1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Teaching is a complex and demanding profession. It is widely recognized that the role of the teacher has intensified, and teachers are needing to adapt to ‘bureaucratically driven escalation of pressures, expectations and controls concerning what teachers do and how much they should be doing within the teaching day’ (Hargreaves, 1994). Therefore to sustain energy and enthusiasm for the work, teachers need to maintain their personal commitment to the job (Day, 2000).

Teaching is also a highly responsible job and there is a daily need for teachers to fully engage in that work with not only their heads, but also their hearts (Day, 2004; Elliott and Crosswell, 2001; Fried, 1995; Nias, 1996). It appears to be a professional necessity for teachers to be emotionally committed to their work, for without this emotional connection teachers face the constant danger of burn-out in an increasingly intensified work environment (Nias, 1996). As Day (2004: 11) stated, a passion for teaching cannot be considered to be a ‘luxury, a frill, or a
quality possessed by just a few teachers, instead he argued, a sense of passion and commitment is ‘essential to all good teaching’.

Teacher commitment from this perspective is a phenomenon that requires a positive emotional attachment to the job. Such teachers believe that a committed teacher is: someone with a love for the job and really enjoys the job to do it well. Teachers who hold this conception consider that there needs to be a certain level of emotional attachment to some aspect of teaching for teachers to be committed to the work.

1.1.1 Theoretical Background of the Concept “Organizational Commitment”:

The concept organizational commitment has grown in popularity in the literature on industrial and organizational psychology (Cohen, 2003). Early studies on organizational commitment viewed the concept as a single dimension, based on an attitudinal perspective, embracing identification, involvement and loyalty (Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, 1974). According to Porter et al (1974) an attitudinal perspective refers to the psychological attachment or affective commitment formed by an employee in relation to his identification and involvement with the respective organization.
Porter et al. (1974) further described organizational commitment as “an attachment to the organization, characterized by an intention to remain in it; an identification with the values and goals of the organization; and a willingness to exert extra effort on its behalf”. Individuals consider the extent to which their own values and goals relate to that of the organization as part of organizational commitment; therefore it is considered to be the linkage between the individual employee and the organization.

Another perspective on organizational commitment is the “exchanged-based definition” or “side-bet” theory (Becker, 1960; Alluto, Hrebiniai and Alonso, 1973). This theory holds that individuals are committed to the organization as far as they hold their positions, irrespective of the stressful conditions they experience. However, should they be given alternative benefits, they will be willing to leave the organization.

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) supported the “side-bet” theory by describing organizational commitment as a behaviour “relating to the process by which individuals become locked into a certain organization and how they deal with this problem”. This behavioural aspect of organizational commitment is explained through calculative and normative commitments.
The calculative or normative perspective refers to an employee’s commitment to continue working for the organization based on the notion of weighing cost benefits of leaving an organization (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972). Wiener and Vardi (1980) described organizational commitment as “behavioural intention or reaction, determined by the individual’s perception of the normative pressure”.

Meyer and Allen (1984) initially viewed organizational commitment as two-dimensional namely, affective and continuance. Meyer and Allen (1984) defined the first dimension, namely affective commitment as “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to and involvement in the work organization”, and they defined the second dimension, namely continuance commitment as “the extent which employees feel committed to their organization by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving”. After further research, Allen and Meyer (1990) added a third dimension, namely normative commitment.

Allen and Meyer (1990) defined normative commitment as “the employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organization”. Consequently, the concept organizational commitment is described as a tri-dimensional concept, characterized by the affective, continuance and normative dimensions (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Common to the three
dimensions of organizational commitment is the view that organizational commitment is a psychological state that characterizes organizational members’ relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

**Definitions of Organizational Commitment:**

Kanter (1968) defined commitment as “a result of the perception of benefit associated with staying in and the perception of cost associated with leaving from an organization.”

Porter and Lawler (1968) viewed organizational commitment as the willingness of an employee to exert high levels of effort on behalf of the organization, a strong desire to stay with the organization, and an acceptance of its major goals and values.

Steers (1977) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”.

Wiener (1982) defined organizational commitment as “the aggregate internalized normative pressures to conduct in a manner which meets organizational objects and interests.”
Reichers (1985) defined “organizational commitment as behaviour that is visible when organizational members are committed to existing groups within the organization.”

O’Reilly (1989) defined organizational commitment as “an individual’s psychological bond to the organization, including a sense of job involvement, loyalty and belief in the values of the organization”.

Meyer, Allen and Gellantly (1990) defined organizational commitment as “an attitude characterized by favourable positive cognitive and affective components about the organization”.

Morrow (1993) defined organizational commitment as “an attitude that reflects feelings such as attachment, identification and loyalty to the organization as an object of commitment.”

Best (1994) maintained that “committed individuals enact specific behaviours due to the belief that it is morally correct rather than personally beneficial.”

Masson (1995) defined “organizational commitment as the degree to which employees believe in and accept organizational goals and desire to remain with the organization.”

Miller and Lee (2001) defined “organizational commitment as a state of being, in which organizational members are bound by their actions
and beliefs that sustain their activities and their own involvement in the organization.”

Cohen (2003) defined “commitment as a force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets”.

Miller (2003) defined organizational commitment as “a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization”. Organizational commitment is therefore, the degree to which an employee is willing to maintain membership due to interest and association with the organization’s goals and values.

**Organizational Commitment Model :**

Meyer and Allen (1997) used the tri-dimensional model to conceptualize organizational commitment in three dimensions namely, affective, continuance and normative commitments.

**Affective Commitment Dimension :**

The first dimension of organizational commitment in the model is affective commitment, which represents the individual’s emotional attachment to the organization. According to Meyer and Allen (1997, p 11) affective commitment is “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization”. Organizational
members who are committed to an organization on an affective basis, continue working for the organization because they want to (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Members who are committed on an affective level stay with the organization because they view their personal employment relationship as congruent to the goals and values of the organization (Beck and Wilson, 2000).

Affective commitment is a work related attitude with positive feelings towards the organization (Morrow, 1993). Sheldon (1971) also maintained that this type of attitude is “an orientation towards the organization, which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization”. Affective commitment is the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday et al, 1982).

The strength of affective organizational commitment is influenced by the extent to which the individual’s needs and expectations about the organization are matched by their actual experience (Storey, 1995). Tetrick (1995, p 589) also described affective commitment as “value rationality-based organizational commitment, which refers to the degree of value congruence between an organizational member and an organization”.
The organizational commitment model of Meyer and Allen (1997) indicated that affective commitment is influenced by factors such as job challenge, role clarity, goal clarity, and goal difficulty, receptiveness by management, peer cohesion, equity, personal importance, feedback, participation, and dependability.

Affective commitment development involves identification and internalisation (Beck and Wilson, 2000). Individuals’ affective attachment to their organizations is firstly based on identification with the desire to establish a rewarding relationship with an organization. Secondly, through internalisation, this refers to congruent goals and values held by individuals and the organization. In general, affective organizational commitment is concerned with the extent to which an individual identifies with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

**Continuance Commitment Dimension:**

The second dimension of the tri-dimensional model of organizational commitment is continuance commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997) defined continuance commitment as “awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization”. It is calculative in nature because of the individual’s perception or weighing of costs and risks associated with leaving the current organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997).
Meyer and Allen (1991) further stated that “employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so”. This indicates the difference between continuance and affective commitment. The latter entails that individual’s stay in the organization because they want to.

Continuance commitment can be regarded as an instrumental attachment to the organization, where the individual’s association with the organization is based on an assessment of economic benefits gained (Beck and Wilson, 2000). Organizational members develop commitment to an organization because of the positive extrinsic rewards obtained through the effort-bargain without identifying with the organization’s goals and values.

The strength of continuance commitment, which implies the need to stay, is determined by the perceived costs of leaving the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1984). Best (1994) indicated that “continuance organizational commitment will therefore be the strongest when availability of alternatives are few and the number of investments are high”. This argument supports the view that when given better alternatives, employees may leave the organization.

Meyer et al (1990) also maintained that “accrued investments and poor employment alternatives tend to force individuals to maintain their
line of action and are responsible for these individuals being committed because they need to”. This implies that individuals stay in the organization, because they are lured by other accumulated investments which they could loose, such as pension plans, seniority or organization specific skills.

The need to stay is “profit” associated with continued participation and termination of service is a “cost” associated with leaving. Tetrick (1995) supported the profit notion by describing the concept continuance organizational commitment as “an exchange framework, whereby performance and loyalty are offered in return for material benefits and rewards”. Therefore, in order to retain employees who are continuance committed, the organization needs to give more attention and recognition to those elements that boost the employee’s morale to be committed.

**Normative Commitment Dimension :**

commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization”. In terms of the normative dimension, the employees stay because they should do so or it is the proper thing to do.

Wiener and Vardi (1980) described normative commitment as “the work behaviour of individuals, guided by a sense of duty, obligation and loyalty towards the organization”. Organizational members are committed to an organization based on moral reasons (Iverson and Buttigieg, 1999). The normative committed employee considers it morally right to stay in the organization, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the organization gives him or her over the years.

The strength of normative organizational commitment is influenced by accepted rules about reciprocal obligation between the organization and its members (Suliman and Lies, 2000). The reciprocal obligation is based on the social exchange theory, which suggests that a person receiving a benefit is under a strong normative obligation or rule to repay the benefit in some way (McDonald and Makin, 2000). This implies that individuals often feel an obligation to repay the organization for investing in them, for example through training and development.

Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that “this moral obligation arises either through the process of socialization within the society or the
organization”. In either case it is based on a norm of reciprocity, in other words if the employee receives a benefit, it places him or her, or the organization under the moral obligation to respond in kindness.

**Developing Organizational Commitment:**

Organizational commitment is a spontaneous process, which develops through the orientation of individuals to the organization. The development process can be described based on stages and levels of organizational commitment.

**Stages of Organizational Commitment:**

Organizational Commitment develops through stages, which are outlined by O’Reilly (1989, p 12) as compliance, identification and internalisation. These stages are described below:

**Compliance Stage:**

The first stage, namely compliance centralises around the employee accepting the influence of others mainly to benefit from them, through remuneration or promotion (O’Reilly, 1989). At this stage, attitudes and behaviours are adopted not because of shared beliefs but simply to gain specific rewards. The nature of organizational commitment in the compliance stage is associated with the continuance dimension commitment, where the employee is calculative with the need to stay in the
organization when evaluating the rewards (Beck and Wilson, 2000). This implies that at this stage employees stay in the organization because of what they receive (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

**Identification stage:**

The second stage, namely identification occurs when employees accept the influence of others in order to maintain a satisfying self-defining relationship with the organization (O’Reilly, 1989). Employees feel proud to be part of the organization; they may regard the roles they have in the organization as part their self-identity (Best, 1994). Organizational commitment at this stage is based on the normative dimension (Meyer and Allen, 1997). The individual stays because he or she should and is guided by a sense of duty and loyalty towards the organization.

**Internalization stage:**

The last stage, namely internalization takes place when the employee finds the values of the organization to be intrinsically rewarding and congruent with his or her personal values (O’Reilly, 1989). Organizational commitment at this level is based on the affective dimension (Meyer and Allen, 1997). The employee at this stage develops not only the sense of belonging but passion to belong to the organization hence the commitment is based on a “want to stay” basis. The values of the
individual are therefore congruent with those of the group and the organization (Suliman and lies, 2000).

**Levels of Organizational Commitment:**

There are different levels of organizational commitment which are related to the individual’s development of the individual’s organizational commitment (Reichers, 1985).

The following is a description of the levels of organizational commitment:

**Higher level of Organizational Commitment:**

A high level of organizational commitment is characterized by a strong acceptance of the organization’s values and willingness to exert efforts to remain with the organization (Reichers, 1985). Miller (2003, p 73) states that “high organizational commitment means identifying with one’s employing organization”. The “will to stay” suggests that the behavioural tendencies at this level relate closely with affective dimension of commitment, where individuals stay because they want to.

**Moderate level of Organizational Commitment:**

The moderate level of organizational commitment is characterized by a reasonable acceptance of organizational goals and values as well as
the willingness to exert effort to remain in the organization (Reichers, 1985).

This level can be viewed as a reasonable or average commitment, which implies partial commitment. The willingness to stay is an attribution of a moral commitment associated with the normative dimension of commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997). The individuals stay in the organization because they should do so.

**Lower level of Organizational Commitment:**

The low level of organizational commitment is characterized by a lack of neither acceptance of organizational goals and values nor the willingness to exert effort to remain with the organization (Reichers, 1985). The employee who operates on this level must be disillusioned about the organization; such an employee may stay because he or she needs to stay as associated with the continuance dimension (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Given an option they will leave the organization.

**Effects of Organizational Commitment:**

Organizational commitment can have either a negative or a positive effect on the organization.
Negative effect of low level organizational commitment:

The negative effect implies that the level of organizational commitment is low. Employees with a low level of organizational commitment tend to be unproductive and some become shirkers at work (Morrow, 1993).

Lowman (1993) stated that organizational commitment can be regarded as a “work dysfunction when it is characterized by under-commitment and over-commitment”. The following are the characteristics of over-commitment and under-commitment according to Lowman (1993):

**Characteristics of Over-Commitment and Under Commitment**  
*(Lowman, 1993)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under-commitment</th>
<th>Over-commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of success</td>
<td>Overly loyal employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of failure</td>
<td>Job and occupational burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic and persistent procrastination</td>
<td>Obsessive-compulsive patterns at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative cultural, familial and personality factors</td>
<td>Neurotic compulsion to succeed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic and persistent under-achievement</td>
<td>Extreme high level of energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In certain cases the high rate of staff turnover and absenteeism are associated with the low level of organizational commitment (Morrow, 1993). Cohen (2003) explain that “lack of organizational commitment or loyalty is cited as an explanation of employee absenteeism, turnover, reduced effort expenditure, theft, job dissatisfaction and unwillingness to relocate”.

Organizational commitment is regarded to be the best predictor of employees’ turnover, than the far more frequently used job satisfaction predictor (Miller, 2003). Given the fact that employees who operate in a continuance commitment dimension are calculative of their stay, one would deduce that such employees may continuously stay away from work when they feel like, doing so.

**Positive effect of organizational commitment:**

Committed organizational members contribute positively to the organization which is not the case with less committed members. Cohen (2003) stated that “organizations whose members have higher levels of commitment show higher performance and productivity and lower levels of absenteeism and tardiness”. This implies that employees with a high level of commitment tend to take greater efforts to perform and invest their resources in the organization (Saal and Knight, 1987).
Organizational commitment can result in a stable and productive workforce (Morrow, 1993). It enables employees to release their creativity and to contribute towards organizational development initiatives (Walton, 1985). Employees who are highly committed do not leave the organization because they are satisfied and tend to take challenging work activities (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Committed members are normally achievement and innovative orientated with the ultimate aim of engaging in and improving performance (Morrow, 1993).

Other positive effects of organizational commitment include feelings of affiliation, attachment and citizenship behaviour, which tend to improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Williams and Anderson, 1991). Affectively and normatively committed members are more likely to maintain organizational membership and contribute to the success of the organization than continuance-committed members (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

**General Factors Affecting Organizational Commitment**

There are a variety of factors that shape organizational commitment. Such factors include the following: job-related factors; employment opportunities; personal characteristics; positive relationships; organizational structure; and management style.
**Job-related Factors:**

Organizational commitment is an important job-related outcome at the individual level, which may have an impact on other job-related outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism, job effort, job role and performance or visa versa (Randall, 1990). The job role that is ambiguous may lead to lack of commitment to the organization and promotional opportunities can also enhance or diminish organizational commitment (Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller, 1996).

Other job factors that could have an impact on commitment are the level of responsibility and autonomy. Baron and Greenberg (1990) state that “the higher the level of responsibility and autonomy connected with a given job, the lesser repetitive and more interesting it is, and the higher the level of commitment expressed by the person who fill it”.

**Employment Opportunities:**

The existence of employment opportunities can affect organizational commitment (Curry et al., 1996). Individuals who have a strong perception that they stand a chance of finding another job may become less committed to the organization as they ponder on such desirable alternatives. Where there is lack of other employment opportunities, there is a tendency of high level of organizational commitment (Vandenberghe, 1996). As a result,
membership in the organization is based on continuance commitment, where employees are continuously calculating the risks of remaining and leaving (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

**Personal characteristics:**

Organizational commitment can also be affected by the employee’s personal characteristics such as age, years of service and gender (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Baron and Greenberg (1990) state that “older employees those with tenure or seniority, and those who are satisfied with their own levels of work performance tend to report higher levels of organizational commitment than others”. This implies that older people are seen to be more committed to the organization than other age groups.

Another personal characteristic that may affect organizational commitment is associated with gender (Meyer and Allen, 1997). However, it is argued that gender differences in commitment are due to different work characteristics and experiences that are linked to gender (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

**Work Environment:**

The working environment is also identified as another factor that affects organizational commitment. One of the common working environmental conditions that may affect organizational commitment
positively is partial ownership of a company. Ownership of any kind gives employees a sense of importance and they feel part of the decision-making process (Klein, 1987). This concept of ownership which includes participation in decision-making on new developments and changes in the working practices, creates a sense of belonging (Armstrong, 1995). A study conducted by Subramaniam and Mia (2001) also indicated that managers who participate in budget decision-making tend to have a high level of organizational commitment.

Another factor within the work environment that may affect organizational commitment is work practices in relation to recruitment and selection, performance appraisal, promotions and management style (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Metcalfe and Dick (2001) in their study concluded that “the low level of organizational commitment of employees could be attributed to inappropriate selection and promotion which lead to the perpetuation of managerial style and behaviour that has a negative effect on organizational commitment of subordinates”.

**Positive Relationships :**

The organization as a workplace environment is built up of working relationships; one of which is the supervisory relationship. According to Randall (1990) “the supervisory relationship can affect organizational commitment either positively or negatively”. A positive supervisory
relationship depends on how work-related practices such as performance management are being implemented in the organization (Randall, 1990). When individuals find the supervisory relationship to be fair in its practices, they tend to be more committed to the organization (Benkhoff, 1997).

Other work relationships, such as teams or groups, which exist in the workplace, can affect organizational commitment. Organizational members can demonstrate commitment when they are able to find value through work relationships (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Brooke, Russell and Price (1988) state that “employee commitment and attachment to the organization can be increased through efforts made to improve the organizations social atmosphere and sense of purpose”. In essence, when work relationships reflect mutual respect to individuals, they are able to commit themselves to the organization.

**Organizational Structure** :

Organizational structure plays an important role in organizational commitment. Bureaucratic structures tend to have a negative effect on organizational commitment. Zeffanne (1994) indicated that “the removal of bureaucratic barriers and the creation of more flexible structure are more likely to contribute to the enhancement of employee commitment both in terms of their loyalty and attachment to the organization”. The
management can increase the level of commitment by providing the employees with greater direction and influence (Storey, 1995).

**Management style:**

It is stated by Zeffanne (1994) that “the answer to the question of employee commitment, morale, loyalty and attachment may consist not only in providing motivators, but also to remove demotivators such as styles of management not suited to their context and to contemporary employee aspirations”. A management style that encourages employee involvement can help to satisfy employee’s desire for empowerment and demand for a commitment to organizational goals.

Gaertner (1999) argues that “more flexible and participatory management styles can strongly and positively enhance organizational commitment”. Organizations need to ensure that their management strategies are aimed at improving employee commitment rather than compliance (William and Anderson, 1991).

**1.1.2 Correlates of Organizational Commitment**

In the present study the investigator has identified through a exhaustive review of literature relevant correlates of organizational commitment. The conceptual frameworks of each of the independent variables have been explained in detail here.
1.1.3 Organizational Support

Perceived Organizational Support (POS) has received a great deal of attention in the recent literature. Research on perceived organizational support (POS) began with the observation that if managers are concerned with their employees’ commitment to the organization, employees are focused on the organization’s commitment to them. Perceived Organizational Support describes employees’ beliefs that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. For employees, the organization serves as an important source of socio-emotional resources, such as respect and caring, and tangible benefits, such as wages and medical benefits. Being regarded highly by the organization helps to meet employees’ needs for approval, esteem and affiliation. Positive valuation by the organization also provides an indication that increased effort will be noted and rewarded. Employees therefore take an active interest in the regard with which they are held by their employer.

Perceived organizational support is based on organizational support theory which involves the organization’s propensity to meet employees’ socio-emotional needs (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Participation in decision making, fairness of rewards (Allen et al., 2003), developmental experiences and promotions (Wayne et al., 1997), autonomy (Eisenberger
et al., 1999), and job security (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002) have also been empirically linked to perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support assures employees that the organization stands behind them as they perform their jobs and handle stressful conditions (George et al., 1993). Organizational support theory also adds that perceived organizational support invokes the norm of reciprocity in that supported employers, value and respect their organization and will therefore contribute to the organizations goals. Further, positive feelings rendered to the employee through perceived organizational support will fulfill socio-emotional needs and endear the employee to the organization.

Social exchange theory also aids our understanding of perceived organizational support. This theory suggests that employees value job rewards to a greater extent if the rewards are based on the discretion of the organization rather than influenced by external influences such as unions or health and safety regulations. Voluntary rewards that come directly from the organization are perceived s an indication that the organization values the employee’s well-being. As Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) noted, voluntary job rewards such as job enrichment, promotions and compensation contribute more to perceived organizational support if they are viewed as purely voluntary organizational actions.
Eisenberger et al., (1986) reported that employees showed a consistent pattern of agreement with the statement concerning whether the organization appreciated their contributions and would treat them favourably or unfavourably in differing circumstances. Employees evidently believed that the organizations have a general positive or negative orientation towards them that encompasses both their contributions and their welfare. Meyer and Allen (1997) have noted that there are at least three sets of beliefs that have been shown to have strong and consistent links with commitment to the organization – the beliefs that the organization is supportive (Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro, 1990), treats its employees fairly (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992), and contributes to the employees feeling of personal competence and self-worth (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Steers, 1977). Moreover, they argued that many of the job characteristics and work experience variables found to correlate with organizational commitment might contribute to one or more of these perceptions. For example internal promotion policies and job security might foster perceptions of organizational support; performance based reward policies and employee participation might contribute to perceptions of organizational justice; and job challenge and autonomy might bolster perceptions of personal competence.
For many years, organizational theorists have alluded to employment as the exchange of employees’ effort and loyalty for the organization’s provision of material and socio emotional benefits (e.g., Etzioni, 1961; Gould, 1979; Levinson, 1965; March and Simon, 1958; Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982; Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974). These characterizations of the employee–employer relationship emphasize organizations’ attainment of favourable outcomes through the generous treatment of employees. For example, employees who are well treated are more likely to become affectively committed to the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Mowday et al., 1982), to exceed their explicitly required work responsibilities, and to respond flexibly to organizational problems and opportunities (George and Brief, 1992).

A meta analysis by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) suggested three major work-experience antecedents of POS: organizational rewards and working conditions, support received from supervisors, and procedural justice. Considering these antecedents, in turn, research has identified a variety of rewards and favourable working conditions that are positively related to perceived organizational support, such as developmental experiences allowing employees to expand their skills (Wayne, Shore, and Liden, 1997), autonomy in the manner in which jobs are carried out (Eisenberger, Rhoades, and Cameron, 1999), and visibility to and
recognition from upper-level management (Wayne, Shore, Bommer, and Tetrick, 2002).

Research has shown that high levels of perceived organizational support are associated with a host of positive work outcomes including increased affective commitment (Eisenberger et al. 1990) and job involvement (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002) and reduced absenteeism, turnover intentions (Eisenberger et al., 1986) and strain (Stamper and Johlke, 2003). Saks (2006) reported that perceived organizational support was associated with employee engagement (i.e. both job and organization), which subsequently predicted job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intent and citizenship.

Employees who experience a strong level of POS feel the need to reciprocate favourable organizational treatment with attitudes and behaviours that in turn benefit the organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In support of this social exchange perspective, research has revealed that POS is positively related to job attendance and measures of job performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger, Fasolo, and Davis-LaMastro, 1990), the tendency to help coworkers (Shore and Wayne, 1993), the tendency to offer constructive suggestions for organizational
improvement, and affective organizational commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990).

Overall, it appears that employees with higher levels of POS are likely to be more committed and possibly more willing to engage in extra role or “Organizational Citizenship” behaviours (Organ, 1988) than are employees who feel that the organization does not value them as highly. Additionally, some work also suggests that POS may be beneficial to the individual as well as to the organization.

**Antecedents of Perceived Organizational Support (POS)**

**Fairness of Treatment**

Fairness is often discussed in terms of two types of justice: distributive and procedural. Distributive justice involves fairness in the distribution of outcomes, whereas procedural justice involves fairness in the procedures used to determine the distribution of outcomes (Greenberg 1990). Shore and Shore (1995) argued that repeated fair treatment would have a strong cumulative effect on POS by indicating a concern for employees’ welfare. Further, they maintained that procedural justice might have a stronger influence on POS than distributive justice. This is because the receipt of outcomes such as promotions and pay raises occur infrequently. However, employees are exposed to instances of procedural
justice (e.g. being included in decision-making and receiving consistent performance evaluations) on a more regular basis. Procedural justice and favourable outcomes have both been positively linked to POS (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002). Of the two dimensions of fairness, procedural justice has been found to contribute more strongly to POS than distributive justice (Fasolo 1995; Wayne et al. 2002).

Shore and Shore (1995) suggested that perceptions of fairness surrounding a particular decision contribute to a more global history of support. Although employees would remember a few important organizational decisions that contribute to POS, less important decisions that also contribute to POS would tend to be forgotten. The accumulated history of decisions would operate through POS to influence employee attitudes and performance. In accord with this view, Moorman et al. (1998) found that POS fully mediated the association between procedural justice and extra-role behaviour. Longitudinal research to assess the causal direction of the relationship between POS and fairness would be helpful to provide more definitive evidence concerning these relationships.

Research on fairness has also considered the relative contributions made by procedural justice and interactional justice to POS. Interactional justice refers to employees’ perceptions of the favourableness of an
interpersonal interaction accompanying decisions of resource allocation (Bies and Moag 1986). Masterson et al. (2000) reasoned that because procedural justice results from actions of the organization, and interactional justice results from individuals’ actions, the two types of fairness should differentially influence employees’ social exchange relationships with the organization and with representatives of the organization. Supporting these hypotheses, Masterson et al.’s study of university employees found that procedural justice was predictive of POS, whereas interactional justice from supervisors was predictive of the quality of employees’ exchange relationship with their supervisors.

Support from Organizational Representatives

According to Organizational Support Theory, employees incorporate the favourable treatment received from various organizational agents and units into an overall perception of organizational support. OST assumes treatment received from an organizational agent contributes to POS to the extent that the representative’s actions are believed to be sanctioned and promoted by the organization, as opposed to being seen as idiosyncratic motives of the agent. In general, the higher the status or standing the employee believes the organizational agent has within the organization, the more the employee should attribute the actions of that agent to the intent of
the organization. The actions and words of high status employees are seen as closely conveying the favourable or unfavourable orientation toward employees of the personified organization. The perceived status of an agent would be influenced by the agent’s formal position in the organizational hierarchy. However, perceptions of status are also influenced by one’s treatment by others, allowing individuals with similar job titles to differ markedly in the extent to which they are viewed to represent the organization.

Organizational agents’ status would be influenced by the extent of the positive valuation and regard extended to them by the organization, the degree of job autonomy afforded them, and their influence in important organizational decisions (Eisenberger et al. 2002). Favorable or unfavourable treatment received from high-status representatives, who would be strongly identified with the organization, would have an increased influence on POS. Accordingly, Eisenberger et al. found that the relationship between perceived supervisor support and POS increased with the status employees attributed to them. According to OST, support from the supervisor results in a favourable relationship between the employee and the organization. In contrast, leader–member exchange theory (Liden et al. 1997) proposed that positive interactions between supervisor and subordinate contribute to a constructive working relationship between the
two interacting parties. Both views would seem to be correct, as supervisors are able to jointly influence the exchange relationships that they have with the employee and that the employee has with the organization. Because the supervisor is an important source of information, she is able to influence whether employees attribute favourable or unfavourable treatment to the actions of the supervisor, the organization, or both.

**Human Resource Practices**

Systematic organization-wide policies and procedures directed toward employees, or HR practices, should make an important positive or negative contribution to POS because they are specifically oriented toward employees. Favorable HR practices that signify an investment in human capital and demonstrate recognition of employee contributions have been suggested to promote POS (Allen et al. 2003). Indeed, POS has been found to be related to HR practices such as job security, autonomy, training, participation in decision-making, and opportunities for rewards and promotions (Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Allen et al. 2003). The favourableness of a specific HR practice should increase POS to the extent that it is attributed to the voluntary, intentional actions of the organization. Tsui et al. (1997) proposed that organizations have different strategies
concerning the human resources they are willing to invest in employees and the returns they expect on these investments. According to Tsui et al., organizations may have one of four HR investment strategies. The first two strategies are balanced strategies, with the first characterized by the organization’s and the employee’s exchange of few valued resources, and the second strategy defined by the mutual exchange of highly valued resources. The remaining two strategies are unbalanced, wherein the organization either provides the employee with few resources while expecting much in return, or provides many resources while expecting little from the employee in return.

In a study of employees from multiple organizations, Tsui et al. (1997) found that employees whose organizations invested many valued resources in employees, such as assurances of job security and developmental opportunities, showed greater affective commitment and higher performance. As noted above research on HR practices and POS has shown that strong investments of resources in employees may contribute substantially to POS. Consistent with this view, Shore and Barksdale (1998) found that employees who reported strong mutual obligations between themselves and their organization had higher levels of POS than employees who reported low mutual obligations between themselves and their work organization.
Psychological outcomes of Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived Organizational Support was originally assumed to create a felt obligation to help the organization reach its goals, increase affective commitment to the organization, and strengthen performance–reward expectancies (Eisenberger et al. 1986). More recently, attention has been given to the role of POS in reducing aversive psychological and psychosomatic reactions to stressors by indicating the availability of material aid and emotional support when needed to face high demands at work (George et al. 1993; Robblee 1998).

Felt obligation

When one person treats another well, the norm of reciprocity obliges the return of favourable treatment (Gouldner 1960). The reciprocity norm may also apply to employee–employer relationships, compelling employees to recompense advantageous treatment they receive from their work organization. Because POS provides a broad and valued set of socio-emotional and impersonal resources to employees, the norm of reciprocity should, in turn, produce a general felt obligation to help the organization achieve its goals (Eisenberger et al. 1986; Shore and Shore 1995). In accord with Organizational Support Theory (OST), Eisenberger et al. (2001) found a positive relationship between postal employees’ POS and a
general felt obligation to help the organization. Supporting the notion that reciprocity is involved in this process, the relationship between POS and felt obligation increased with employees’ exchange ideology, which is the endorsement of the reciprocity norm as applied to the employee–employer relationship.

**Affective Organizational Commitment**

Organizational Support Theory (OST) holds that POS fosters affective organizational commitment by meeting employees’ socio-emotional need such as the needs for esteem, approval, and emotional support (Eisenberger et al. 1986; Armeli et al. 1998). The fulfillment of these needs should facilitate the incorporation of employees’ organizational membership and role status into their social identity, thereby creating a strong emotional attachment to the organization. A longitudinal panel study found that while POS was related to temporal changes in affective commitment, affective commitment was unrelated to temporal changes in POS (Rhoades et al. 2001). Also, the obligation that arises because employees feel the need to reciprocate the support they receive should also lead to affective commitment to the organization (Rhoades et al. 2001). Thus, Eisenberger et al. (2001) found that felt obligation mediated the relationship between POS and affective commitment.
Performance–Reward Expectancies

Organizational Support Theory (OST) proposes a reciprocal relationship between Perceived Organizational Support (POS) and performance–reward expectancies (Eisenberger et al. 1986; Shore and Shore 1995). By providing employees with favourable opportunities for rewards, the organization would convey high regard for its employees and increase POS. In turn, POS would increase employees’ expectancies that high performance will be rewarded by the organization. Accordingly, Eisenberger et al. (1990) found a positive relationship between POS and performance–reward expectancies.

Behavioral Outcomes of POS

Organizational Support Theory (OST) assumes that felt obligation, fulfillment of socio-emotional needs, affective commitment, and performance–reward expectancies all contribute to increased performance and decreased withdrawal behaviour. Accordingly, Rhoades and Eisenberger’s (2002) meta-analysis reported that POS had highly reliable effects on in-role performance, extra-role performance, and turnover. The felt obligation that POS is presumed to produce should enhance performance. Accordingly, Eisenberger et al. (2001) found that felt obligation mediated the positive relationship between POS and extra-role
behaviour. It also follows that the relationship between POS and behavioural outcomes should be stronger among employees who strongly endorse the reciprocity norm as applied to employee–employer relationships. Consistent with that belief, Armeli and colleagues (1998) reported that the negative association between teachers’ POS and absenteeism increased with the strength of their exchange ideology. Because POS should meet employees’ socio-emotional needs, employees with strong socio-emotional needs should place more value on POS. Consequently, these employees should more strongly reciprocate the organization’s support.

In view of the importance of perceived organizational support and the limited research teachers the investigator included it as a crucial independent variable.

1.1.4 Work Life Balance

The term Work Life Balance was coined in 1986, although its usage in everyday language was sporadic for a number of years. In the past decade, an increasing number of scholarly and popular press articles and books have been promoting the importance of work life balance. Indeed, Douglas Hall (1990) in Organizational Dynamics stated that the “work life balance is fast becoming the hot career issue of the new decade”.
Work–life balance is a broad concept including proper prioritizing between "work" (career and ambition) on the one hand and "life (health, pleasure, leisure, family and spiritual development) on the other. Related, though broader, terms include "lifestyle balance" and "life balance". Work-life balance is a form of metaphor; but a metaphor of what? In the English language “balance” is a complex word with a variety of meanings. As a noun, a balance is a set of scales, a weighing apparatus; it is also the regulating gear in clocks. If we use the scales, then balance occurs when there is “an equal distribution of weight or amount” (OED); but this presents problems for work-life balance since both sides may be very heavy or very light. Furthermore, the type of work-life balance sought by many may not imply equal weight on both sides. However balance also has a physical and psychological meaning as “stability of body or mind” so that suicide is sometimes officially recorded as taking one’s life “while the balance of the mind was disturbed”. However this version of the metaphor, whether it applies to body or mind is somewhat more appropriate since it implies both the possibility of external verification and human agency. Put another way we can observe when someone has lost their balance; and we know that in given circumstances some people have better balance than others and may perceive that they have better balance. This gives rise to the need to recognize that balance can have
both an objective and subjective meaning and measurement, that it will vary according to circumstances and that it will also vary across individuals.

**Definitions of Work Life Balance**

Kirchmeyer (2000) defined a balanced life as “achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains”.

Clark, (2000) defined Work-life balance as “satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict”.

Hill et al., (2001) defined Work-family balance as “the degree to which an individual is able to simultaneously balance the temporal, emotional and behavioural demands of both paid work and family responsibilities.”

The New Zealand Department of Labour (2004) defines work-life balance in terms of creating a productive work culture where the potential for tensions between work and other parts of people’s live is minimized.

David Clutterbuck (2003) defined work life balance as being aware of different demands on time and energy and having the ability to make choices in the allocation of time and energy.
In 2003, Greenhaus et al. published a well-regarded and highly cited manuscript on work/life balance. They proposed a definition of balance that attempted to combine the different foci of prominent researchers in the field: equality (Clark, 2000; Kirchmeyer, 2000; Marks and MacDermid, 1996; Mead, 1964) and engagement (Marks and MacDermid, 1996). To this end, they defined balance as “the context to which an individual is equally engaged in-and equally satisfied with-his or her work and family role” (Greenhaus et al., 2003). They further contend that this definition follows the work of Marks and MacDermid in that it provides a broad enough definition to include both positive and negative balance. To this end, balance becomes a continuum with imbalance (in either role) anchoring one end and balance (again in either role) anchoring the other end. Furthermore, Greenhaus et al. propose three components of balance: 
a) time balance (i.e., time is divided equally between roles);
b) involvement balance (i.e., the individual has equal psychological involvement in both roles); and 
c) satisfaction balance (i.e., equal satisfaction is gained from both roles).

Work life balance as defined by Deery and Dundas (2008) is about effectively managing the juggling act between paid work and all other activities that are important to people such as family, community activities, voluntary work, personal development and leisure and recreation.
Therefore work life balance is basically a balance between a person’s commitment for family, personal interests, hobbies and work time.

**Need and Benefits of Work Life Balance**

To understand the need and benefits of work life balance, one first needs to understand about work life imbalance, as with the understanding of the origin, causes and effects of this imbalance, the balancing act becomes easier. The world of today is exceedingly demanding. The work culture varies from organization to organization.

Dinham (1997) reported that the increase in workload, for many teachers, has spilled over into their personal lives. To make the required personal investments to adapt to these increased expectations, teachers’ need to divert scarce personal resources away from areas of life, such as family to professional priorities. Dinham (1997) reported that around 40% of teachers’ partners felt that teaching-related issues impact on the personal lives of their families. These issues include the general over work, the unrealistic demands of school and disruptions to personal lives by work expectations (Dinham, 1997). It is apparent, therefore, that many teachers are currently walking a fine line in the way that they are attempting to manage the balance between personal commitments as home and their commitment to teaching.
Today the deadlines are getting tighter and an individual's job is not only to match that deadline but also to give quality output. Due to this work pressure it becomes exceedingly difficult to maintain a family life. It becomes very difficult to have the engagement of mind with the engagement of body. In every individual's life there are four stakeholders- own personality, job, family and society.

It is very important to give equal importance to all the stakeholders. A person who is a workaholic and does not enjoy his family life cannot be termed a successful person. When life encounters such imbalance then the peace and harmony of life vanishes and there is an adverse effect of it on the work life too. To avoid such situation one should always try to avoid this imbalance in life. The transition from work life imbalance to work life balance has obvious benefits to an organization and its employees.

At the organizational level, balanced nature of work enables increase in productivity and efficiency of employees. Employees become more creative and they derive more satisfaction from work. Better teamwork and communication offer a conducive working environment. This leads to enjoyment at work and increased passion for it.

Work life balance on an individual level can bring phenomenal changes in his life and can also heavily impact a society. A balanced work
life is of advantage to an employee's health. Stress levels decline drastically to healthy levels. Individuals derive more value from their work and from life that leads to greater satisfaction and is also seen as a mode of self-actualization.

The employee can better understand the nature of his work life balance as work life balance can vary among individuals. It is at this point often that an employee starts resting immense trust in the organization and his commitment levels to the organization increase. On the social front, the individual gains when relationships improve. The individual can now willingly devote more time and energy to his social commitments, which is also vital for a happy life.

Thus, work-life balance can bring a huge transformation at the organizational and individual levels. It helps an organization to inherently build a strong value system, which is attributed to the work life balance enjoyed at the employee level. Consequently, the organization does not have to impose a formulated framework of organizational values because they now become intrinsic to it.

**Work Life Balance Policies:**

Social exchange theory clearly explains the relationship between work life balance and commitment. This theory supports the possibility
that work life balance policies promote employee participation in the organization to the extent that the employees feel obligated to exert “extra effort” in return for these “extra benefits”. These are extra role activities that employees perform and are not mandated to do, but are beneficial towards the organization, is a further indication of their organizational commitment (Lambert, 2000). Commitment in an organization is the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests (Mckenzie and 2001).

Recently, dramatic shifts in the composition and nature of the economy have renewed interest in the debate concerning who is responsible for work–life balance. For instance, current approaches to work have increased economic pressure on organisations, which has equated to greater work pressures and work–life imbalance for individuals. While individual consequences of work–life imbalance are documented (e.g. Brough and O’Driscoll 2005), research delineating the societal consequences of work–life imbalance is now emerging. Higgins, Duxbury and Johnson (2004), in a benchmark study, estimated that work overload cost the Canadian health-care system CA$5.92 billion per annum, followed by caregiver strain (CA$4.85 billion), work-to-family interference (CA$2.77 billion) and family-to-work interference (CA$514 million). The reckoning of both the direct and indirect costs of work–life balance raises
the issue of the proportion of responsibility that is legally or morally attributable to organisations and to societies for the provision of services to facilitate balance for employees.

Currently, there are four major categories of work–life balance and family friendly initiatives: 1) flexible/alternative work arrangements, such as compressed working weeks and permanent part-time positions; 2) paid and unpaid leave arrangements, such as paid maternity, paternity, and adoption leave, and unpaid leave for sabbaticals, cultural, or volunteer reasons; 3) dependant care services, such as the provision or subsidy of childcare or elder-care services; and 4) access to information, resources or services, such as employee assistance programs, health facilities and stress management programs (Gray and Tudball 2003). Although research has discussed the consequences of family-friendly policies for individual employees (e.g. Brough, O’Driscoll, and Kalliath 2005), the actual impact of these policies on organisations and society is less clear.

The direct comparison of the consequences of the various types of work–life balance policies is difficult due to cross-cultural variations in government regimes, employment policies, and labour-market conditions (Ackers 2003). Policies in Anglo-Saxon countries, such as Australia, tend to emphasize individual responsibility and are voluntarily adopted by
organizations with little government influence. In contrast, policies in Scandinavian countries (e.g. Norway and Sweden) are influenced by a prevailing public responsibility model characterized by generous leave conditions and benefits (Brough, O’Driscoll, and Kallith 2007; Gauthier and Hatzius 1997). Work–life balance research has also been predominantly conducted within individualist countries (e.g. US, UK, Australia) although the recognition that theoretical models should also be applicable to collectivist countries (e.g. Asia and South America) is now occurring (e.g. Spector et al. 2007). Interest in multicultural work–life balance issues is also increasing due to the globalisation of the world economy and multinational corporations being deployed in a number of countries.

**Work–life balance and family-friendly policies**

There is mixed evidence regarding the cost-effectiveness of work–life balance and family-friendly policies. Some research links these policies with reduced levels of employee turnover, increased employee satisfaction, commitment and productivity, and decreased rates of physical and emotional disorders associated with work–life conflict Brough and O’Driscoll (2005). Glass and Riley (1998) demonstrated that a positive relationship existed between the provision of adequate maternity leave and
reduced rates of turnover in US female employees. Similarly, Australian research found that 70% of businesses that incorporated telework options reported a number of positive benefits, such as increased business productivity and reduced costs, improved employee flexibility and work–life balance, and increased workforce participation (Australian Telework Advisory Committee 2006).

However, research has also identified an increase in organizational costs due to work–life balance policies. Myer, Mukerjee, and Sestero (2001) identified that not all flexible family-friendly policies uniformly improved productivity and some, such as job-sharing, actually decreased productivity.

Similarly, a recent comprehensive study of 2191 UK organisations found that the organisational costs of family-friendly policies were offset by reduced employee earnings. Some workers may require family-friendly practices in order to work at all. If these practices are associated with too large an earnings reduction, such workers may find it optimal simply not to work. If increasing the labour supply of these workers is deemed important, one can imagine that provision of family-friendly practices might be subsidized (Heywood, Siebert, and Wei 2007, 297).
Thus, it appears that family-friendly and work–life balance initiatives can support organisations to address key issues such as retention and productivity. However, specific organisational and legislative conditions should be considered to ensure that the implementation of work–life balance policies have long-term positive outcomes for both employees and organisations. The presence of formal and informal ‘barriers’ often restrict (or block) employee access to work–life balance policies. Examples of such barriers include supervisor support, co-worker attitudes, perceived negative career consequences, and societal norms (McDonald, Brown and Bradley 2005; Thompson, Brough, and Schmidt, 2006). This ‘provision-utilization gap’ of work–life balance employment policies is now recognized as a pertinent research issue (O’Driscoll, Brough, and Biggs 2007).

In view of the relevance of work life balance and policies for teachers and the benefits thereof the investigator included it as an important independent variable.

1.1.5 Ethical Leadership Behaviour:

Ethical leadership has been discussed recently by numerous scholars in the field of organizational behaviour and management with respect to its impact on individual, group and organizational outcomes (e.g., Koh and
Boo, 2001; Lucas, 2000, Petrick and Quin, 2001; Trevino, Brown and Hartman, 2003). While there have been studies that have examined the individual and situational determinants of ethical leadership behaviours and the consequences of such ethical behaviours at the organizational level (Holmes, Langford, Welch, and Welch, 2002; Honeycutt, Glassman, Zugelder, and Karande, 2001), how ethical leadership influences individual behaviour has not been thoroughly explored.

In conceptualizing of ethical leadership, Trevino, Hartman and Brown (2000) present a matrix comprising unethical leadership (weak moral person, weak moral manager), hypocritical leadership (weak moral person, strong moral manager), ethical leader (strong moral person, strong moral manager), and ethically ‘silent’ or ‘neutral’ leadership (weak/strong moral person, weak moral manager). In a similar fashion, Trevino and Brown (2004) proposed an individual must be perceived as both a “moral person” and a “moral manager to have a reputation of ethical leadership.” A “moral person” is related to good character; the leader is honest and trustworthy, shows concern for employee welfare and is seen as approachable. Whereas, a “moral manager,” is one who leads others on the ethical dimension, allows employee to know what is expected, and holds them accountable. Moral managers set ethical standards, communicate ethics messages, use the position of leadership to promote ethical conduct
at work and use rewards and punishments to guide ethical behaviour in the organization. Trevino and Brown (2004) explained that a leader who is strong on both dimensions is perceived to be an ethical leader. An ethical leader clearly leads his organization on ethics and values. People know what they could expect of him, and they know what he expected of them from an ethics perspective. Examples of ethical leaders are Arthur Andersen, James Burke, CEO of Johnson and Johnson during the early 1980s and Bill George (a retired CEO of Medtronic). An unethical leader is perceived to be neither a moral person nor a moral manager. The research identified Al Dunlap of Sunbeam as an unethical leader. Others are Dennis Kozlowski from Tyco, Bernie Ebbers from WorldCom, and Richard Scrushy from Health-South. Leaders who communicated a strong ethical values (moral managers), but who are not perceived to be ethical themselves (they are not moral persons) were tagged hypocritical leaders. According to the study, Jim Bakker, the founder of PTL Ministries is an example of a hypocritical leader. Also, Michael Sears, fired from Boeing for offering a job to an Air Force procurement specialist while overseeing negotiations with Boeing, represents a more recent example of a hypocritical leader.

The ethically silent leader is not perceived to be unethical but is seen as focusing intently on the bottom line without setting complementary
ethical goals. Leaders in this category are likely to be perceived by an employee in a negative way. Silence means that the top executive really doesn’t care on how business goals are met and so employees act on such messages. Sandy Weill, CEO of Citigroup, may be a good example of ethically silent leader.

Thus, ethical leaders can effectively achieve greater performance within organizations by exhibiting qualities that will influence employee to work harder. This will at the long run assist organizations to achieve their goals and objectives optimally.

**Characteristics of an Ethical Leader**

A good leader has an idea of goodness and respective goals and is willing to hold on to these goals even in difficult times. A good leader is authentic, cares strongly about certain ideas that deserve robust concern and is a person of prudence. In a study conducted on the understanding of executive ethical leadership (Trevino, Brown and Hartman, 2003), ethical leaders are thought to be receptive and open, possess traditional leadership traits such as integrity, honesty, and trustworthiness. Ethical leadership includes transactional leader behaviours such as setting ethical standards and holding followers accountable for ethical conduct. Resick, Hanges, Dickson and Mitchelson (2006) identified six key attributes that characterized ethical leadership which includes character and integrity;
ethical awareness; community/people-orientation; motivating; encouraging and empowering; and managing ethical accountability.

The characteristics of ethical leadership as identified by Freeman and Stewart (2006) are: (1) the articulation and embodiment of the purpose and values of the organization by the leader; (2) the leader focuses on organizational success rather than on personal ego; (3) the leader finds the best people and develops them; (4) he/she creates a living conversation about ethics, values and the creation of value for stakeholders; (5) takes a charitable understanding of others’ values; (6) makes tough calls while being imaginative; (7) creates stakeholder support and societal legitimacy.

In a similar vein, O’Connell and Bligh (2009) identified the following nine characteristics of an ethical leader from an analysis of past researches. (1) Uses an ethical lens (2) Makes ethical decisions (3) Considers the long-term implications of business decisions, (4) Considers others’ well-being when making decisions and treats others fairly (5) Acts ethically or role models ethical behaviour (6) Communicates the importance of ethics; (7) Understands themselves and those with whom they work (8) Holds others accountable for acting ethically; (9) Offers training and support for employees on how to act ethically in the workplace.

Gini (1998) stated that ethical leaders are leaders who use their social power in their decisions, their own actions, and their influence on
others in such a way that they act in the best interest of followers and not enact harm upon them by respecting the rights of all parties. Brown, Trevino and Harrison (2005) specified ethical leadership in terms of behaviour as: “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement and decision-making”.

According to Trevino, Hartman, Brown, (2000) an ethical leader is a person who has an established reputation of:

- Consistently upholding a set of ethical principles (moral person);
- and
- Creating the perception in others that ethics and values are important to organizational operations (moral manager).

- His personal traits are:
  - Committed to set of principles
  - Open communicator/listener
  - Honest, sincere and forthright
  - Concern for others
  - Aware of opportunities for role modeling in smallest of ways.
  - Predictable and trusted
  - Focused on the greater good.
Effective ethical leaders repeatedly let employees know that every person has to make ethical decisions and they are not alone. Such leaders, talk about the importance of ethics; keep promises and commitments; model ethical behaviour; discipline employees who violate ethical standards and consider ethics when making important decisions. This type of leadership behaviour encourages the employees to observe less misconduct; feel less pressure to conduct misconduct; are more willing to report misconduct; and are satisfied with the process of reporting. Ethical leaders also help employees connect policies (organizational), law (societal), universal values (ethical); and self (personal /moral/religious).

Nevertheless, these unique qualities that characterized ethical leaders make them different from other leaders of corporate organizations. Ethical leaders are those leaders that are sensitive to the interest of all employees without fear or favour.

Ethical Theories

For the purpose of studying ethics and leadership ethical theories fall into two domains: theories about leaders’ conduct and theories about leaders’ character stated another way ethical theories are about both the actions of the leader and who they are as people. Ethical theories that deal with the conduct of leaders are in turn divided into two kinds: theories that
stress the consequences of leaders’ actions and those that emphasize the duty or rules governing leaders’ actions. Teleological theories, from the Greek word telos, meaning ‘ends’ or ‘purposes’, try to answer questions about right or wrong by focusing on whether a person’s conduct will produce desirable consequences. In effect, the consequences of an individual’s actions determine the goodness or badness of a particular behaviour.

In assessing consequences, there are three different approaches to making decisions regarding moral conduct. One is ethical egoism, which states that a person should act as to create the greatest good for herself or himself. A leader with this orientation would take a job or career that he or she selfishly enjoys. Self interest is an ethical stance closely related to transactional leadership theories. Ethical egoism is common in some business in which a company and its employees make decisions in ways that will achieve its goal of maximizing profits.

**Domains of Ethical Theories**
A second theological approach is utilitarianism, which states that we should behave so as to create the greatest good for the greatest number. The morally correct action is the action that maximizes social benefits while minimizing social costs (Schumann, 2001). Closely related to utilitarianism, and opposite of ethical egoism, is altruism, an approach that suggests that actions are moral if their primary purpose is to promote the best interests of others. From this perspective, a leader may be called on to act in the interests of others, even when it runs contrary to his or her own self interests (Bowie, 1991). Authentic transformational leadership is based on altruistic principles (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999. quite different from looking at which actions will produce outcomes, deontological theory is derived from Greek word does which means ‘duty’. Whether a given action is ethical rests not only with its consequences but also with whether the action itself is good. Telling the truth, keeping promises, being fair,
and respecting others are all actions that are inherently good, independent of the consequences. The deontological perspective focuses on the actions of the leader and his or her moral obligations and responsibilities to do the right thing. A leader’s actions are moral if the leader has a moral right to do them, if the actions do not infringe on others’ rights, if the actions further the moral rights of others (Schumann, 2001).

Whereas teleological and deontological theories approach ethics by looking at the behaviour or conduct of a leader, a second set of theories approaches ethics from the viewpoint of a leader’s character. These theories are called virtue based theories, and they focus on who leaders are as people. In this perspective, virtues are rooted in the heart of the individual and in his or her disposition (Pojman, 1985). Further more, it is believed that virtues and moral abilities are not innate but can be acquired and learned through practice. People can be taught by their families and communities to be morally appropriate human beings.

**Heifetz’s Perspective on Ethical Leadership**

Ronald Heifetz (1994) has formulated a unique approach to ethical leadership; it emphasizes how leaders help followers to confront conflict and to effect changes from conflict. Heifetz’s perspective is related to ethical leadership because it deals with values; the values of workers and
the values of organizations and communities in which they work. For Heifetz (1994), leaders must use authority to mobilize people to face tough issues. The leader provides a ‘holding environment’ in which there is trust, nurturance, and empathy.

**Burn’s Perspective on Ethical Leadership**

Similar to that of Heifetz, Burn’s (1978) perspective argues that it is important for leaders to engage themselves with followers and help them in personal struggles regarding conflicting values. The resulting connection raises the level of morality in both the leader and the follower. For Burn’s, it is the responsibility of the leader to help followers assess their own values and needs in order to raise them to a higher level of functioning, to a level that will stress values such as liberty, justice, and equality (Ciulla, 1998).

**Greenleaf’s Perspective on Ethical Leadership**

Robert Greenleaf developed a somewhat paradoxical approach to leadership called servant leadership. It is an approach that has gained increased popularity in recent years (Block, 1993; De Pree, 1989). With its strong altruistic ethical overtones, servant leadership emphasizes that leaders should be attentive to the concerns of their followers and empathize with them; they should take care of them and nurture them. He argued that
leadership was bestowed on a person who was by nature a servant. In fact, the way a person emerges as a leader is by first becoming a servant. A servant leader focuses on the needs of followers and helps them to become more knowledgeable, more free, more autonomous and more like servants themselves. They enrich others by their presence.

In addition to serving, the servant leader has a social responsibility to be concerned with the have-nots and to recognize them as equal stakeholders in the life of the organization. Where inequalities and social injustices exist, a servant leader tries to remove them (Graham, 1991). In becoming a servant leader, a leader uses less institutional power and less control while shifting authority to those who are being led.

The ethical and leadership research can be applied to people at all levels of organizations and in all walks of life. At a very minimum, it is crucial to state that leadership involves values, and one cannot be a leader without being aware of and concerned about one’s own values. Because leadership has a moral dimension, being a leader demands awareness on our part of the way our ethics defines our leadership. In view of the importance of ethical leadership behaviour the investigator has included it as a crucial independent variable in the study.
1.2 NEED FOR THE STUDY:

Over the past several years, considerable interest has been generated in the concept of organizational commitment. A substantial amount of time and energy has been devoted to the analysis of this topic. The popularity of the concepts appears to stem from its linkage with several important employee behaviours. Research indicated that organizational commitment has an impact on job performance (Mowday, Porter and Dubin, 1974; Van Maanen, 1975; Porter, Crampom, and Smith, 1976; Steers, 1977; Larson and Fukami, 1984), absenteeism (Smith, 1977; Steers, 1977; Koch and Steers, 1978; Larson and Fukami, 1984), and turnover (Porter et al., 1976; Hom, Katerberg, and Hulin, 1979; Koch and Steers, 1978; Angle and Perry, 1981; Price and Mueller, 1981; Larson and Fukamni, 1984). Thus, organizational commitment would appear to have potentially serious consequences for overall organizational performance.

Despite the large number of studies that have investigated the determinants of organizational commitment, there is little agreement regarding the relative impact of the various individual and organizational factors on commitment (Steers, 1977; Angle, 1983; Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, 1978; Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Reichers, 1985). For the most part, the research results in this area are inconsistent. For example, several
studies indicated that while both individual and organizational factors have a significant impact on organizational commitment, the latter are the more powerful determinants (Hrebinia and Alutto, 1972; Steers, 1977; Stevens et al., 1978; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Angle, 1983). In contrast, Koch and Steers (1978) found individual characteristics to be more effective predictors than organizational characteristics. Several other studies have found both sets of factors to be roughly of equal importance in predicting commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Brief and Aldag, 1980). Still other studies suggest that while organizational characteristics are major determinants of commitment, individual characteristics have no significant impact on this variable (Ritzer and Trice, 1969; Aranya and Jacobson, 1975; Bateman and Strasser, 1984). Finally, considering only organizational factors, some studies have found extrinsic factors to be stronger determinants than intrinsic factors (Kissler and Sakumura, 1966; Angle, 1983), yet other studies have found the reverse (Brown, 1969; Buchanan, 1974; O’Reilly and Caldwell, 1980).

Considering the state of the literature regarding the organizational commitment, and the fact that commitment may have important consequences for work-performance, absenteeism, and turnover, this matter would appear to warrant further investigation.
A central theme that emerges from the conceptual work on organizational commitment is the notion of exchange, where individuals attach themselves to the organization in return for certain payments from the organization (March and Simon, 1958; Hrebiniaik and Alutto, 1972; Steers, 1977; Mowday and Steers, 1979, 1979; Farrell and Rusbult, 1981; Peters, Bhagat, and O'Connor, 1981; Mowday et al., Angle, 1983). Individuals enter organizations with specific skills, desires, and goals, and expect a work setting where they can use their skills, satisfy their desire, and achieve their goals. To the extent the organization is perceived as facilitating these ends, organizational commitment is likely to increase. On the other hand, if the organization is perceived as failing to provide sufficient opportunities along these lines, organizational commitment is likely to diminish (Steers, 1977). The perception of being valued and cared about by the organization encourages the incorporation of organizational membership and role status into the employee's self-identity and thereby increases prosocial acts carried out on behalf of the organization.

Teachers with higher levels of perceived organizational support are likely to be more committed and possibly more willing to engage in extra role or “organizational citizenship” behaviours than are teachers who feel that the organization does not value them as highly. Hence perceived
organization support directly influences on Organizational Commitment of teachers.

Work Life Balance is a hot topic, both in academic research and in professional business practice. The combination of work and private life is quickly becoming a central issue in different fields such as psychology, sociology, management, organization studies and gender studies (Casper et al., 2007, Den Dulk and De Ruijter, 2008 Dikkers et al., 2007; Greenhaus, 2008; Kelly et al. 2008; Lewis et al., 2007; McDonald et al., 2007; Ryan and Kossek 2008; Sullivan and Smithson, 2007; Van der Lippe and Peters, 2007; Watts, 2009). Work Life Balance is not only receiving much attention in academic circles, but in professional business practice as well. The Work Life Balance of teachers is important since teaching has been identified as a stressful profession.

Research has shown that organizational commitment is greater for employees whose leaders encourage their participation in decision making (e.g Jermier and Berkes, 1979; Rhodes and Steers, 1981), who treat them with consideration (e.g. Bycio, Hackett and Allen, 1995; Decotiis and Sumjmers, 1987), fairness (e.g. Allen and Mayer, 1995: Decotiis and Summer, 1987).
It is expected that leaders who exhibit ethical behaviour would be more likely to consider the individual needs and rights of teachers and treat them fairly, which are core characteristics of transformational leadership behaviour. Butcher and Milner (2002) concluded that there is a positive relationship between ethical behaviour and employee’s level of commitment.

The present study on organizational commitment of teachers in relation to perceived organizational support, work life balance and ethical leadership behaviour is a humble attempt on the part of investigator to throw light on the unexplored correlates of commitment of B.Ed. college teachers.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The problem for the study is as follows:

“A STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF B.ED.COLLEGE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, WORK LIFE BALANCE AND ETHICAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR OF THEIR PRINCIPALS.”

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY:

It was intended through the present investigation to study the organizational commitment of B.Ed. college teachers in relation to
Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behavior of their Principal’s. Organizational Commitment was considered as the dependent variable. Standardized questionnaires on Organizational Commitment, Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behavior were used. The tools were administered on a stratified random sample of 300 teachers \((N=300)\) working in different B.Ed. colleges in Bangalore city. The composition of the sample was 150 males and 150 females making a total of 300 teachers. The data was collected by the investigator herself by personally visiting the B.Ed. colleges. All precautions were taken to maintain normal conditions while collecting the data. The data was analyzed to test the hypotheses stated. The main purpose of the study was to examine the independent variables that were significantly related to Organizational Commitment and to find out whether the difference in the independent variables would account for significant difference in the dependent variable Organizational Commitment. Considering all this the present study on Organizational Commitment of B.Ed. college teachers in relation to Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behavior of B.Ed. college Principals was undertaken with the following objectives.
1.5 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The present study was undertaken with the following major objectives:

1. To find out the relationship between Organizational Commitment viz. Affective, Continuance, Normative and Organizational Commitment (Total) of B.Ed. College teachers with Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behaviour of principals.

2. To find out whether differences in the Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behaviour of Principals would account for significant difference in the Organizational Commitment of B.Ed. College Teachers.

3. To find out whether differences in the gender, type of management, marital status, nature of appointment, salary and teaching experience of B.Ed. College teachers would account for significant differences in their Organizational Commitment.

4. To find out the main and interaction effect of main independent and background variables on Organizational Commitment of B.Ed. College teachers.
1.6  RESUME OF THE SUCCEEDING CHAPTERS:

In this chapter, the conceptual description of Organizational Commitment, Organizational Support, Work Life Balance and Ethical Leadership Behavior of Principals have been presented. The need for the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study and limitations has been discussed.

In chapter II, relevant literature, related to the problem has been reviewed.

In chapter III, the methodology adopted for the study has been discussed in detail. In this chapter, the definition of the terms used in the study, the discussion of variables, hypotheses formulated for the study, tools used, sampling procedure, scoring of the responses and the statistical techniques used for the analysis of the data have been discussed.

Chapter IV is devoted to the analysis and interpretation of data.

In Chapter V, summary, major findings, educational implications and suggestions for further research are presented.

Finally the bibliography and appendices has been included.