment focus will be most related to the next circle outside it, the above quotation allows the possibility that it will also be related to the circle two stages away, but not as strongly as it is related to the adjacent one. Morrow's model is shown in Figure 1a. In Morrow's model, job involvement is the endogenous variable and the two forms of organizational commitment are the variables which mediate the relationships between the PWE and career commitment, the exogenous variables, and job involvement, the endogenous variable. Morrow's model concentrates on the positioning of and the conceptual differences between commitment forms in the inner and outer circles. It does not explain why and how each is related to the other. This paper will elaborate on these issues from previous conceptual and empirical research. The logic behind Morrow's model seems similar to that in models proposed by Yoon, Baker and Ko (1994), and Gregerson (1993). Yoon et al. (1994) based their arguments on Lawler's (1992) theory of attachment attributed mainly to nested subgroups. This theory or principle
of proximal rules explicates why `actors develop stronger affective ties to subgroups within a social system rather than to the social system, to local communities rather than to states, to work organization, and so forth' (Lawler, 1992, p. 334). According to this theory the mechanism that leads to stronger commitment to proximal targets is stronger interpersonal attachment among their members. Yoon et al. (1994) defined personal attachment as the degree of affective personal relationships an individual has with other members in her or his immediate work unit. Interpersonal attachment produces a stronger commitment to subgroups than to the larger group, because the credit for positive effect from interpersonal bonds is likely to be attributed to the proximal subgroups, while the blame for negative affects is likely to be attributed to the large group. According to the above logic one can develop stronger attachment to the job, which is a proximal target in one's immediate work unit, than to one's career, which is a much more distant target. Gregerson (1993) argued in this regard that proximal variables exert the most significant influence on employees' actions because proximity provides more opportunities for exchange relationships. PWE is a dispositional variable characterized by a belief in the importance of hard work and is assumed to be a relatively fixed attribute over an individual's.
A) Protestant work ethic → Continuance organizational commitment
  ↓
  Job involvement

  Carrier commitment → Affective commitment

B) Protestant work ethic → Job involvement → Continuance organizational commitment
  ↓
  Affective commitment
  ↓
  Moral Commitment
As a general work value orientation learned early in the socialization processes (Shamir, 1986), it is the most stable commitment form because it is less related to characteristics of the work setting. It is also the least proximal variable among the have commitment foci because it is not related specifically to any concrete characteristic in the workplace. Thus PWE very logically represents the exogenous variable in Morrow's model. According to Morrow, PWE should be related to career commitment. The logic of proximity supports such a relationship. Career commitment represents a more immediate and proximal construct than PWE. While PWE respects general values about work, career commitment represents a more specific, narrow focus, one's own career or vocation (Blau, 1985). How can PWE be related to career commitment? Furnham (1990) applies Holland's (1973) theory according to which different types of people have different interests, competencies, and dispositions. They tend to surround themselves with people and situations congruent with their interests, capabilities, and outlook. People tend to search for environments that will let them exercise their skills and abilities and express their personality. Thus people with high PWE will search for and work in careers that their personality and will be more attached to them. The higher their level of PWE the more attached they will be to the vocation they choose. On the
other hand, a low PWE simply does not into an occupational setting that values high PWE. The poor fit should manifest itself, therefore, in low attachment to the occupation. The literature provides conceptual as well as empirical support for a relationship between occupational commitment and organizational commitment. Witt's (1993) explanation is based on Schneider's (1983) attraction ± selection ± attrition (ASA) framework, which states that people select themselves into and out of organizations. In other words, people seek the organization that them. In the ASA framework, individuals highly committed to their occupation may have carefully selected an organization as an appropriate workplace. Hence they may be highly committed to the organization. Another explanation for this relationship was provided by Vandenberg and Scarpello (1994) who argued that organizational commitment depends in part on a perceived match or congruence between a person's own values and those espoused by the organization. Given that occupational values and expectations characterize a personal value system, the commitment of occupational members to the organization depends in part on realizing their occupational values and expectations within that employment setting. Occupationally committed individuals tend to seek employment (i.e. self-select) in settings that encourage them to behave according to the occupational value system. In this case there is a greater chance that individuals' values will fit those of the organization. A low psycho-logical attachment to an occupation
simply does not fit in an employment setting which values that occupation. The poor fit should manifest itself, therefore, in low attachment to the organization. None of the foregoing distinguishes between continuance and affective commitment. Morrow's model includes two forms of organizational commitment proposed by Meyer and Allen (1984). The first dimension was termed affective commitment and was defined as `positive feelings of identification with, attachment to, and involvement in, the work organization' (Meyer and Allen, 1984). The second was termed continuance commitment and was defined as `the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving (e.g. investments or lack of attractive alternatives)' (Meyer and Allen, 1984). McGee and Ford (1987) in their factor analysis found that the continuance commitment scale is a two-dimensional construct in itself. One subdimension represents the personal sacrifices that would result from leaving the organization and was termed `personal sacrifices'. The other, `low alternatives', represents the role of available employment alternatives in the decision to remain in one's organization. Research findings have supported two-dimensional structure of the continuance commitment construct (Hacket et al., 1994; Somers, 1993). According to Morrow, career commitment should be related to continuance commitment. There is conceptual support for presenting continuance commitment before affective commitment. Witt (1993) states that
among some employees, a specialized occupation may lead to limited alternative opportunities. Because continuance commitment develops partly as a result of such `low alternatives', occupational commitment will be related to continuance commitment more strongly than to affective commitment. The relationship between continuance and affective commitment was explained by McGee and Ford (1987) and Meyer, Allen and Gellatly (1990). They stated that the accumulated investments that bind an individual to an organization can lead, through self-justification or dissonance reduction, to an affective attachment to the organization. That is, the binding properties of high personal investments are thought to be translated into a greater degree of affective attachment to the organization to blunt the disagreeable reality that one might be stuck as a result of the high costs associated with exit. Partial support for this relationship was provided by Meyer et al. (1990) who found that respondents who indicated that it would be costly to leave the organization reported feeling more affective attachment to it. Somers' (1993) findings of a positive relationship between the sacrifice component of continuance commitment and affective commitment also supported the above relationship. Interestingly, Somers did not find a significant relationship between affective commitment and the `low alternatives' component of continuance commitment.
The outermost circle in Morrow's model is job involvement. Job involvement is viewed by Kanungo (1982) as the cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with one's job. Of all forms of commitment the job is the closest, most tangible and most concrete focus. How does affective commitment affect job involvement? Two explanations can be offered. First, the ASA (attraction ± selection ± attrition) framework described earlier argues that because the occupationally committed employees may have selected their organization carefully and thus may be more concerned with the long term, initial work assignments and the fairness of current work assignments may be less salient for them. Therefore, a positive relationship can be expected. Second, Witt (1993) relates three forms of commitment—occupational, organizational, and job involvement—and explains the interrelationships in the same order as in Morrow's model. Accordingly, a specialized occupation may lead to limited opportunities for employment elsewhere, so that leaving the organization may not be a viable alternative. Hence employees with few alternative employment opportunities (high continuance commitment) will develop affective attachment to the organization (high affective commitment) and positive attitudes toward any job assignment they receive there (high job involvement).

**The Randall and Cote model**
Morrow's model should be compared with an earlier one proposed and tested by Randall and Cote (1991), who tested slightly different forms of commitment. These are PWE, career commitment, organizational commitment, work group attachment, and job involvement. They included only one form of organizational commitment, the affective one, and instead of the continuance Organizational commitment in Morrow's model theirs had the work group attachment form. Four forms of commitment the affective organizational commitment, PWE, career commitment, and job involvement were tested in both models. Randall and Cote's approach differs from Morrow's. It postulates that job involvement influences both organizational commitment and career salience directly and strongly. It affects organizational commitment because situational factors have been identified as potentially the most important set of antecedents of organizational commitment. Of these, job involvement in particular exerts a powerful influence on commitment to the organization. Job involvement was also found to predict career salience because it fosters job challenge, which in turn leads to career identification. Job involvement itself was strongly affected by PWE which has a key role in influencing an employee's affective responses in the workplace, and was affected to a lesser extent by work group attachment (Randall and Cote, 1991). The main difference between the Randall and Cote and the Morrow models is the role of job involvement, the endogenous variable
according to Morrow, and an important mediator according to Randall and Cote. Hence their approach is applied here and tested against Morrow's model. While Randall and Cote do not provide sufficient justification for what they termed the pivotal role of job involvement, this paper will attempt to clarify and justify their argument. Clearly, the proximity argument that influenced Morrow's model is not utilized by Randall and Cote. Instead they apply a strong situational approach. Accordingly, experiences in the work setting as represented in the level of job involvement will determine affective reactions towards other constituents in the workplace. As in Morrow, PWE is the exogenous variable. But in Randall and Cote's model it affects job involvement instead of career commitment, as in Morrow. Schnake (1991) explained that people with a strong work ethic tend to have contempt for idleness and self-indulgence. Employees with a high work ethic are likely to make sure that they put in a fair day's effort, and believe that work is its own reward. Persons with a strong work ethic may be motivated to apply more effort, to continue to do so even when bored or fatigued, and to accept responsibility for their work. They may feel a moral obligation to perform the task to the best of their abilities. Such persons may also feel guilty when they believe they are not working as hard as they should. Thus they are more likely to be job involved than persons with lower levels of PWE. Shamir (1986) argued that it is therefore reasonable to expect that positive attitudes to work in general will lead to
positive attitudes to the specific job. People who value the work role highly will demonstrate it in their attitude toward the job. According to Shamir it would seem that commitment to the job, which is based on the individual meaning of the job, has a stronger influence on organizational commitment or occupational commitment. This argument is the Randall and Cote model. How does job involvement mediate the relationship among PWE, occupational commitment and the two forms of organizational commitment? Witt (1993) suggested that employees given unsatisfactory work assignments may develop unfavorable and durable attitudes to the organization, arguing that the reactions to one's work assignment(s) may be salient in the commitment decision. His results were consistent with previous findings showing that early work experiences contribute to later commitment (Pierce and Dunham, 1987). Witt concluded that one's work experiences and attitudes are an important factor in later job attitudes. The foregoing supports the notion of job involvement as a mediator in work commitment interrelationships. Job involvement is strongly affected and can be perceived as a reflection of work experiences. The more positive these experiences, the higher the job involvement. Higher job involvement will lead to positive attitudes toward organization and career. By inference, Randall and Cote seem to conceptualize job involvement as a mediator based on the social exchange theory that given certain conditions people seek to
reciprocate those who benefit them. Employees who are involved in their job have positive work experiences which are attributed to the organization or their career. To the extent that positive experiences are attributed to the efforts of organizational officials, these are reciprocated with increased affective organizational commitment to the persons who caused them. Finally, one highly involved in a job will also attribute it to the occupation and will reciprocate with high occupational commitment.

The difference between the Morrow and the Randall and Cote models provides an important reason to compare them. While there are probably other potential models these two are justified conceptually and present the best alternatives to be tested and compared. Another issue this research addresses is the continuance commitment form. As mentioned, earlier research clearly showed that continuance commitment has two dimensions, `personal sacrifices' and `low alternatives'. Morrow (1993) mentioned but did not consider it in developing the work commitment model. Thus the need to include the full scale of continuance commitment should be tested. Possibly the relationships among the commitment foci differ depending on the kind of continuance commitment scale the model includes. Therefore Morrow's and Randall and Cote's models will be tested not only with the full scale of continuance commitment but also with each of its dimensions.
The Mowday, Porter, Steers, and Boulian Model (1979)

Mowday, Porter, Steers, and Boulian began to theorize about organizational commitment in both attitudinal and behavioural contexts. Mowday et al. (1982) described organizational commitment as the relative “strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization, which is characterized by belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization” (p. 27). Organizational commitment as defined by Mowday et al. (1974) has three major components: 1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goal, 2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and 3) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership. Building on Mowday and his colleagues’ organizational commitment theory, O’Reilly and Chatman reviewed individual psychological attachment to the organization.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework that guided the present investigation was the three-component model of organizational commitment developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). Meyer and Allen’s (1997) theory of organizational commitment suggests that “by understanding when and how commitments develop and how they shape attitudes and behaviours, organizations will be in a better position to anticipate the impact that change will have and to manage it more effectively”
Meyer and Allen (1984) first identified two components of organizational commitment, those of affective attachment and cost attachment. But after continued research, Meyer and Allen (1990) identified a third component, that of obligation. The three-component model was developed as a result of three common themes within the commitment literature as noted by Meyer and Allen. Some of the common definitions within the affective orientation theme include “an attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization” (Sheldon, 1971) and “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982). Some of the common definitions within the cost-based theme are “profit associated with continued participation and a cost associated with leaving” (Kanter, 1968) and “commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side-bet, links extraneous interest with a consistent line of activity” (Becker, 1960). Some of the common definitions within the obligation theme include “the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interest” (Wiener, 1982) and “the committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the company, regardless
of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the firm gives him or her over the years” (Marsh & Mannari, 1977). From the three themes, Meyer and Allen identified the three components of organizational commitment as affective, continuance, and normative. From the three-component model theory of organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen developed a multidimensional model of organizational commitment. The multidimensional model consists of five parts: 1) Distal Antecedents, 2) Proximal Antecedents, 3) Process, 4) Commitment, and 5) Consequences.

**Distal antecedents.** The first section of the multidimensional model dealt with distal antecedents. The distal antecedents are categorized as: organizational characteristics, personal characteristics, socialization experience, management practices, and environmental conditions. The “distal causes exert their influence on commitment through their influence on the more proximal causes (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Studies (Kock & Steers, 1978; Lee, Ashford, Walsh, and Mowday, 1992; Waldman & Avolio, 1996) have concluded that antecedents are a reliable predictor of organizational commitment.

**Proximal antecedents.** The second section of the multidimensional model identified the proximal antecedents. The proximal antecedents are categorized as: work experiences, role status, and psychological contracts. Proximal antecedents are variables that directly affect organizational commitment.
**Process.** The third section of the multidimensional model is the process in which the antecedents affect the various components of commitment.

**Components (bases) of organizational commitment.** The fourth section of the model identified the three components of commitment: affective, continuance or normative. The three components were found to be related, but distinguishable from each other (Dunham, Grube, and Castañada, 1994; Meyer et al., 2001).

Meyer and Allen state, “Affective commitment refers to an employee’s attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (1997). An employee who has a strong affective commitment to an organization stays with the organization because he or she wants to continue working in the organization. **Meyer and Allen (1991)** found that the best predictor of affective Commitment was work experience. Employees whose work experiences are consistent with their expectations and whose basic needs within the organization are satisfied have a stronger level of affective commitment to the organization. Employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they have no desire to leave. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), “Continuance commitment refers to the awareness of cost associated with leaving the organizations” (p. 11). Employees with a strong continuance commitment to an organization recognize that leaving the organization may be detrimental to them financially due to the lack of employment alternatives and a loss of investments (e.g., personal relationships,
pension plans). Continuance commitment was originally a unitary dimension, but through continued research (McGee & Ford, 1987) was subdivided into two dimensions: continuance commitment - low number of alternatives (CC:LoAlt) and continuance commitment - high personal sacrifice (CC:HiSac). The former reflects an individual’s commitment to an organization because of a lack of employment opportunities, and describes an individual remaining with an organization because of the personal loss that would occur by leaving the organization. Employees with strong continuance commitment remain with the organization because they have to. To confirm the distinction between the two variables, further research was conducted (McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer, Allen, and Gellatly, 1990, Allen & Meyer, 1990; Somers, 1993 Dunham, Grube, and Castañeda, 1994). The third component, normative commitment, reflects a feeling of “obligation to continue employment” (Meyer & Allen, 1997). An employee with a strong normative commitment feels he or she has a moral obligation to stay in the organization. Normative commitment was developed on the basis that the organization made a particular kind of investment in the employee, which gives the employee a sense of obligation to the organization.

Consequences. The fifth and final section of the multidimensional model discusses the consequences of organizational commitment. These have been defined as retention (withdrawal behaviour and turnover), productive behaviour
(performance), and employee well-being (Allen & Meyer, 1991). The consequences of affective commitment are lower turnover and turnover intentions, better on-the-job behaviour (attendance, organizational commitment behaviour, performance), and better employee health and well-being (Angel & Lawson, 1994; Hackett, Bycio, and Hausdorf, 1994; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2001). The consequences for continuance commitment are lower turnover and turnover intention, consequently, there was no (e.g., a negative outcome) of on-the-job behaviour and employee health and well-being (Hackett et al., 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2001). The consequences for normative commitment are lower turnover and turnover intentions, better on-the-job behaviour (attendance, organizational commitment behaviour, performance), and better employee health and well-being (Hackett et al, 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer et al., 2001).

Organizational commitment sits side by side with job performance in our integrative model of organizational behaviour, reflecting one of the starting points for our journey through the concepts covered in this course. Why begin with a discussion of organizational commitment? Because, it is simply not enough to have talented employees who perform their jobs well. You also need to be able to hang on to those employees for long periods of time so that the organization can benefit from their efforts. Put yourself in the shoes of a business owner. Let’s say you
spent a great deal of time recruiting a graduate from the local university, selling her on your business, and making sure that she was as qualified as you initially believed her to be. Now assume that, once hired, you took a personal interest in that employee, showing her the ropes and acting as mentor and instructor. Then, just as the company was set to improve as a result of that employee’s presence, she leaves to go to work for a competitor. As an employer, can you think of many things more distressing than that scenario?

Recent survey by the Society for Human Resource Management showed that 75 percent of employees were looking for a new job. Of those job seekers, 43 percent were looking for more money, and 35 percent were reacting to a sense of dissatisfaction with their current employer. Managers should be worried about these sorts of numbers, because the cost of turnover can be very high. Estimates suggest that it costs about .5 times the annual universities, year in and year out. After all, if a company wants to have the best products in a given market, it helps to have the best people. Microsoft placed 50 on Fortune’s list of the “100 Best Companies to Work For” in 2007.1 However, for the first time in its history, Microsoft is having trouble holding on to its best and brightest. Microsoft’s annual rate of voluntary turnover, which captures the percentage of the workforce that decides to quit in a given year, is just 9 percent—still below the industry average. But many of Microsoft’s most respected software developers, engineers, managers,
and marketers have recently left to go work for competing firms in the high-tech industry. For example, Kai-Fu Lee, one of Microsoft’s foremost experts on speech recognition, left for Google, as did Mark Lucovsky, Joe Beda, and Gary Burd, three of the company’s most distinguished engineers. The employees who have quit their jobs at Microsoft voice a wide range of complaints about the company, including a swelling bureaucracy, sagging morale among the rank-and-file employees, a lack of innovative spark, cuts in compensation and benefits, and an unfair performance evaluation system. Many of these complaints are echoed on Web sites and blogs run by current Microsoft employees, which reinforce a culture of criticism within the company. The challenge for Microsoft is to find a way to reverse these trends so that it can retain the most talented employees. After all, what could be more damaging than losing one of your best and brightest to a major competitor? Not only do you no longer have access to that employee’s knowledge and experience, but now your competitor can draw on his or her wisdom to find a way to beat you. Microsoft is already taking steps to combat some of the complaints raised by former employees, including a reorganization of its business units designed to make the company more nimble and innovative. Of course, there isn’t likely to be a “magic bullet” that will single-handedly prevent further exit of more and more talented and valuable employees.

Withdrawal behaviour
Salary benefits to replace an hourly worker, 1.5 times the annual salary benefits to replace a salaried employee, and as much as 5 times the annual salary benefits to replace an executive. Why so expensive? Those estimates include various costs, including the administrative costs involved in the separation, recruitment expenses, screening costs, and training and orientation expenses for the new hire. They also include “hidden costs” due to decreased morale, lost organizational knowledge, and lost productivity.

**Organizational commitment** is defined as the desire on the part of an employee to remain a member of the organization. Organizational commitment influences whether an employee stays a member of the organization (is retained) or leaves to pursue another job (turns over). It is important to acknowledge that turnover can be both voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary turnover occurs when employees themselves decide to quit; involuntary turnover occurs when employees are fired by the organization for some reason. Our attention in this chapter is focused
primarily on reducing voluntary turnover—keeping the employees that the organization wants to keep. Employees who are not committed to their organizations engage in withdrawal behaviour, defined as a set of actions that employees perform to avoid the work situation—behaviours that may eventually culminate in quitting the organization. The relationship between commitment and withdrawal is illustrated in Figure -1. Some employees may exhibit much more commitment than withdrawal, finding themselves on the blue end of the continuum. Leaving aside personal or family issues, these employees are not “retention risks” for the moment. Other employees exhibit much more withdrawal than commitment, finding themselves on the red end of the continuum. These employees are retention risks—teetering on the edge of quitting their jobs. The sections that follow review both commitment and withdrawal in more detail

What does it mean to be committed employee

One key to understanding organizational commitment is to understand where it comes from. In other words, what creates a desire to remain a member of an organization? To explore this question, consider the following scenario: You’ve been working full-time for your employer for around five years.

TYPES OF COMMITMENT
In table-1 the left-hand column reflects some emotional reasons for staying with the current organization, including feelings about friendships, the atmosphere or culture of the company, and a sense of enjoyment when completing job duties. These sorts of emotional reasons create **affective commitment**, defined as a desire to remain a member of an organization due to an emotional attachment to, and involvement with, that organization. Put simply, you stay because you *want* to. The middle column reflects some cost-based reasons for staying, including issues of salary, benefits, and promotions, as well as concerns about uprooting a family. These sorts of reasons create **continuance commitment**, defined as a desire to remain a member of an organization because of awareness of the costs associated with leaving it. In other words, you stay because you *need* to. The right-hand column reflects some obligation-based reasons for staying with the current organization, including a sense that a debt is owed to a boss, a colleague, or the larger company. These sorts of reasons create **normative commitment**, defined as a desire to remain a member of an organization due to a feeling of obligation. In this case, you stay because you *ought* to.

**Table-1 The three types of organizational commitment**

| What makes someone want to stay with their current organization? |  |
|---|---|---|
| Emotion based | Cost based | Obligation based |
| Some of my best friends work in my office . . . I’d | I’m due for a promotion soon . . . will I advance as | My boss has invested so much time in me, mentoring |
miss them if I left. I really like the atmosphere at my current job . . . it’s fun and relaxed. My current job duties are very rewarding . . . I enjoy coming to work each morning.

quickly at the new company? My salary and benefits get us a nice house in our town . . . the cost of living is higher in this new area. The school system is good here, my spouse has a good job . . . we’ve really “put down roots” where we are.

me, training me, showing me “the ropes. My organization gave me my start . . . they hired me when others thought I wasn’t qualified. My employer has helped me out of a jam on a number of occasions . . . how could I leave now?

As shown in Figure -2, the three types of organizational commitment combine to create an overall sense of psychological attachment to the company. Of course, different people may weight the three types differently. One person may be very rational and cautious by nature, focusing primarily on continuance commitment when evaluating his or her overall desire to stay. Another person may be more emotional and intuitive by nature, going more on “feel” than a calculated assessment of costs and benefits. The importance of the three commitment types also may vary over the course of a career. For example, you might prioritize affective reasons early in your work life before shifting your attention to
continuance reasons as you start a family or become more established in a community. Regardless of how the three types are prioritized, however, they offer an important insight into why someone might be committed and what an organization can do to make employees feel more committed.

Figure -2 also shows that organizational commitment depends on more than just “the organization.” That is, people aren’t always committed to companies; they’re also committed to the top management that leads the firm at a given time, the department in which they work, the manager who directly supervises them, or the specific team or co-workers with whom they work most closely. We use the term focus of commitment to refer to the various people, places, and things that can inspire a desire to remain a member of an organization. For example, you might choose to stay with your current employer because you are emotionally attached to your work team, worry about the costs associated with losing your company’s salary and benefits package, and feel a sense of obligation to your current manager. If so, your desire to remain cuts across multiple types of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) and multiple foci (or focuses) of commitment (work team, company, manager).

Now that you’re familiar with the drivers of commitment in a general sense, let’s go into more depth about each type.

**AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT.** One way to understand the differences among the three types of commitment is to ask yourself what you would feel if you left the
Consider the reasons listed in the left-hand column of Table 1. What would you feel if, even after taking all those reasons into account, you decided to leave your organization to join another one? Answer: You’d feel a sense of sadness.

Employees who feel a sense of affective commitment identify with the organization, accept that organization’s goals and values, and are more willing to exert extra effort on behalf of the organization. Is affective commitment something that you feel for your current employer or have felt for a past employer? It’s safe to say that if managers could choose which type of commitment they’d like to in still in their employees, they would choose affective commitment. Moreover, when a manager looks at an employee and says “She’s committed” or “He’s loyal,” that manager usually is referring to a behavioural expression of affective commitment. For example, employees who are affectively committed to their employer tend to engage in more interpersonal and organizational citizenship behaviours, such as helping, sportsmanship, and boosterism. One meta-analysis of 22 studies with more than 6,000 participants revealed a moderately strong correlation between affective commitment and citizenship behaviour. Such results suggest that emotionally committed employees express that commitment by “going the extra mile” whenever they can. Because affective commitment reflects an emotional bond to the organization, it’s only natural that the emotional bonds among coworkers influence it. We can therefore gain a better understanding of affective
commitment if we take a closer look at the bonds that tie employees together. Assume you were given a sheet with the names of all the employees in your department or members of your class. Then assume you were asked to rate the frequency with which you communicated with each of those people, as well as the emotional depth of those communications. Those ratings could be used to create a “social network”

*Fig. 2 Drivers of overall management*
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diagram” that summarizes the bonds among employees. The lines connecting the 10 members of the work unit represent the communication bonds that connect each
of them, with thicker lines representing more frequent communication with more emotional depth. The diagram illustrates that some employees are “nodes,” with several direct connections to other employees, whereas others remain at the fringes of the network. The erosion model suggests that employees with fewer bonds will be most likely to quit the organization. The employee who only has one bond with someone else (and a relatively weak bond at that). From an affective commitment perspective, that employee is likely to feel less emotional attachment to work colleagues, which makes it easier to decide to leave the organization. Social network diagrams can also help us understand another explanation for turnover. The social influence model suggests that employees who have direct linkages with “leavers” will themselves become more likely to leave. In this way, reductions in affective commitment become contagious, spreading like a disease across the work unit. Think about the damage that would be caused if the central figure in the network (the one who has linkages to five other people) became unhappy with the organization. Cisco Systems seems to understand the importance of affective commitment. The San Jose–based leader in networking hardware and software enjoys one of the lowest voluntary turnover rates among organizations surveyed by Fortune in 2004 (3 percent). Cisco employees point to the fun workplace culture as a key factor, with company cafes offering movie-themed menus at Academy Awards time or “nerd lunches” during which experts discuss important tech topics.
Harley-Davidson also appears to understand the importance of fostering an emotional attachment to the organization. The voluntary turnover rate at the Milwaukee-based motorcycle manufacturer is less than 2 percent, and employee surveys reveal that workers strongly identify with the culture of motorcycle riding. In fact, Harley-Davidson pays some employees to work at biker rallies. These sorts of activities reinforce the emotional bonds between the company and its employees, fostering affective commitment.

**CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT.** Now consider the reasons for staying listed in the middle column of Table-1. What would you feel if, even after taking all those reasons into account, you decided to leave your organization to join another one? Answer: You’d feel a sense of anxiety. Continuance commitment exists when there is a profit associated with staying and a cost associated with leaving, with high continuance commitment making it very difficult to change organizations because of the steep penalties associated with the switch. One factor that increases continuance commitment is the total amount of investment (in terms of time, effort, energy, etc.) an employee has made in mastering his or her work role or fulfilling his or her organizational duties. Picture a scenario in which you’ve worked extremely hard for a number of years to finally master the “ins and outs” of working at a particular organization, and now you’re beginning to enjoy the fruits of that labor in terms of financial rewards and better work assignments. That effort
might be wasted if you moved to another organization (and had to start over on the learning curve). Another factor that increases continuance commitment is a lack of employment alternatives. If an employee has nowhere else to go, the need to stay will be higher. Employment alternatives themselves depend on several factors, including economic conditions, the unemployment rate, and the marketability of a person’s skills and abilities. Of course, no one likes to feel “stuck” in a situation, so it may not be surprising that the behavioural benefits associated with affective commitment do not really occur with continuance commitment. There is no statistical relationship between continuance commitment and citizenship behaviour, for example, or any other aspects of job performance.  

Continuance commitment therefore tends to create more of a passive (as opposed to active) form of loyalty. It is important to note that some of the reasons in the middle column of Table-1 centre on personal or family issues. Continuance commitment focuses on personal and family issues more than the other two commitment types, because employees often need to stay for both work and non-work reasons. One concept that demonstrates the work and non-work forces that can bind us to our current employer is embeddedness, which summarizes a person’s links to the organization and the community, his or her sense of fit with that organization and community, and what he or she would have to sacrifice for a job change.
As demonstrated in Table-2, embeddedness strengthens continuance commitment by providing more reasons why a person needs to stay in his or her current position (and more sources of anxiety if he or she were to leave). Think about your current situation. If you’re a college student who is working part-time, you likely don’t feel very embedded. Your links to your job are probably only short term, and you may feel that the job is more routine than you’d like from a fit perspective. You probably also wouldn’t feel you were sacrificing much if you left the job. From a community perspective, you may be going to school in a different city or state than where you grew up, again resulting in few links, low perceived fit, or a lack of felt sacrifice. However, if you’re a full-time employee who is relatively established in your job and community, you may feel quite embedded in your current situation. To see how a Memphis law firm took advantage of the concepts of embeddedness and continuance commitment to retain its employees, Alcon Labs seems to understand the value of continuance commitment. The Fort Worth–based leader in eye care products enjoys a voluntary turnover rate of less than 2 percent. One likely reason for that low rate is the benefits package Alcon offers its employees. For example, Alcon offers a 401(k) retirement plan in which it matches 240 percent of what employees contribute, up to a total of 5 percent of total compensation. So, for example, if an employee invests $500 toward retirement in a given month, Alcon contributes $1200. That policy more than doubles the most
generous rates of other companies, allowing employees to build a comfortable “nest egg” for retirement more quickly. Clearly employees would feel a bit anxious about giving up that benefit if a competitor came calling.

**NORMATIVE COMMITMENT.** Now consider the reasons for staying listed in the right hand column of Table -1. What would you feel if, even after taking all those reasons into account, you decided to leave your organization to join another one? Answer: You’d feel a sense of *guilt*. Normative commitment exists when there is a sense that staying is the “right” or “moral” thing to do. The sense that people *should* stay with their current employers may result from personal work philosophies or more general codes of right and wrong developed over the course of their lives. They may also be dictated by early

**Table-2 Embededness and continuance commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facet</th>
<th>To the organization</th>
<th>To the community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Links</strong></td>
<td>-I’ve worked here for such a long time.</td>
<td>-Several close friends and family live nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-I’m serving on so many teams and committees.</td>
<td>-My family’s roots are in this community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit</strong></td>
<td>-My job utilizes my skills and talents well.</td>
<td>-The weather where I live is suitable for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-I like the authority and responsibility I have at this company.</td>
<td>-I think of the community where I live as home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice</strong></td>
<td>-The retirement benefits provided by</td>
<td>-People respect me a lot in my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
experiences within the company, if employees are socialized to believe that long-term loyalty is the norm rather than the exception. In addition to personal work philosophies or organizational socialization, there seem to be two ways to build a sense of obligation-based commitment among employees. One way is to create a feeling that the employee is in the organization’s debt—that he or she owes something to the organization. For example, an organization may spend a great deal of money training and developing an employee. In recognition of that investment, the employee may feel obligated to “repay” the organization with several more years of loyal service. Picture a scenario in which your employer paid your tuition, allowing you to further your education, while also providing you with training and developmental job assignments that increased your skills. Wouldn’t you feel a little guilty if you took the first job opportunity that came your way? Another possible way to build an obligation-based sense of commitment is by becoming a particularly charitable organization. Did you ever wonder why organizations spend time and money on charitable things—for example, building playgrounds in the local community? Don’t those kinds of projects take away from research and development, product improvements, or profits for shareholders?
Well, charitable efforts have several potential advantages. First, they can provide good public relations for the organization, potentially generating goodwill for its products and services and helping attract new recruits. Second, they can help existing employees feel better about the organization, creating a deeper sense of normative commitment. The potential commitment benefits of charitable actions may be particularly appealing to younger employees. Some evidence indicates that members of Generation Y (those born between 1977 and 1994) are somewhat more charitably minded than other generations. Many organizations increasingly believe that social responsibility must become a more central feature of their organizational identity to retain such employees, even if their charitable actions do not have a tangible impact on sales of products or services. Qualcomm recognizes the value of normative commitment. The San Diego–based firm, specializing in wireless technologies, has a voluntary turnover rate of just over 3 percent. After six Qualcomm employees lost their homes in a forest fire, other Qualcomm employees collected donations and contributed $60,000 to the Red Cross disaster relief fund. Qualcomm matched that contribution and gives 1–2 percent of its pre-tax profits to charitable causes each year. Charitable actions are also an important element of Microsoft’s culture. Not only does Bill Gates himself donate a large percentage of his wealth to philanthropic efforts, but his organization matches any
charitable contribution made by its employees. These sorts of activities create a sense that employees ought to remain in their current positions.

**Four types of employee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Task performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lone wolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Apathetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig: 3**Psychological and physical withdrawal**

**Withdrawal behaviour**

- Psychological:
  - Day dreaming,
  - Looking busy,
  - Cyber loafing

- Physical:
  - Tardiness,
  - Missing meeting,
  - Quiting,
  - Long breaks,
  - Moonlighting,
  - Socializing
**Self-efficacy:**

Perceived self efficacy is defined as people’s beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives (*Bandura, 1994*). The construct of self efficacy represents one core aspect of Bandura’s social cognitive theory. *Bandura (1994)* Postulates that these expectation determine whether or not a certain behaviour or performance will be attempted, the amount of effort the individual will contribute to the behaviour, and how long the behaviour will be sustained when obstacle are encountered. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through four major processes, namely cognitive, motivational, and affective and selection process.

Personal well-being and human accomplishment are enhanced by a strong sense of efficacy in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. It can be regarded as an optimistic and self-confident view of one’s capability to deal with certain life stresses. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interests and deep engrossment activities. People with high efficacy set them challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them while they also heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. After failure, they quickly recover their sense of efficacy. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and
skills which are acquirable, therefore approaching threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them.

In contrast, when individual doubt their capabilities, they shy away from difficult tasks which they view as personal threats. They easily fall victim to stress and depression. In terms of feeling, a low sense of self efficacy is associated with depression, anxiety and helplessness. Person with low self-efficacy also tend to have low self-esteem, and they harbour pessimistic thoughts about their accomplishments and personal development according to Schwartz (1992).

**Self Efficaccy and other types of self beliefs**

**Expectancy Related Construct**

Concept such as self-concept, self-esteem, outcome expectations and locus of control are often confused with self-efficacy. Although these terms are often mistakenly used interchangeably, they represent quite different constructs.

A) **Self concept**

Self-concept refers to a generalised self-assessment incorporating a variety of self-reactions and beliefs such as feelings of self-worth and general beliefs of compliance. In contrast, self-efficacy beliefs are context specific judgements of
personal capabilities to organize and execute a course of action to attain a set goal. Self-efficacy focuses more specifically on the tasks or activities that an individual’s feels capable of performing, rather than a more global assessment of how good you are at some tithing as provided in assessment of self-concept (Zimmerman and Cleary, 2006).

B) Self Esteem
Self-esteem can be defined as atype of belief involving judgements of self-worth. It is an affective reaction indicating how a person feels about him. Self-efficacy perceptions, involves cognitive judgements of personal capabilities (Pintich and Schunk, 2002). Bandura (1997) argues that perceptions of worth or self-esteem may develop from a person’s global self-perception, as well as from a variety of other sources, such as altruism and empathy.

C) Outcome expectations
Research (Schnuk and Miller, 2002) shows that self-efficacy beliefs are usually better predictors of behaviour than outcome expectation. Outcome expectations refer to a general behaviour in terms of certain situations. These outcomes expectations are distinctive and important for understanding behaviour but self-efficacy beliefs accounts for a bigger part.

D) Perceived Control
The construct of perceived control comes from earlier research on locus of control (Zimmerman and Cleary, 2006), and is concerned with general expectations, that outcomes are controlled by either one’s behaviour or by external events. This dualistic view of control suggests that an internal locus of control promotes self-directed behaviour, whereas external locus of control inhibits one’s self-directed abilities.

Self-efficacious individuals and those with an internal locus of control will exhibit more self-directed behaviour than will low self-efficacious individuals or those with an external locus of control.

**Specific and General self efficacy**

Gardner and Pierce (1998) and Judge et al (1998) state that self-efficacy can be viewed from both a specific and a general angle. An example of a specific angle would be task specific self-efficacy, which can be seen as an expectation or judgement about the likelihood that a task will be successfully performed. It is a powerful motivator of behaviour, as efficacy expectations determine the initial decision to perform a task, the effort that gets expended and the level of persistence that emerge in the face of adversity. Self-efficacy can also be viewed as general, stable cognition or trait that individuals hold with them that reflects the expectation that they possess the ability to perform a task successfully in a variety of situations, according to Eden and Zuk (1995).
According to Gardner and Pierce (1998) self-efficacy gradually emerges through the experiences that the individual accumulates. Frequent situation specific experiences of personal success across time and situations give rise to generalised self-efficacy. Judge et al. (1998) state that it could be expected that generalised self-efficacy would be load on the same factor as self-esteem, because self-efficacy and self-worth are the core components of self-esteem. Repeated success at a specific task, the accumulation of successful experiences across a variety of tasks and positive feedback from the work environment are likely to lead to higher generalised self-efficacy. Self-efficacy can impede or enhance motivation. People with high self-efficacy choose to repeatedly perform more challenging task (Bandura, 1997).

General self-efficacy has been hypothesised to be a strong determinant of self-efficacy (Eden, 1988). Sadri and Robertson (1993) argue that enhanced task performance is the major consequences of high levels of specific self-efficacy perceptions. Although research on the possible effects of self efficacy on employee attitude and commitment is limited, it seems plausible that the higher one’s level of self efficacy in some tasks, the higher one’s positive affect associated with it (Lee And Bobko, 1994; Schwoerer and May, 1996). and Bandura (1989) suggested that inefficacious thoughts could cause stress and depression, which could lead to reduced level of satisfaction. According to
Bandura (1989) employees with a low level of self-efficacy shy away from difficult tasks, doubt their own capability and are not very committed to the goals and aspirations they set for themselves. Bandura (1977) suggested that efficacy expectations also influence the choice of the environment.

**Sources of self efficacy**

Bandura (1977) identifies four ways in which self-efficacy is learned and self-efficacy expectations are acquired, mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and physically status.

**Mastery experiences**

The most effective way of creating a strong sense of self efficacy is through mastery experiences. Enactive mastery, defined as repeated performance accomplishment (Bandura, 1982) has been shown to enhance self-efficacy more than the other kind of cues. The manner in which accomplishments are received has an influence on an individual’s self-efficacy expectations and actions. Successes build a strong belief in one’s personal efficacy, while failures undermine it. Further, while positive mastery experiences increase self-efficacy, negative one’s tend to decrease self-efficacy according to Gist (1987).

When people experience only easy successes, they come to expect quick results. Failures discourage them, therefore some setbacks aerves a useful purpose in teaching that successes usually requires sustained effort. Once individuals become
convinced they have what it takes, they preserve and quickly rebound from setbacks or failures. This builds self-efficacy and they emerge from setbacks.

**Vicarious Experiences**

Beliefs are often acquired through observation and interpretation. In observing the modelling behaviours of others, the learner is able to reflect on past experiences with such behaviour and make meaning of its relevance in a new situation (Bandura, 1977). The impact of modelling on previsioned efficacy is strongly influenced by perceived similarity to the models. Modelling is more effective when the models succeed after overcoming difficulty than when they exhibit initially facile performances (Bandura et al, 1980). Through their behaviour and expressed ways of thinking, competent model transmit knowledge and teach observes effective skills and strategies for managing environmental demands. Its effect also are enhanced when the modelled behaviour produces clear results or consequences and when there is similarity between the subject and the model in terms of age, capability, and other personal characteristics (Bandura, 1977).

Self-monitoring is a special type of vicarious experience often involving videotaped feedback in which the individuals mistakes are edited out. This promotes the idea of perfection as the individual can see herself performing the task correctly.

**Social Persuasion**
People’s belief about self is influenced by the message conveyed by others. Encouragement supports self-efficacy, criticism hampers it. Verbal persuasion is believed to influence efficacy perceptions in some situations, but it is viewed as less effective than modelling or enactive mastery. People, who are verbally persuaded that they possess the skills and capabilities to master a given activity, are likely to show more determination and sustain it. Verbal persuasion, promote people to develop skills and lead them to try harder to succeed. According to Bandura(1977) individuals who have been persuaded that they lack capabilities, tend to avoid challenging activities that cultivate potential and give up quickly in the face of adversity.

**Physical Affective status**

Stress and anxiety have a negative effect on self-efficacy. Bandura and Adams(1977) found that in anxiety provoking situations, modelling yielded higher self-efficacy and performances than psychological desensitization. Some people interpret their stress reaction and tension as signs of vulnerability to poor performance. Bandura (1977) states that mood also affects people’s judgements of their personal efficacy. By reducing stress reactions and altering people’s negative emotional proclivities of their physical state, self-efficacy beliefs can be modified.
Self Efficacy and performance

Many studies have reported significant correlation between self efficacy and subsequent task performance (Bandura, 1982; Chambliss and Murray, 1979; Feltz, 1982; Federick et al., 1984). Efficacy perception still predict subsequent performance, even in studies where efficacy perceptions have been altered. Bandura, 1977 notes that although active mastery yields the greatest increase in self-efficacy, correlation between self-efficacy and performance remain high for non-enactive modes such as modelling.

Several studies have found self-efficacy to be a better predictor of subsequent performance than past behaviour (Bandura et al., 1980). However other studies contradicted this for example, Gist (1987). Studies conducted by Feltz (1982) provided some evidence that as experience with at ask increases, past performances becomes more predictive than self-efficacy. It needs to be noted that Feltz’s study involved a task in which subjects were unable to observe their performance and no feedback was provided (Gist, 1987). Under these circumstances self-efficacy may have verticality. Locke et al., 1984, found that when past performance was controlled, self-efficacy was a significant predictor of subsequent performance. The correlation between self-efficacy and past performance was however higher, than the correlation between self-efficacy and future performance.
Relation of self efficacy to motivation

Bandura (1997) and Schnuk (1995) confirm the contention that efficacy beliefs mediate the effect of skills or other self-belief on subsequent performance attainment. Researches also demonstrated that self-efficacy beliefs influence these attainments by influencing effort, persistence and perservance (Boufford-Bouchard, 1990; Schnuk and Hanson, 1995). Motivation has been defined by social cognitive researches as a process in which goal directed behaviour is instigated and sustained (Printich and Schnuk, 2002).