CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

AIMS AND HYPOTHESES
The relationships of all variables, included in the present investigation with organizational commitment and job involvement are reviewed in this section. The first part of this chapter confines itself to an examination of both organizational commitment and job involvement as they relate to each other, as well as the personal, social, and organization specific demographic variables. The second portion reports the review of relationships of commitment and involvement with the following variables:

1. Role stress, i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity
2. Protestant Work Ethic, i.e., pro work and non work ethic
3. Organizational Climate and its dimensions
4. Orientation (self, task, and interaction orientation)

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement**

Organizational commitment and job involvement have been considered as related variables. This is partially because they do have some common elements, since job is a subset of the larger set, the organization. Another reason is that job involvement and organizational commitment measures have reported similar relationships with other variables.

Inspite of this, they warrant being called separate constructs. Shore (1986) had demonstrated that employees could distinguish between job and organizational commitment. Later factorial studies (Brooke et al., 1988) also found organizational commitment and job involvement to be related. They further tested the model that a single factor underlies
the constructs of job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction. Their research led them to believe that this hypothesis did not hold true. They were able to say, on the basis of analysis of their data that the respondents were able to distinguish between the extent to which they liked the job (job satisfaction), are absorbed and preoccupied in it (job involvement), and the degree of attachment they feel to the employing organization (organizational commitment). Factor analysis suggested that these constructs were factorially independent, though moderately correlated. McFarlane (1985) also mentioned that people can differentiate between their attitudes towards the job and the organizations. Blau (1986) carried out a factorial study of job involvement and organizational commitment. Reporting a significant positive correlation between the two variables, he further contended that the two should be considered separate, as they are factorially independent. Reiterating his earlier findings, it was stated by Blau (1987,p.252), "Overall, the results of this study indicate that job involvement and organizational commitment can be operationalized as distinct constructs..." Shrivastava and Dolke (1979) also examined the factor structure of various job attitudes. They established the empirical distinction between job involvement and organizational commitment. Organizational Commitment and job involvement were also reported to be independent constructs by Morrow and McElroy (1986), and Morrow and Goetze (1988).
Morrow (1983) mentioned that job involvement and organizational commitment represent two related but distinct attitudes, because they have different referents. Whereas, the thrust or referent in the case of job involvement would be the particular job which an individual would be doing or performing. Organizational commitment on the other hand would be making a reference to the entity called organization. Concern over the relevance and existence of these concepts was, however, expressed earlier by Morrow (1983).

Blau (1989), Lee and Mowday (1987), Mathieu and Kohler (1990), and Morrow and McElroy (1987) have also reported a significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment. Similarly Mowday et al. (1982) have reported, on the basis of some studies, the range of correlations between job involvement and organizational commitment as .30 to .56. These are across four samples on which studies were conducted.

Staw (1982) developed a fourfold categorization of the variables influencing the commitment of an individual. All four of these categories refer to the more general notion of "ego-involvement" (i.e., tendency of the individuals to attach psychological importance to their behaviour). These categories include
1. Responsibility for the action (greater commitment resulted if the individual is responsible for the outcomes of behaviour).
2. Responsibility for the consequences of the action.
Verma and Upadhyay (1986) investigated the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment, collecting questionnaire data from 100 non-executive employees of a steel plant. They reported that job involvement and organizational commitment are positively correlated.

Kanungo (1982) mentioned that, for those high on job involvement, the job is important to their self image. Such individuals really care about the work they do on their jobs. On the other hand, employees who are higher on organizational commitment have a positive orientation about the employing organization. These individuals identify with the organization's characteristics and goals, and wish to maintain membership with it (Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974).

Research review suggests that a moderately positive relationship exists between organizational commitment and job involvement. However, they are independent enough to warrant being considered as separate constructs. One of the factors leading to their independence deals with their specific referents. It is possible for employees to be involved in the jobs that they hold without being committed to organizations they work for and vice versa. Relatedness may be explained in terms of spread over or spill over effects. It is possible that the respondents may be able to become involved in the job if the commitment to the organi-
zation is strong enough or vice versa. Hence, it is hypothe-
sized that organizational commitment is positively related
to job involvement.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involve-
ment with Age

The relationship between organizational commitment and
age has been examined by many researchers, and most often a
positive correlation between the two has been reported.
This has been explained in terms of the structural approach,
also known as the side-bet approach. Or else, it is ex-
plained in terms of social psychological linkages. Al-
though, recently, there is a tendency to incorporate the two
view points into a third, integrated view point, and to seek
recourse to the same.

Barnard's (1938) conception of organizational
commitment in terms of reward-cost notions seems to be the
earliest exposition of the theory which was later considered
to be the viewpoint of Becker (1960). Becker (1960) stated
that if a person refused to change his job, even when the
new job offered him a higher salary and better working
conditions, it would be assumed that this decision was born
out of commitment. He proceeded on to state that in such a
case rewards other than income and working conditions would
be attached to the present job. Thus, change would be pain-
ful. He further remarks that side-bets are instrumental in
making commitments. The individual stakes something which
is of value to him, which will be lost to him if later
actions are inconsistent with the original action, which
resulted in the creation of the side-bet. Some commitments hence may come about as a result of "...conscious decisions, but others arise crescively; the person becomes aware that he is committed only at some point of change and seems to have made the commitment without realizing it (Becker, 1960, p. 38)."

Becker (1960), further mentioned as a true sociologist, that side-bets would be culturally specific, as various things have value only within specific sub-cultures. However, there are certain systems of value which permeate an entire society.

Age is said to be a valuable side-bet in the individual's repertoire and positive relationships explained in terms of side-bets usually run in the following manner. Age is considered as an investment. Sheldon (1971) has given an explanation which may make the side-bet notion explicit.

1. Age binds an employee more tightly to certain benefits, e.g., to one's pension plans.
2. With advancing age, the opportunities for inter-organization mobility are reduced.

Stevens et al. (1978) have called the process of getting committed to an organization an exchange approach. Their notion is that an employee is exchanging membership with an organization for cumulative benefits which accrue to him for being a part of that organization. This notion was later utilized by Farrell and Rusbult (1981).
Ritzer and Trice (1969) conducted a study in which they attempted to put to test the proposed side-bet model of Becker (1960). They studied the variables which can be considered to operationalize Becker's concept of side-bets. Their results caused them to reject Becker's theory. Thus, they came up with the viewpoint that rather than being a structural phenomenon, commitment is actually a psychological phenomenon. They said that commitment, both to the organization and the occupation, are based on subjective meaningfulness of the organization or the occupation.

Aranya and Jacobson (1975) in a study on system analysts, designed to check the hypothesis proposed by Becker (1960) and Ritzer and Trice (1969), found that organizational commitment was psychological phenomenon.

Meyer and Allen (1984) also attempted to reinterpret the relationship between age and commitment. They are of the opinion that instead of viewing the scores of older employees as being representative of becoming "locked in" or of continuance commitment, the positive correlations may reflect an increase in affective commitment, i.e., attachment to the organization.

Alutto, Hrebinia, and Alonso (1973) conducted a study and reported that the Ritzer and Trice's (1969) conclusions were, in part, an artifact of their measurement of the concept of commitment. They stated that commitment to an organization can not be purely a social psychological phenomenon, contrary to the conclusion arrived at by Ritzer and Trice (1969). Commitment to the organizations and occu-
pations does have important structural concomitants which must be taken into account for a complete understanding of the phenomenon. This laid the foundation of the integrationist approach (Shoemaker, Snizek, and Bryant, 1977; Stevens et al., 1978). Thus, it was considered that neither the side-bet approach nor the psychological model have been able to encompass the full range of relevant factors, which may determine the attachment of the individuals to organizations.

This integrated approach has been substantiated by Reichers (1986), who is of the view that both the psychological and structural characteristics are important determiners of commitment. The critical variable is the phase of career being examined. Alvi and Ahmed (1987) have advocated what is alternatively known as the "blended approach." Morris and Sherman (1981) also remarked that neither of the approaches alone is sufficient to explain the degree of workers' commitment to their organization in any society, regardless of the degree of affluence. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986, p. 497) suggest, "New employees appear to base their commitment on compliance, exchanging behaviour for extrinsic rewards. Overtime, it may be that as one comes to understand and appreciate the goals and values represented by the organization, identification or pride in affiliation may develop."

The classic and repetitive explanation of a positive correlation between age and organizational commitment is,
that as age advances, comparable alternative employment is less feasible. (Bhagat and Chassie, 1981). Although age has more or less clear effects, as shown by some of the available studies (Angle and Perry, 1981; Aranya, Kushnir, and Valency, 1986; Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Bluedorn, 1982; DeCotiis and Summers, 1987; Flynn and Solomon, 1985; Fukami and Larson, 1984; Glisson and Durick, 1988; Kluge, 1988; Koch and Steers, 1978; Lee, 1971; Lee and Mowday, 1987; Luthans, Baack, and Taylor, 1987; Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd, 1985; Marsh and Mannari, 1977; Martinez, 1986; Mathieu and Hamel, 1989; Meyer and Allen, 1984; Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth, 1978; Mobley and Hwang, 1982; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Pierce and Dunham, 1987; Porter et al., 1974; Reynolds, 1951; Salanick, 1977; Stevens et al., 1978; Tahouri, 1985; Welsch and La Van, 1981; Wiener, 1982; and Wiener, Muczyk and Gable, 1987). However, there are some studies which have failed to find the predicted positive relationship between organizational commitment and age.

Alvi and Ahmed (1987) in a study of Pakistani workers found a negative correlation between age and organizational commitment. They have rendered the following explanations for the results:

All the workers studied were older males (35 years and above), they were employed in industries like packaging, etc. and held temporary jobs. Hence, there was little question of accrual of benefits. Moreover, most of the workers were rural migrants who gave up jobs fairly quickly.
Another reason could be that, since Pakistan is as yet a developing economy, there is no emergence of a young, dynamic, professional class.

Another study which is considered as a pioneer one in reporting a negative relationship as mentioned earlier is that of Ritzer and Trice (1969). But, this study has been criticized (Alutto et al., 1973) for using an insensitive measure of organizational commitment. Reichers (1986) failed to find a significant role of age in the prediction of organizational commitment in multivariate analysis, even though the correlation was significant. It has been remarked, that the side-bet relation between age and commitment in other studies may be "spurious", i.e., moderating variables may be affecting the relationship between age and commitment. Non significant relationship between organizational commitment and age was also reported by Barling, Wade, and Fullagar (1990).

Hence, one can say that majority of the literature reviewed, falls in the pile of a positive relationship between organizational commitment and age. It is possible that there is a combination of factors which result in the commitment of the employee to the organization. Side-bets could be an important explanation of the relationship. The economic reality of the society could be another important determinant. Mobility may not be shunned as such, but given a certain state of economy, it may not be possible. Even though side-bets offer an explanation, the psychological
factors cannot be ignored. It has been stated that commitment is a concept which is not culturally specific (Marsh and Mannari, 1977; Mobley and Hwang, 1982). Affective attachment to the workplace may be viewed as a psychological phenomenon resulting from either post-actional justification or from a case of becoming committed to a perception of enhanced "felt responsibility" and importance. This view of enhanced self image has been used by Salanick (1977). The results of Hrebiniak and Alutto may be seen to be the best explanation for viewing commitment "...commitment in utilitarian organizations is partially an exchange and partially a structural phenomenon" (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972, p. 569).

Age of the respondent has been frequently investigated in relation to their job involvement. If a positive relationship exists, it could be explained in terms of how, with an increment in age, one draws larger amount of self esteem from work. One's perceptions of self worth are related increasingly to involvement in the job one is performing. This is more true of today's industrialized and institutionalized world where increasing time and effort are invested in jobs and the outcomes alter perceptions of self.

The literature is replete with studies reporting a positive relationship between job involvement and age (Agarwala, 1976; Aleem and Khandelwal, 1988, 1989; Anantharaman, 1980; Barling et al., 1990; Dailey and Morgan, 1978; Hall and Mansfield, 1975; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975; Khandelwal 1986, 1987; Lee and Mowday, 1987; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Madhu and Harigopal, 1980; McKelvey and Seka-
factors cannot be ignored. It has been stated that commitment is a concept which is not culturally specific (Marsh and Mannari, 1977; Mobley and Hwang, 1982). Affective attachment to the workplace may be viewed as a psychological phenomenon resulting from either post-actional justification or from a case of becoming committed to a perception of enhanced "felt responsibility" and importance. This view of enhanced self image has been used by Salanick (1977). The results of Hrebiniak and Alutto may be seen to be the best explanation for viewing commitment "...commitment in utilitarian organizations is partially an exchange and partially a structural phenomenon" (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972,p.569).

Age of the respondent has been frequently investigated in relation to their job involvement. If a positive relationship exists, it could be explained in terms of how, with an increment in age, one draws larger amount of self esteem from work. One's perceptions of self worth are related increasingly to involvement in the job one is performing. This is more true of today's industrialized and institutionalized world where increasing time and effort are invested in jobs and the outcomes alter perceptions of self.

The literature is replete with studies reporting a positive relationship between job involvement and age (Agarwala, 1976; Aleem and Khandelwal, 1988, 1989; Anatharaman, 1980; Barling et al., 1990; Dailey and Morgan, 1978; Hall and Mansfield, 1975; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975; Khandelwal 1986, 1987; Lee and Mowday, 1987; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Madhu and Harigopal, 1980; McKelvey and Seka-
The relationship between age and job involvement has been upheld cross culturally too. In a study conducted by Reitz and Jewell (1979), the age and job involvement relationship was found to be positive in five out of the six countries investigated. Similarly, Sekaran and Mowday (1981) in a study of samples drawn from India and United States found that there was a significant relationship between them in both countries. However, age was more important in American than in the Indian sample.

Some studies, however, have failed to find the predicted positive relationship between age and job involvement e.g., (Gechman and Wiener, 1975; Gurin et al., 1960; Happali and Mallapa, 1988; Kitchen, 1979; Knoop, 1986; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Malhan, Agarwala, and Singh, 1981; Mannheim, 1975; Orpen, 1982; Pathak, 1982; and Reddy and Ravi Kumar, 1980). Schwyhart and Smith (1972) investigated the involvement-age relationship in a sample of 149 middle level managers of a company with a replication on 58 managers. Although, for the primary sample, there was a significant relationship, this could not be substantiated in the replication sample.
Knoop (1986) who failed to find a significant relationship between the two variables of job involvement and age in a sample of the teaching community, said that this could be so because teaching is a profession which is different from other professions. Teachers have a job that offers them "variety autonomy and challenge" and they can become involved at any age. Moreover, change of students, change in class, and curricula offer possibilities of continuous involvement to the members of the profession. Hence, age does not play a significant role. To sum up, as of now, the available literature relating job involvement to age is not very clear regarding the relationship. Continued research on diverse samples can help us make a final statement.

On the basis of the foregoing review, it is hypothesized that: i) Age is positively related to organizational commitment, the older employees being more committed. ii) Age is positively related to job involvement, the older employees being more involved.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Tenure

Tenure as a variable has been considered if not more, then equally important to age as an antecedent of organizational commitment. This is the reason why a large number of studies have incorporated, if not both, then atleast one of the two variables. Tenure refers to the length of time spent with the organization. Previous literature leads a researcher to expect a positive relationship between tenure
and organizational commitment. Explanations for this positive relationship span the entire gamut ranging from exchange approach, (structural or side-bet) to social psychological approach. Luthans et al. (1985), commenting upon the place of the two demographic variables, i.e., age and tenure vis-a-vis organizational commitment, said that these two have been the most frequently examined, and have been most consistent in their relationship to organizational commitment. They further state that this relationship held across various countries. The side-bet approach is likely to explain the positive relationship between tenure and organizational commitment in the following manner.

With prolonged tenure in the organization the individual:
1) develops organization specific skills which are rendered redundant on termination of membership in the organization. Salanick (1977) also suggested that the employability of the person diminishes with increased tenure in an organization.
2) the individual's 'felt responsibility' is also enhanced with prolonged tenure. As more time is spent by employees in the organization, they come to be the pillars of that organization. Salanick (1977) has proposed that greater felt responsibility leads to commitment.

Another possible explanation could be that, as tenure increases, the individuals tend to earn greater confidence in performing their roles or doing the required tasks. This
is clearly explained by the results of a study carried out by Organ and Greene (1974) on scientists and engineers. They reported that the senior scientists and engineers felt more in control of their work situations as time elapsed. Ogilvie (1986) states that additional time spent with a company increases the bond between the organization and the individual. Ogilvie goes on further to state that with increasing tenure, managers behave in ways that further commit them to the organization, as the behavioural or irrational school of commitment suggested (Salanick, 1977; and Staw, 1982). Sheldon's (1971) views about explaining the relationship between tenure and commitment are similar to an explanation offered for the positive relationships between age and commitment. Tenure is perceived to be a valuable investment. According to her, the incentives given to a person older in age and with greater tenure would be so high that other organizations would be reluctant to provide the same. Grusky (1966) states that the time invested in an organization is a valuable resource in itself.

Sheldon (1971) also explicitly mentions investments as a term referring to social involvements in an organization. Investments or bonds would be the social framework of explaining the relationship between tenure and commitment. Emotional ties, formed over the years in an organization may be viewed as a part of the larger psychological support which an employee draws from the organization.

Martin and O'Laughlin (1984), in a seemingly behavioural explanation of the relationship between
organizational commitment and tenure state that commitment attitudes and commitment behaviour are reciprocally related over time. They mention that as tenure increases, the attitude of intent to stay strengthens the employee's commitment behaviour to the organization. "This strengthened commitment behaviour, by extension of the reciprocal interplay between attitudes and behaviours, then serves to strengthen the attitude of intent to stay" (Martin and O'Laughlin, 1984, p. 273).

Reichers (1986) integrated the structural and psychological viewpoints as an explanation for enhanced commitment with increased age and tenure. It was pointed out, that in the earlier phase of the career, psychological factors may be more important to engender commitment, but with increasing tenure, these factors will recede into the background and side-bets or sunk costs may then render the feeling of being locked in the organization. Reichers (1986) has conceived of tenure as a summary variable which captures the essence of an individual's investments over time.

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) commented that there was little evidence that tenure engendered either job satisfaction or commitment. With age in the equation, the tenure effects range from zero to negative. They mention that, since an increment in tenure is necessarily one in age as well, isolated effects are not clearly depicted. They put forth, on the basis of the results of their study,
that tenure coefficients, from which age has been excluded are positive but much smaller than those of age. Positive relationship between tenure and organizational commitment is reported in a large number of studies (e.g., Becker and Casper, 1956; Buchanann, 1974; Grusky, 1966; Hall and Schneider, 1972; Hrebinik and Alutto, 1972; Koch and Steers, 1978; Lee, 1971; Luthans et al., 1985; Mathieu and Hamel, 1989; Meyer and Allen, 1984; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Ogilvie, 1986; Reiss, 1955; Sheldon, 1971; and Stevens et al., 1978).

However, as mentioned earlier, there are some studies which have not found a significant relationship between tenure and organizational commitment. One of the significant studies which failed to find a significant relationship between the two variables is by Aranya, Kushnir, and Valency (1986) who used a sample of accountants employed in various firms. The non-significant relationship here may be a reflection of the case where, since the profession is so well defined, commitment to the employing organization may not be as important as commitment to the profession. As it is only under certain conditions that commitment to both the occupation and organization are compatible (Thornton, 1970). It is possible that such a coexistence does not occur in this case.

Bateman and Strasser (1984) who failed to find a significant relationship between tenure and organizational commitment had studied job tenure and not organizational tenure. Job tenure may not be a useful indicator because it
may actually breed stagnation and hence be detrimental to commitment. Bluedorn (1982) also found a non significant relationship between commitment and tenure. DeCotiis and Summers (1987) found that although total tenure did have significant relation with commitment, this was not borne out by the subsequent multiple regression analysis. Total tenure failed to make a statistically significant contribution to variance in commitment. Flynn and Solomon (1985) also studied job tenure and not organizational tenure. Some of the other studies which have reported a non significant relationship between organizational commitment and tenure have been by Barling et al. (1990), Glisson and Durick (1988), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Martin and O'Laughlin (1984), Mobley and Hwang (1982), and Reichers (1986). Reichers (1986), however, studied a sample where the tenure ranged from a minimum of one year to maximum of ten years, though there was some spread within this. Here, the tenure was not long enough for investments to become operative.

Referring to the process of developing affective identification based on the belief system which one may have, it may be tempting to say that loyalty is positively reinforced during socialization by the organization particularly, and before entering the work place generally. Hence, to identify and be loyal to the organization would be perceived positively.

Regarding post-actional justification, the concept is drawn from Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance.
By being in an organization one would slowly develop positive attitudes. Committing attitudes would follow a behaviour which is committing, in this case the act of being a part of the organization.

Hence, one may sum up with the statement that enhanced commitment to the organization as a function of increased tenure may be an interaction of both side-bets, sunk costs or the feeling of being locked-in as also a result of developing affective identification with the organization. This affective identification can either be a result of one's belief system or a case of post-actional consonance. Affective identification or continuance of membership may also be the result of prolonged social involvements in the organization.

Although, tenure has been studied in relation to job involvement, there is almost no consensus yet on a relationship between the two variables. Positive relationship between job involvement and tenure has been reported in some studies e.g. (Aleem and Khandelwal, 1988; Anantharaman, 1980; Das, 1983; Jones et al., 1975; Khandelwal, 1986; Madhu and Harigopal, 1980; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Newman, 1975; Parsuraman and Alutto, 1984; Pathak, 1982; Pathak and Pathak, 1987; Rabinowitz et al., 1977; Sekaran and Mowday, 1981; Sharma and Kapoor, 1978; Sharma and Sharma, 1978; and Shrivastava and Dolke, 1978).

A general explanation of a positive relationship between tenure and job involvement would be in terms of socialization on the job itself and enhanced felt responsibil-
ity with prolonged time. Also, as time on job increases, there is greater clarity about expectations from the job, and with clear expectations there may be increased involvement. The relationship has been upheld cross culturally as reported by Sekaran and Mowday (1981). Sometimes, the nature of the job itself may make tenure to be an important factor. Rabinowitz et al., (1977) in their study on civil servants, stated that tenure was the second most significant predictor of job involvement. They explained the results by saying that since the sample consisted of civil servants, tenure for them was synonymous with seniority which in turn assured other rewards. Hence, tenure was very important.

There are almost equal number of studies which have reported a lack of significant relationship between job involvement and tenure. (e.g., Agarwala, 1976; Barling et al., 1990; Dailey and Morgan, 1978; Hall and Mansfield, 1975; Happali and Mallapa, 1988; Kitchen, 1979; McKelvey and Sekaran, 1977; Orpen, 1982; Saal, 1978; Schneider et al., 1971; and Schwyhart and Smith, 1972). Ghosh and Deb (1983), found that job involvement does not increase, instead decreases with tenure.

It is possible that no significant relationship exists between job involvement and tenure, especially, if the respondent has reached a stage of either stagnation or indifference about the job. But, tenure must be subdivided into various levels or categories and studied in relation to job involvement, instead of being clubbed singularly.
Another reason for lack of emergence of a significant relationship could be a lack of availability of an alternative job. In such a case too, tenure will have no significant relationship with involvement in job.

Das (1983) stated that tenure did not have a linear relation with job involvement. This relationship was moderated by hierarchy. Dave and Sutaria (1976) found that different demographic variables are important at different stages of career. Job attitudes are positive when a person is new on the job and negative when he is about to leave.

Thus, the relationship of job involvement with length of time spent in the organization has provided mixed results.

On the basis of the foregoing review it is hypothesized that: i) Tenure is positively related to organizational commitment, the employees with longer tenure being more committed. ii) Tenure is positively related to job involvement, the employees with longer tenure being more involved.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Number Of Promotions Received**

Promotions received by an employee would indicate to him or her an increment in terms of both financial status and organizational status.

As suggested earlier, theoretically, any act which enhances an employee's felt responsibility, enhances his commitment (Salanick, 1977). Dealing with the concept in a slightly different manner, Hall and Nougain (1968) mentioned a manager's "success syndrome." They remarked that a manag-
er perceives himself to be successful by virtue of the financial rewards he receives and his organizational status i.e., his position or placement in the hierarchy. Thus, when the employee is promoted, it leads to elevation of the status which further leads to high self esteem and commitment.

Though, some studies in literature have employed promotion as a variable, and have studied its relationship with organizational commitment, more often it is the subjective perception of satisfaction with promotion which has been studied, or else it is promotional prospects which have been studied in relation to organizational commitment.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) have studied promotions in terms of the perception of the respondent that promotions are based upon the individual's contribution to the firm. Whereas, Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986), and Stone and Porter (1975) have studied opportunity for promotions or promotional prospects. Similarly, Kanter (1977), found that opportunity for promotion and fairness of promotional processes were positively related to organizational commitment.

Alvi and Ahmed (1987) found that promotions had a significant effect on the organizational commitment of male employees. Darden, Hampton, and Roy (1989) stated that perceived rewards in terms of a promotion have a strong impact on organizational commitment. Ogilvie (1986) also found promotion to be a significant predictor of organiza-
tional commitment. He viewed promotions as a human resource management practice. Morrow and McElroy (1987) found a significant relationship between satisfaction with promotions and commitment. On the other hand Sheldon (1971) found that employees who had not received rewards or promotion to higher position were still committed. These men, however, had been in the organization for long span of time. Stevens et al. (1978) said that 'perceived importance of performance' criteria for promotion was a significant predictor of federal service commitment but not of organizational commitment. They said that, within the organization, other considerations like inter-personal relations may overrule performance criteria.

Hence, promotions are not simplistic in their effect upon commitment. It may be more fruitful to investigate the perceived fairness of promotional processes (Ogilvie, 1986) than merely the number of promotions received.

Promotions received by the respondents have not received adequate attention in studies of job involvement. In a system where promotions are merit based, the relationship between job involvement and promotion received is of greater relevance than in a system where promotions are seniority based.

The public sector in India follows promotional policies almost parallel to that of civil service, i.e., promotions based upon merit are an exception rather than the rule. Rabinowitz et al. (1977), in an investigation of job involvement of a sample of civil servants found that since
the promotions are based upon seniority and not merit per se., the promotions received can not be directly related to job involvement.

Saal (1978) found the relationship between satisfaction with promotions and job involvement to be of a significant nature.

Schwyahart and Smith (1972) found that job involvement and promotions are not significantly related. They have offered an explanation which runs along the following lines. They hold that involvement may be an attitude fostered more by expectation rather than by previous experience, at least with respect to promotions. They further state that the job may become important to the self image of the manager, no matter what his success is in terms of promotions received. This would seem a logical relationship, but like many other linkages this too does not emerge as a simplistic one. Morrow and McElroy (1987) failed to find a significant relationship between satisfaction with promotions and job involvement. Finally, promotions given to the employees reflect the general reward governing policies of an organization. Promotion is both a financial increment as well as increase in nonmaterial rewards like status.

Promotions will not play any role in affecting the organizational commitment or job involvement where the promotions are based simply on seniority. If, however, these are merit based promotions then they may have some effect on job involvement and organizational commitment. The
research enquiries investigating the relationship of organizational commitment and job involvement to the number of promotions an employee has received are few. These studies reveal mixed results, hence the relationships of these two variables with the number of promotions received needs to be explored.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Number Of Dependents**

Number of dependents a respondent has, can be compared to any other variable which entails extra organizational responsibilities. Dependents, hence, will operate in this manner to enhance the organizational commitment of the employees. The employees will benefit from maintaining membership with the organization, as mobility will lead to loss of those benefits which membership allows.

Positive relationship between organizational commitment and number of dependents has been reported by Lee and Mowday (1987). Aranya and Jacobson (1975) found a positive relationship, though not significant, between the number of children and commitment variables. Brooke et al. (1988) and Curry et al. (1986) found that kinship responsibilities were significantly related to commitment. Marsh and Mannari (1977) found that employees were more likely to leave an organization if they had none or fewer dependents. Pierce and Dunham (1987) found that the number of dependents were significantly and positively related to commitment propensity. They found that employees with more dependents have a stronger tendency to become committed.
Among the extra job responsibilities that have been studied to determine their relationship with job involvement, the number of dependents which a respondent may have, is an important one. In the Indian context, this may be treated as especially relevant since the social conditions are such that one may have, at a point, two generations of dependents, i.e., one's parents and one's children.

Although it is not a simple relationship that may exist between the number of dependents and job involvement, it is possible that if a respondent has more dependents, his energies are directed towards his family and he makes lesser investment in his job. On other hand, it is also possible that a larger number of dependents are a matter of concern and he is forced to become serious and involved in his job.

Brooke et al. (1988), Reddy and Ravi Kumar (1980), Saal (1978), and Sharma and Kapoor (1978) failed to find any significant relationship between number of dependents and job involvement. Out of these studies, the study conducted by Brooke et al. (1988) deserves special mention because they enlarged the scope of the variable and made it more meaningful by studying job involvement in relation to kinship responsibilities. Kinship responsibilities in this study connoted a combined index of relations directly dependent upon the respondent and those towards whom there were only responsibilities arising out of familial ties. It was a composite term defining marital status, children below...
There are certain studies which suggest a significant relationship between job involvement and number of dependents (e.g., Agarwala, 1976; Lee and Mowday, 1987; and Malhan et al., 1981). So, it is a variable which has as yet failed to provide any conclusive results with respect to the direction of its linkage to job involvement. Thus, on the basis of existing evidence it is hypothesized that: Employees having more dependents are higher on commitment to the organization.

However, the relationship between the number of dependents an employee has and his job involvement needs to be explored.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Marital Status**

Marital status refers to the respondent being either married or single and the same is considered to be an important personal demographic variable. This is so, because marriage entails certain responsibilities. The commitment of married employees to the organization is mediated by extra organizational responsibilities brought upon by marriage.

Alonso (1970) and Hrebiniak (1971) have studied the marital status of the employee in relation to organizational commitment. Single respondents have lower organizational commitment scores than married ones. Alutto et al. (1973) remark that single respondents have fewer extra organiza-
tional responsibilities which result in diminished salience of organizational side-bets or investments (Bock, 1967; Colombotos, 1963; Vollmer and Mills, 1966; and White, 1967). Alternatively, it may be stated as by Hrebinjak and Alutto (1972), that single employees are more likely than married or separated ones to be positively disposed towards alternative employment.

Ritzer and Trice (1969) hypothesized that marital status affects the respondent's commitment. However, they failed to substantiate their hypothesis on the basis of empirical work carried out by them. Aranya and Jacobson (1975) also reported non-significant relationship between organizational commitment and marital status of the respondent.

The literature available seems more conclusive on the relationship of marital status and organizational commitment than on many other personal demographic characteristics. Single respondents would seem to be less committed to an employing organization than their married counterparts. The notion of side-bets, or exchange, or investment viewpoint, as it is popularly known, would seemingly suffice as an explanation of this relationship. The costs of leaving an organization would be higher for married than for single employees.

Marital status does not appear to have been considered in relationship to job involvement by many researchers. Besides this, the reported relationships do not fall in a single pile.
There are certain studies which have failed to find a significant relationship between marital status and job involvement (Gechman and Wiener, 1975; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; and Saal, 1978). These studies may be considered pointers to the fact that being married does not make any difference in a respondent's involvement with his job. Gannon and Hendrickson (1973) stated that it is possible to be involved both in the family and the job.

As already mentioned, literature also offers some studies which report a significant relationship between marital status and job involvement. A positive relationship between job involvement and marital status was reported by Knoop (1986) who stated that single employees are more involved in their jobs. Rabinowitz et al. (1977) reported low positive correlation between the two variables. Chusmir (1986) using the Job Involvement Questionnaire reported that marital status explained significant variance in job involvement. In an attempt to offer an explanation of the job involvement-marital status relationship, Pathak (1982a) states that this relationship can be expected on two grounds. First, a person who is not married has none or very little extra job responsibilities. It is possible for such a respondent to invest greater time and effort in the job which he/she is doing. Secondly, Pathak (1982) suggests, on the basis of the studies conducted, that family responsibilities may force a person to be more serious about work. This draws from the explanation by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) and
would be true in a country like India which is an economy of scarcities.

The relationship between marital status and job involvement needs to be clearly established through empirical work. After a review of studies conducted using marital status as a variable in relation to organizational commitment and job involvement, it is hypothesized that: Married employees, as compared to unmarried employees, are higher on organizational commitment.

However, the relationship between job involvement and marital status of the employee needs to be explored.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Status Of Spouse (Earning/Non-Earning)

Whether an employee has support of an earning spouse or not, goes a step further in trying to explain the effect of marital status on organizational commitment. Marriage entails extra organizational responsibilities. However, these responsibilities will make a lesser impact if there is support available in terms of an earning spouse. The employee can, if the need arises, terminate membership with an organization to seek alternative employment. This variable does not seem to have been so far conceived of as being related to commitment as evidenced by the literature reviewed.

As is true for organizational commitment, no study could be traced which had investigated the relationship of job involvement with the status of employees' spouse, i.e., earning/non-earning. Judging by mere face validity of con-
cepted, it is possible that a relationship exists between the job involvement of the respondent and the fact that a respondent has an earning spouse. However, only further investigations will shed light on the same. It may be hypothesized that: Employees having an earning spouse, as compared to those having a non-earning spouse, are more committed to the organization.

However, the relationship between job involvement and status of the employees' spouse, i.e., earning/non-earning needs to be explored.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Total Work Experience

The difference between total work experience and tenure is that, most often, tenure refers to a period spent with a particular organization, and, since the respondent may have been mobile, total experience is a sum of various tenures. Most often, job tenure, or tenure in a particular position in the organization have been investigated in relation to organizational commitment and job involvement.

In jobs where mobility is higher, tenure with specific organizations may be short. This thesis is likely to hold true for managerial employees who are positively inclined towards inter-organizational mobility. However, tenure and total work experience would be almost synonymous for those employees who began their careers with an organization and are socialized in the same by maintaining membership.

Alutto et al. (1973) stated that total experience,
which perhaps even more than age implies the accrual of the side-bets and investments associated with seniority and experience, was strongly correlated with organizational commitment.

However, if the benefits earned, or side-bets or investments are portable i.e., transferable from one organization to another, high mobility would not be influencing commitment. If an individual has to forsake benefits that are earned in one organization to join another, this may act as detrimental to commitment. Or, it may be said, that, with portable benefits, the effect of total work experience upon commitment begins to resemble that of tenure.

Bateman and Strasser (1984) studied job and career tenure in relation to organizational commitment. In an analyses over two time periods, they found that, out of job and career tenure, only career tenure was significantly related to commitment, and that too, only in one of the two periods.

Total work experience may be explained as operating in a way which reduces ambiguity or enhances familiarity with the roles. Vivier (1973), in a study of several hundred French railroad chiefs, over a six year period, found that their satisfaction with the jobs and the organization increased as their perception of their ability to handle the job increased.

Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) found that seniority which also connotes enhanced experience was important. They observed that, as work experience increases, there is greater
commitment. However, some studies failed to find this relationship. With regard to job involvement, the results are rather equivocal. Some of the available studies reported a lack of any significant relationship between total work experience and job involvement. However, there are studies available showing the existence of a positive relationship. It is hypothesized that: i) Total work experience is positively related to organizational commitment, employees with longer experience being more committed to the organization. ii) Total work experience is positively related to job involvement, employees with longer experience being more involved.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Background (Rural/Urban)

Rural/Urban background as a variable, posited to influence various job attitudes, has special relevance to Indian studies. However, this has not received attention from empirical researchers whether western or eastern. Residential background has often been conceived of in terms of community size in western investigations.

Blood and Hulin (1967), Hulin and Blood (1968), and Turner and Lawrence (1965) found that workers from rural background have internalized values about the goodness of work and are likely to respond more "positively" to job enlargement.

Blood (1968) could not replicate Blood and Hulin's (1967) contention, neither could Siegel and Ruh (1973)
replicate Hulin and Blood's (1968) contention which postulated that differences in community size are related to differences in work values.

Ruh, White, and Wood (1975) in a detailed study in which they considered background as a factor, stated that background was significantly related to job involvement, and accounted for a small percentage of variance in explaining the same. However, the relationship is far from being simple.

Saal (1978) failed to find any relationship between job involvement and rural/urban background. This could be a result of the cosmopolitization of the environment. Increasingly there is an expansion so the barriers are breaking down especially, owing to exposure to media.

The perception of an employee, as to whether he has a rural or an urban background holds relevance for studies of Indian workforce. This is so, more if ties with the rural area are maintained and continually nurtured. If the employee considers that he has a rural background, then on terminating membership with the organization, he can go back to the rural roots, more so if he possesses assets like land etc. However, this factor can be considered more important for workers rather than managers. In the west, urbanization has taken place very rapidly in this century and close to the industrial centres, rural/urban distinction has largely lost its relevance.

Srivastva (1977) stated, in his study of job attitudes
of workers, that the worker would not carry out industrial work if his heart lay in the village. He, however found that the worker was wedded to industrial employment. In the case of a manager, it is more likely that he may not choose to go back to the village, given the values of consumerism so predominant in the urban centers and lack of the same in the rural areas.

Not much literature is available on these relationships and whatever studies are available cannot be categorized in one single pile. The relationship of rural/urban background with organizational commitment and job involvement, needs to be explored.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with level of Educational Qualifications

Educational qualifications of the sample have been studied in many studies on organizational commitment. Most studies (Angle and Perry, 1981, 1983; Balaji, 1986; Blue-dorn, 1982; Brief and Aldag, 1980; Curry et al., 1986; Dornstein and Matalon, 1989; Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Koch and Steers, 1978; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Morris and Steers, 1980; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Sheldon, 1971; Steers, 1977; and Stevens et al., 1978) have reported an inverse relationship between organizational commitment and educational level.

Educational attainment of the employee can affect the employees' commitment in the following two ways:
1) Higher education will allow him a larger number of alternatives and mobility. Hence, he can decide upon better
prospects or career alternatives or conversely, lower level of education would mean a paucity of alternatives.

2) Higher education results in enhancing perceived expectations from the organization. Those who are highly educated, may have greater expectations from the organization which the organization may not be able to satisfy.

Both arguments help to explain the inverse relationship between organizational commitment and education. The first viewpoint has been used by Angle and Perry (1981) and Ritzer and Trice (1969), who gave this explanation but whose own data did not corroborate the significant inverse relationship. The latter argument has been used by Steers (1977) and Mowday et al. (1982).


Alvi and Ahmed (1987) collected their data on the less skilled labourers in the developing economy of Pakistan. There, the conditions of the labour market are such that the
expectations of the work force are very low. Aranya and Jacobson (1975) have taken their results, which failed to show a significant inverse relationship between organizational commitment and education, as supportive of the social psychological viewpoint of commitment.

Luthans et al. (1987) also failed to find a significant relationship between organizational commitment and education per se. However, the regression equation computed where personal characteristics accounted for significant variance in commitment had education as one of the component predictors. Mottaz (1986) reported that education possesses a significant, indirect positive effect on organizational commitment by increasing work rewards but a direct negative effect when work rewards are held constant. The effect of education on organizational commitment was mostly through intrinsic rewards and values. Glisson and Durick (1988) found that education was a significant negative predictor of commitment. Mathieu and Hamel (1989) found that education was a significant predictor for non-professionals and a non-significant predictors for professionals.

Stevens et al. (1978) posited that educational qualification was an important predictor of managers' commitment to federal service because:

1) Education improved the available external alternatives.
2) Assimilation into professional value sets via education would lead to outside identification (in this case the federal service).
3) Managers perceive that the opportunity to use education
lies more outside than inside the federal service.

Hence, one can say that education will normally influence commitment in a manner posited by Steers (1977), Stevens et al. (1978) and Mowday et al. (1982). It could be said that education is one of those variables which affects the organizational commitment of employees, in a complex manner.

The relationship between job involvement and education does not permit a single unequivocal statement. Results of studies conducted to determine the same, range from a clearly positive significant relationship to a significant negative relationship. There are also studies which have failed to find any significant relationship between the two variables.

Significant negative relationship between job involvement and education has been reported in many studies (Agarwala, 1976; Pathak, 1982; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977; Ruh and White, 1974; Ruh, White, and Wood, 1975; Saal, 1978; Sekaran and Mowday, 1981; and Sharma and Kapoor, 1978).

A significant negative relationship between job involvement and education means that those who have lower educational qualifications are more job involved. The possible reason for this would be that these people have learnt about the job by being on the job. As Lodahl and Kejner (1965) held that people who are more job involved in their jobs have been socialized by the jobs. Hence, they find a greater fulfillment in the job that they are doing.

Significant positive relationship indicating that those
with greater amount of education are highly job involved is also reported by some researchers (e.g., Aleem and Khandelwal, 1988, 1989; Gurin et al., 1960; Khandelwal, 1987; Knoop, 1986; Mannheim, 1975; Pathak and Pathak, 1987; Parsuraman and Alutto, 1984; Schuler, 1975; and Stevens et al., 1978). Positive relationship between education and involvement may be explained by the fact that if education has been a prologue to the job which is being performed i.e., job is a culmination of education or there has been a moderation of job involvement and education by certain mediating variables, then positive relationship may emerge.

Finally, there is the third set of studies which failed to reveal any relationship between job involvement and education. (Barling et al., 1990; Kitchen, 1979; Malhan et al., 1981; McKelvey and Sekaran, 1977; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Orpen, 1982; Sekaran, 1981; Sekaran, 1981a, Sharma and Sharma, 1978 and Venkataraman, 1979).

Pathak (1982a), in explaining the possible reason for failure of any relationship to emerge between the two variables states that this would be because of restriction in the range of educational level taken in the various samples. This is more so, when sub groups at higher job levels are considered.

Another problem that often arises while trying to relate job involvement to education, is the codification of categories of education in relation to job held. A meaningful interpretation would be possible, if the nature of education could be related to the kind of work the job
entails.

Literature reviewed is replete with evidence to the effect that respondents with higher education are less committed to the organization. However, there are many studies which have failed to substantiate this relationship. Also, available literature of the job involvement-education relationship is more fuzzy as there are studies reporting positive, negative, and no relationship.

Hence, at this stage of empirical enquiry, the relationship between organizational commitment and education is clearer than between job involvement and education. Thus it is hypothesized that: Level of educational qualifications is inversely related to organizational commitment, more educated employees being less committed.

However, the relationship between job involvement and level of educational qualifications of the employee needs to be explored.

Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Salary

Pay or salary is the term used for the financial reward given to the employee by the organization in which he or she is employed.

Goldthorpe, Lockwood, and Platt (1968), in a study of British factory workers found that commitment to the organization is primarily instrumental. This implies that commitment is contingent upon financial rewards.

Mowday et al. (1982) posit that the level of pay would
be positively related to commitment, as pay is an important inducement to maintain membership with the organization. However, as they themselves discovered, empirical support for this prediction was weak. They found that better paying positions were not necessarily associated with higher commitment to the organization.

Theoretically, Salanick (1977) suggested that the level of rewards influence the perceived instrumentality of work, when the instrumentality is high, that is, the extrinsic rewards are high, then the employee's felt responsibility would be lowered. Hence, the employee would be provided with external justification for being involved in the task and the need to provide internal justification would not be present.

Mowday et al. (1982) provided an example of how the pay system can serve to enhance the organizational commitment of the employees. A number of studies have reported a significant positive relationship between pay and organizational commitment. (Alvi and Ahmed, 1987; Aranya and Jacobson, 1975; Brooke et al., 1988; Bhagat and Chassie, 1981; DeCotiis and Summers, 1987; Kluge, 1988; Ogilvie, 1986; Pfeffer and Lawler, 1980; Shrivastava, 1978; and Stone and Porter, 1975).

Some studies have, however, failed to find a significant relationship between the two variables (Bluedorn, 1982; Curry et al., 1988; and Flynn and Solomon, 1985). Morrow and McElroy (1987) failed to find a significant relationship between commitment and satisfaction with pay.
Pay was also posited to be significantly related to commitment in the pioneer study by Ritzer and Trice (1969) which attempted to test the side-bet theory of organizational commitment. They found that a positive relationship did exist. Pay can be said to account for enhanced commitment in a manner also explained by Hall and Nougain (1968) who mentioned that salary is the evidence of his success to a manager, and an enhanced feeling of success and self-esteem leads to heightened commitment.

The review of literature leads to the conclusion that it is not salary, or pay per se that is important, what is seemingly important is equity. Equity would be explained as perception of rewards being commensurate with perceived input, a kind of rough cost-benefit analysis. Bluedorn (1982), Bruning and Snyder (1983) and William and Hazer (1986) found that equity seemed a probable determinant of organizational commitment. Dornstein and Matalon (1989) reported pay equity was significantly related to commitment. Another important aspect of study with regard to pay is the satisfaction with pay which has been studied by Alutto et al. (1973), DeCotiis and Summers (1987), and Flynn and Solomon (1985).

But, even in studying satisfaction with pay and its relationship with organizational commitment, Welsch and LaVan (1981) failed to find a significant relationship between the two.

As with most other variables, neither cut and dried
relationships exist and nor are cut and dried explanations plausible. There are complex and intricate mediations which may lead to certain consequences prohibiting unidirectional arrow formations.

Pay or salary has also been studied in relation to job involvement. Some studies reported a positive relationship between pay and job involvement (Aleem and Khandelwal, 1988, 1989; Brooke et al., 1988; Orpen, 1986). Pathak and Pathak (1987) reported a positive relationship between job involvement and income for a sample of workers.

Happali and Mallappa (1988), Knoop (1986), and Saal (1978) failed to find any significant relationship between the two variables. Morrow and McElroy (1987) also reported lack of significant relationship between job involvement and satisfaction with pay.

A significant positive relationship between pay and job involvement may possibly be more true for developing economies and lower rungs of hierarchies. Owing to the conditions of the economies, higher pay package are necessary for people at lower levels to meet their subsistence needs. At upper levels, however, they connote a heightened sense of responsibility in corporate sector.

Some of the available investigations failed to conclusively report a positive relationship between salary and job involvement, and between salary and organizational commitment. However, there are some empirical verifications of a positive relationship between these variables. Salary would foster organizational commitment and job involvement by
increasing felt responsibility of the employee and strengthening the existing positive orientation to the job. Drawing upon the available research investigations it is thus hypothesized that: salary is positively related to organizational commitment.

However, the relationship between salary and job involvement needs to be explored.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Number of Suggestions**

Although there is a lot of emphasis being placed on participation in decision making by the employees, there seems to be a dearth of studies which have operationalized one aspect of participation. This aspect pertains to the number of suggestions given by the employees, acceptance of these suggestions, and a systematic investigation of its relationship to organizational commitment of the respondents.

The number of suggestions an individual gives and are accepted by the organization should be indicative of his felt responsibility. Giving suggestions is important in itself but even more important is the fact that these suggestions are considered carefully by the organization. This would consequently affect commitment. Jaiswal (1982) found that organizational commitment depended upon the satisfaction of higher order needs among which felt responsibility was very important. Herzberg (1966) stated that contextual needs have to be satisfied before an individual
can be motivated or committed to the organization. Kanungo and Misra (1988) also found that in the work context, growth needs are most important. Verma and Roy (1988) supported this view by stating that need satisfaction had a positive impact on commitment of employees to organizations.

No study which had investigated the relationship between job involvement and number of suggestions given could be traced. Hence, it would be reasonable to investigate the impact of suggestions given by the respondents to the organization and its relationship with commitment and involvement.

On the basis of the possible importance of this variable and lack of empirical findings with regard to the same, it can be said that number of suggestions given by the employees and accepted by the organization need to be investigated in relation to organizational commitment as well as job involvement.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Role Stress (Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity)**

Role conflict and role ambiguity (taken together are mentioned as role stress) are important intervening variables that mediate the effects of various organizational practices on individual and organizational outcomes (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Argyris (1957), Ben David (1958), Kornhauser (1962), Reissman (1949), and Wilensky (1956) have studied role conflict among professional employees in various organizational
settings. Citing the importance of meaningful research conducted on role conflict, Maruyama (1963) suggested that in a paradigm of mutual causal process of organizational behaviour, this would play a significant role.

It follows from a glance at the concepts of both role stress and organizational commitment that some relationship of significance would exist. If a respondent is working for any organization, then one of the ways in which the organization would be able to foster commitment in him would be by providing him with clear instructions regarding the role which he is expected to perform. Hence, a lower degree of role ambiguity and high clarity will lead to being committed to the organization. Lower role ambiguity would foster commitment by enabling a respondent to perceive clearly the role expectations from him.

Similarly, if conflicting demands are eliminated from a person's role set, it would enable him to be committed to the organization. The lack of conflict may be stated to lead to a stage of clarity, and ensuing commitment.

Mowday et al. (1982) referring to role related variables state that with regard to these, the concern would relate to the extent to which variation in the task requirements of jobs influences employee commitment. Role conflict and ambiguity are important potential elements influencing commitment. Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) also stated that role related variables be considered as having significant impact on commitment. Finally, Katz and Kahn (1966) had also suggested that role taking is important in deciding as
to how various factors influence organizational behaviour. Van Sell, Brief, and Schuler (1981) suggested that role conflict and role ambiguity be studied in relation to organizational commitment. Stressing the importance of the variables of role conflict and role ambiguity, Bennis (1962), Kornhauser (1965), and Likert (1961) state that lack of ambiguity in the performance of organizational roles could be regarded as an organizational asset.

Literature is rather unequivocal in terms of commitment-role ambiguity and commitment-role conflict relationship, i.e., a negative relation between commitment and role ambiguity, as well as between commitment and role conflict is often found. However, there are some studies which failed to find any significant relationship between these variables. For instance, Flynn and Solomon (1985) failed to find the negative relationship between role ambiguity and organizational commitment. Hrebinjak and Alutto (1972) found that organizational commitment did not vary as a function of perceived role conflict. Role conflict as conceived by them, however, measured the disparity between professional and organizational expectations. Moreover, tension and commitment were inversely related. Tension measured, among other things, a respondent's feelings of uncertainty regarding role requirements. A lot of research investigations suggested that role stress had negative effects on commitment (French and Caplan, 1973; Schuler, 1975; and Rizzo et al., 1970). Vredenburgh and Trinkaus
(1983) in a study of hospital nurses, stated that professional commitment predicted role stress. They used Alutto et al.'s (1970) conceptualisation of professional commitment, and role stress was operationalized in terms of job tension, initially conceived by Kahn et al. (1964).

Alutto (1969) found that increased role tension diminishes commitment by making extra organizational alternatives more attractive. Bluedorn (1982) found potential role conflict, adapting it from Kahn et al.'s (1964) definition, to be significantly negatively related to commitment. DeCotiis and Summers (1987) also found that both role conflict and role ambiguity were significantly negatively related to commitment. Mathieu (1988) found role strain to be negatively influencing organizational commitment. Mathieu and Hamel (1989) stated that role strain had a significant negative impact with regard to organizational commitment for non professionals. Fisher and Gitelson (1983), who meta analysed a number of studies using role conflict and role ambiguity, state that organizational commitment had a range of correlations from -.12 to -.37 (mean r=-.34) with role ambiguity, and -.12 to -.41 (mean r=-.26) with role conflict.

Dornstein and Matalon (1989), Morris and Koch (1979), and Morris and Sherman (1981) reported role conflict to have an inverse relationship with organizational commitment. However, the results for role ambiguity were contradictory. Glisson and Durick (1988) found a significant negative relationship between role ambiguity and organizational
commitment.

Salanick (1977) mentioned that when individuals do not know what is expected of them, they would be less committed to the organization. The reason he put forth is that anything which contributes to creating definite expectations for a person's behaviour would enhance his felt responsibility, and consequently the commitment to the organization. Conversely, not having clear expectations with regard to behaviour would lower commitment.

Stevens et al. (1978) found that role variables were the most important predictors of organizational commitment. They mentioned that role overload was inversely related to organizational commitment.

Commenting upon the commitment-role stress linkage, Jackson and Schuler (1985) state that as yet it is not known as to which processes explain the relationships between commitment and role ambiguity and between commitment and role conflict. They opine that the effect could be indirect rather than direct. Commitment could, according to them, partially diminish experienced role conflict and role ambiguity.

Tuma and Grimes (1981) gave a viewpoint which deserves mention. They maintain that role orientation results from organizational processes and not psychological processes. This is quite in keeping with Rizzo et al.'s (1970) contention of role conflict and ambiguity being intervening variables. Whatever may be the process, Schoenherr and Greely
creases the expectation that effort leads to performance and performance leads to outcomes. However, empirical support for this has been modest (Lee and Schuler, 1982).

Fisher and Gitelson (1983), on the basis of forty-two studies which investigated role conflict and role ambiguity in relation to other variables, gave the following statistical values. Range of correlations between job involvement and role ambiguity was from -.12 to -.37 (mean r=-.26) and for job involvement and role conflict it was from .00 to -.21 (mean r=-.15).

Greene (1972), however, stated that role ambiguity was not associated with lower levels of job involvement. Hamner and Tosi (1974) also mentioned that while studying the relationship of role stress to job involvement, organizational level must be taken into account. However, they reported an inverse relationship between role stress and job involvement. Harigopal and Ravi Kumar (1979), in their study, reported that role ambiguity and job involvement were negatively related but there was no relationship between role conflict and job involvement. Madhu and Harigopal (1980) also found the same pattern of results.

Jackson and Schuler (1985) reported a significant negative relationship between job involvement and both role conflict and role ambiguity.

In a very well conducted and detailed study, carried out on over 1573 employees on six samples in four different organizations, Schuler, Aldag, and Brief (1977) reported
and job involvement. This significant negative relationship held across all the six samples studied. Citing the data on role ambiguity and job involvement, the range of correlations were from -.12 to -.41 and barring one sample the negative relationship was significant for all other samples.

The literature cited above is a clear pointer to the fact that even though the research using these concepts has been going on for the past three decades, there is, as yet, room for more empirical input to strengthen and provide a definite shape in the trend of results. The two Indian studies reported failed to find a significant relationship between role conflict and job involvement. Since the number of studies reported are only two, it is premature to pass a judgement on the possible lack of relationship between these two variables. It could simply be an artifact peculiar to the design or set up.

Continued work in the area of these concepts may bring us to the state of unequivocal statements on relationships which exist between role stress and job involvement. On the basis of the empirical research carried out so far and the theoretical nature of the variables it is hypothesized that:

i) Both dimensions of role stress, i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity are negatively related to organizational commitment.

ii) Both dimensions of role stress, i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity are negatively related to job involvement.
Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Protestant Work Ethic

The concept of Protestant Work Ethic has changed a lot since its conception by Max Weber (1905). The Protestant Work Ethic, spoken of today, is neither Protestant, nor is it completely related to work, nor is it exclusively concerned with ethics. Protestant Work Ethic beliefs and behaviour, as defined and measured by the many Protestant Work Ethic scales, appear to be concerned with work values, beliefs and needs, and more particularly with a person's commitment to paid employment (Cook et al., 1981). Protestant Work Ethic has been reconceptualised of, as a part of a conservative value system (Beit Hallahmi, 1979; Furnham, 1982; Joe et al., 1981; MacDonalds, 1972; Mirels and Garrett, 1971). It is logical to assume that conservative beliefs would place a positive value upon loyalty to the organization and thus a positive relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and organizational commitment would be expected to exist.

Protestant Work Ethic has been conceived of as a personality disposition (Mirels and Garrett, 1971). It may also be broadly classified as a value towards work, an orientation to the place of work in one's life. Values are a part of the individual and the values a person holds, would, in a large sense, determine the manner in which he reacts to systems. Buchannan (1974), Card (1978), Dubin et al. (1975), Goodale (1973), Hall et al. (1970), Hall and Schneider (1972), Hulin and Blood (1968), Kidron (1978) and
Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) are among those who found a positive relationship between commitment and work ethic. People with strong personal work ethic tend to be highly committed to the organization.

Katzell (1979), Locke (1976), Mowday et al. (1982), and Vroom (1964) state that attitudes of the kind of satisfaction and organizational commitment are largely a function of work values and work rewards.

Kidron (1976) stated that there cannot be a simple statement upon the relationship between organizational commitment and Protestant Work Ethic. He found that the hypothesized positive relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and moral and calculative commitment to work in organization held true across three organizations. He stated that though Protestant Work Ethic is associated with strong moral identification with the organization in which one works, it may not necessarily indicate a willingness to remain in a given system. Werkmeister (1967) discussed the relationship between value orientation and commitment. He pointed out that the act of commitment is simply a manifestation of an individual's own self and further the value considerations leading to commitment reflect value standards basic to the individual's existence as a person. He also states that moral commitment or identification with goals and organizational values would be strongly related to Protestant ethic.

At the present stage of conceptual evolution of the concept of Protestant Work Ethic in organizational
behaviour, its relationship with organizational commitment needs further empirical investigation. However, the empirical enquiry can result into a significant enrichment only if the operationalization of the concept is both uniform and well crystallized across the investigation. As of now, it would suffice to say that since the presently held concept of organizational commitment allows room for identification with organizational goals (Mowday et al., 1982), a positive relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and commitment is a logical link in employee-organization linkages. However, this relationship would be mediated and vicissitudes in this would be moderated by other intervening variables like job involvement.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) viewed job involvement as a value orientation to work, similar to the Protestant Work Ethic. This orientation would be learned early in socialization, and not easily influenced in a job setting by situational factors. Hence, it is a stable attribute. Kanungo (1982) stated that patterns of socialization where this ethic is fostered as a value may be a necessary but not sufficient condition for work involvement.

Job involvement would relate positively to the Protestant Work Ethic because "work" normally finds its crystallization in terms of the "job" which a person holds. The dimension of "self-esteem" or the "salience of work" in judging one's self-worth, is a component of job involvement. Carrying the sequential extension of this definition of job
job involvement requires an identification with the work which the job entails, this would essentially be related to and mediated by the belief in the "goodness of work" which is essentially a part of the Protestant Work Ethic belief system. Hence, it may be stated that the endorsement of the pro work ethic is related to a higher involvement in the job.

Babu and Reddy (1989) reported a significant relationship between Protestant ethic and job involvement, as did Nelson (1986). Brockner, Grover, and Blonder (1988) hypothesized that those survivors (i.e., employees retained in an organization after a lay-off) who had a strong work ethic would be more involved in their jobs than those with a weak work ethic subsequent to a 'lay-off'. They found that the hypothesized relationship held true for a mild 'lay-off' condition. Blood and Hulin (1967) and Turner and Lawrence (1965) found that employees who have internalized middle class values like the Protestant Work Ethic responded more "positively" to work involvement. Rabinowitz et al. (1977) found, on the basis of the multiple regression analysis carried out by them, that Protestant Work Ethic was a part of the significant set of predictors of job involvement.

It may hence, be said that like organizational commitment, job involvement is also a part of the conservative belief system and that it is related to a value orientation like Protestant Work Ethic. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

1) Protestant Work Ethic is positively related to organiza-
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tional commitment. ii) Protestant Work Ethic is positively related to job involvement. iii) The relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and job involvement is stronger, as compared to the relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and organizational commitment.

**Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Organizational Climate**

Organizational climate has drawn attention by being a vital link in the chain of employee attitudes and outcome behaviour. The relevance of organizational climate may be judged by the mere fact that in the past few years, there are more studies in the area of organizational behaviour which have included in their purview this variable in some form or the other, than those which have not.

Although, organizational climate has attained a prime position today, the earliest concerns go back by about three decades, (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951; Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Halpin and Croft, 1963; Pace and Stern, 1958; Schneider, 1972, 1973; and Taiguri, 1968).

Fredriksen (1968) suggests that climate be seen as a moderator of the relationship between the individual characteristics individual behaviour, and the organization. Studies of organizational climate have been conducted in all kinds of organizational set ups. Gordon and Marquis (1966) and Pelz and Andrew (1966) have conducted their studies in scientific institutions. Halpin and Croft (1963), Pace and Stern (1958), and Pervin (1967) have studied the same in
academic institutions. They reported that a relationship existed between climate and job behaviour.

Prior to commencing upon a review of literature, it is logical to expect a variation in organizational commitment as a result of variation in organizational climate. Favourable organizational climate can foster favourable attitudes in terms of identification and commitment. Tziner (1987) investigated the relationship between perceived climate and organizational commitment. He found that perceived climate made a significant contribution to prediction of worker's attitude and behaviour at work. Glisson and Durick (1988) found a dominance of organizational characteristics in predicting commitment.

Climate, as studied by many researchers, has been conceived of as a vehicle of need satisfaction for those who work in the organization. If the employees perceive that the organization can satisfy the needs of the employees and the climate is perceived favourably, then commitment is fostered. Organizations also resocialize employees as Allen and Meyer (1990, p. 857) state, "...organizations can tailor their socialization practices to foster in their employees a desired organizational commitment...." Singhal and Sood (1981) found in a study on nurses that climate of the hospital was related to occupational commitment.

Alvi and Ahmed (1987) found, in a study of workers in Pakistan that any organization which fulfills the worker's psychological needs enhances their commitment even in developing economies. Similarly, extending the canvas and
taking the society at large in view, Antonovsky and Antonovsky (1974) found that the degree of commitment to society is positively related to the degree of overall need satisfaction. Commitment is higher if there is satisfaction in areas important to the person. Those who have socially important roles to be performed tend to be more committed to society. DeCotiis and Summers (1987), and Steers (1977) stated that individuals come to the organization with certain needs, expectations etc. and if the organization provides them with the climate which is conducive to the same, then the ensuing commitment is enhanced.

Viewing the commitment-climate relationship in terms of an exchange, it may be said that when the respondents perceived the organization as being committed to the realization of their needs, they are committed to the organization in return.

Agarwal (1979) found, in a sample of Block Development Officers, a feeling of being hampered by a set up which was perceived as bureaucratic and consequently lower commitment levels. Datta (1976) concluded that bureaucratic culture inhibits the development of normal human personality and is also inadequate in inducing commitment to work. This provided support to the contention of McGregor (1944), Srivastva (1976), and Strauss (1976) who had put forth a similar view. Singh (1988) also mentioned that organizations which had a high bureaucratic orientation followed complex administrative systems. Hence, the employees are dealt on an
impersonal basis. Kakabadse (1986) reported another probable manner in which centralized and bureaucratic climate affects attitudes like commitment and involvement. He stated that executives, supervisors, and professionals were characterized by feelings of powerlessness and self estrangement in centralized and bureaucratic structures. These findings can broadly be extended to suggest that certain dimensions of an organizational climate which may broadly classified to be perceived as negative would be associated with lower identification and commitment to the organization.

Jaiswal (1982) found that organizational culture, if favourable, leads to higher organizational commitment. The relationship holds true conversely as well. The terms culture and climate are used interchangeably here. He reported, "...when the organizational culture varies from Autocratic to Benevolent-Autocratic and then to Consultative and then again to Democratic form, the low range of commitment goes on decreasing" (Jaiswal, 1982,p.6). Commitment is highest in democratic organizations and lowest in autocratic and benevolent autocratic organizations.

Singh and Das (1978) conducted a study on 200 male respondents of three manufacturing organizations. They indicated that commitment of individuals to the organizations and its goals may be a function of its perceived organizational culture. They found that autocratic and benevolent autocratic organizations seem to elicit lower organization commitment than consultative and democratic
organizations. Welsch and LaVan (1981) report that there was a positive relationship between organizational commitment and perceptions of organizational climate as participative. Angle and Perry (1981) found that organizational commitment was associated with organizational adaptability. However, Dubin, Champoux, and Porter (1975) found that only the most general features of the organization are strongly related to employees' central life interest orientation. The link between climate and job satisfaction was also studied and reported by Friedlander and Marguiles (1969). Hall and Schneider (1973) reported on existence of a relationship between climate and organizational commitment. As organizational climate is a concept which encompasses many dimensions there are many studies which have sought to relate commitment with isolated dimensions of climate. These dimensions range from reward policies to group cohesiveness and so on.

Welsch and LaVan (1981) also state that evidence of a relationship between climate and commitment may be limited as most studies have used isolated fragments of climate.

The role of structure, and it being considered a dimension of organizational climate has also been a subject of some studies. Campbell et al. (1970) suggested that organizational climate affects organizational commitment in a manner independent of the effects of either structure or process variables. Katz and Kahn (1978) and Schneider (1975) also supported this. Odrisscoll (1987) conducted a
study in Papua New Guinea to investigate job attitudes of newly recruited bank employees. The factor of formalization (structural) was found to relate to organizational commitment. The findings emphasized the importance of stage of career and organizational content as important determinants of individual's work orientation.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) conducted a valuable study of organizational climate. They mention that although the importance of the structure of an organization cannot be discounted in determining attitudes and behaviour of the respondents, it is the perception of these by the individuals which is a more important determinant of individual responses to the organization. They held that if an organization creates and maintains a work environment geared towards the attainment of certain organizational goals and if the individuals's performance for a particular environment and goal set is consistent with the environment, it would be expected that the individual's commitment to the organization would be high. They found in their study that out of all the organizational climate dimensions, autonomy, trust, and cohesiveness were related to commitment. Task autonomy was also reported to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment by Mottaz (1988). Trust and dependability were reported to possess a significant relationship with organizational commitment (Hrebiniak, 1974). DeCotiis and Summers (1987) demonstrated that recognition, as found by Bateman and Strasser (1984), and Salanick (1977) was also
significantly related to commitment. Rubenowitz, Nougren, and Tannenbaum (1983) revealed that employees were likely to feel committed and satisfied to the extent that they perceived themselves personally to have authority to make decisions and to the extent that they perceived their immediate work group to make decisions. There was little commitment when they perceived decisions to be made by representatives. Pressure, fairness, innovation and support also depicted a significant relationship to commitment. Cohesiveness was also found to be significant by Buchanan (1974). Katz and Kahn (1978) maintained that organizational climate has its source in the individual’s experiences with both, the structure and the processes of the organization. Hence, concomitant effects upon commitment may be expected.

Spector (1986) conducted a meta analysis of 101 samples from studies relating perceived control variables to 19 employee outcome variables. For all studies combined it was found that high levels of perceived control were associated with high levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, involvement and a lower level of role stress. A similar pattern was found for autonomy and participation studies separately. Beauvois (1987) also reported that organizational conditions had strong positive or inverse associations with involvements in the job.

Padaki (1982, 1983, 1983a) studied the organizational climate in five family managed textile mills in Ahmedabad. She used ninety six scales to measure organizational cli-
mate. Her study suggested a significant relationship between perceived organizational climate, perceived job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational effectiveness. Some of these relationships may be mediated by personality characteristics.

Lee (1971) found that a relationship existed between organizational reward policies and commitment of the respondents. Reward policies have been perceived as one of the dimensions of organizational climate. Studying other dimensions, Marsh and Mannari (1977) found job satisfaction, employee cohesiveness, and status as important sources of commitment. Sigband (1974) suggested the importance of the communication aspect of organizational climate. He suggested that the worker wants to be communicated to, so that he may be informed. Primarily information may be considered, at the least essential if a worker is to identify with the goals of the organization. Wiener (1982) stated that commitment is enhanced when employees accept the values and goals of the organization and integrate them into their own goals and values.

Patchen (1970) and Sheldon (1971) put forth a dimension of feeling important as playing a significant role in developing feelings of commitment. This stands to gain support from Salanick's (1977) contention of commitment as being related to degree of perceived responsibility.

Buchannan (1974) emphasized, the fact that the perceptions of work experience fostered commitment. Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) stated that the effect of organizational
climate vis-a-vis commitment is subordinate to the effect of other variables like total work experience. However, organi-
zational climate did exert a secondary influence upon commit-
tment of teachers and nurses. Steers (1977) also stated that the work experience was more important than personal characteristics for fostering commitment.

"Cumulatively these studies have suggested that organizational climate may be a significant molar variable indicative of organizational culture and institutionalized organizational practices" (Khandwalla, 1988, p. 177). However, increasingly the role of organizational climate in shaping and strengthening various job attitudes like organizational commitment is being understood. Organizational climate if perceived favourable and conducive to the satisfaction of respondent's needs can act to bind the individual to the organization in terms of a profitable side-bet linkage. Apart from that, a favourably perceived organizational climate will lead to fostering of organizationally favourable attitudes. Since all employees go through a stage of socialization in the organization, and a large number of attitudes depend upon this socialization, the existing organizational climate can play a very vital role in fostering organizationally relevant and profitable attitudes. It may consequently affect outcomes and behaviour patterns.

For the past sometime, it is being increasingly debated whether the approach to club the "subunits" of any organiza-
tion, and speak of a unified climate is logical. Khandwalla
(1988) suggests that the linkage between departmental climate and departmental effectiveness may be investigated. It may also be thought that sizable organizations may have multiple climates, so a department may be a more relevant unit of investigation than an organization. However, by doing this, the purpose of studying an organization as a unified whole seems defeated.

The focus of job involvement is the job itself. However, the job is a part of the organization. Hence, perceptions of existing conditions of the work environment are bound to influence the degree of involvement which an employee would have in his job. It is the work situation which exerts the main effects on various aspects of job behaviour (Dubin, Champoux, and Porter 1975; Locke, 1976; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977).

Cawsey (1973) indicated that organizational climate is related to job satisfaction, among other things, in terms of task involvement. This was substantiated by Friedlander and Marguiles (1969), Hall and Lawler (1969), Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Pritchard and Karasick (1973), and Schneider (1972, 1973).

Clark and McCabe (1972) stated that with respect to need patterns managers live in a 'uniworld'. Sekaran (1981) substantiated in a cross cultural study of American and Indian samples that the organizational climate variable of self-esteem from workplace was important for job in-
volvement in both cultures. Hence, Clark and McCabe's (1972) contentions of a uniworld are borne out.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) mentioned that climate perceptions affect an individual's perception of congruence between organizational goals and his/her goals, and hence involvement. It is easier to become involved in the job one is doing if one perceives a congruence in one's values and goals and those ostensibly of the organization, met through performance on the job.

However, Lyon and Ivancevich (1974) found that organizational climate had only a slight impact upon esteem. This can be used as an input for partially hypothesizing the relationship of job involvement and organizational climate. Self esteem derived from work is a dimension of job involvement and if this is not very strongly related then it is clear, that perception of organizational climate does not influence job involvement very strongly. This is probably a case for the support of intrinsic nature of job involvement. A job involved person can continue being so in certain organizational environments, as he can probably insulate himself from the context.

Lee and Mowday (1987) found that organizational experiences and characteristics contributed significantly to job involvement. Pathak (1982) in a sample of bank employees found that a positive relationship existed between job involvement and organizational climate.
Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) mentioned that job involvement was related to work outcomes. They conceived of job involvement as both a cause and an effect of behaviour. Hence, it can be treated as a feed back variable. Schuler (1975) found that some organizational variables resulted in an increment of prediction of variance in job involvement, even though the increment was trivial.

Since job involvement is focussed upon the job and organizational commitment focuses upon the organization, so the relationships of both these variables may relate to different aspects of the perceived climate of the organization.

Organizational climate, like geographical climate includes and is influenced by various features of the environment. Drawing upon its conceptual diversity and proposed linkages, it may be said that various job attitudes would relate differentially to climate. It has been found that, most often the positive dimensions of climate would foster attitudes of commitment to the employing organization as well as involvement in the job one is doing. It is thus hypothesized that: i) Positive dimensions of organizational climate are positively related to organizational commitment. ii) Positive dimensions of organizational climate are positively related to job involvement. iii) Negative dimensions of organizational climate are negatively related to organizational commitment and iv) Negative dimensions of organizational climate are negatively related to job involvement.
Relationship of Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement with Orientation (Self, Task, and Interaction Orientation)

There is a paucity of research investigating the relationship of organizational commitment and job involvement with orientation. However, some literature/empirical investigations depicted other measures tapping job attitude like job satisfaction as related to orientation.

Friedlander (1966) factor analysing a questionnaire used by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959), concluded that job satisfaction has three underlying factors, i.e., recognition through advancement (which may be considered a self-oriented satisfaction), social environment (which may be considered an interaction-oriented satisfaction), and intrinsic self actualizing work (which may be considered a task-oriented satisfaction).

However, Ganesan and Rajendran (1982) found that job satisfaction was not related to personality orientation, but a motivational liking for work itself and certain hygiene factors such as working conditions and inter-personal relations with colleagues were related to personality orientations. The correlations revealed that a significant relationship existed between personality and need satisfaction as well as sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Since the organization and job provide the stimulus situation for the employee, optimized responses in terms of balanced orientation are required to foster commitment to the organization and involvement in the job. It is the
relative contribution of the three kinds of orientations which is of interest. Bass (1967, p. 261) states, "By focussing on how individuals of the three persuasions vary systematically when confronted with different social situations, opportunities are given for generalizing about the interaction of person and situation."

Self orientation was not found to relate consistently to several managerial attitude questionnaires among graduate business students (Bass, Fiedler, and Krueger, 1964). The personality orientations of respondents are not independent of their placement in functional hierarchies. Studying the association between status and task orientation, Dunteman (1966) also reported that supervisors were more interaction oriented than higher level up middle managers. Dobruszek (1967) also found that the higher a man's status in the organization, the higher is his task orientation; the lower his status the higher his interaction orientation. Although, the relationships were somewhat confounded by education and intelligence.

Drawing upon the theoretical construct of task orientation, it seems that the task oriented individual would react favourably to stimulation from the organization as well as the job in terms of his input. Furthermore, for the role of a middle level manager as an executive responsible for getting things done, task orientation would be an asset. Dunteman and Bass (1963), Lester (1964), and Zick (1966) have also shown that people in jobs requiring greater public
interaction were high in interaction orientation, but those who were in technical/research jobs were high in task orientation.

Friedlander (1966) found that among white collar technical workers, social aspects of the job motivated poorer performers, whereas, intrinsic task relevant aspects of the job motivated better performers.

Evidence based on peer and superior ratings of performance in industrial jobs suggests that a task oriented member is more likely to emerge and succeed as a leader in small group as well as large organizations (Bass and Dunteman, 1963; and Dunteman and Bass, 1963). Given the description of a person high on either self, task, or interaction-orientation, the importance of task orientation as a personality dimension related to desired outcome like commitment and involvement merits attention. Bass (1967) suggested that the task oriented person would be directed towards attainment of goals and be persistent in his efforts.

There is little empirical research available to guide the researchers. Hence, against available theoretical conceptualization and operationalization it is hypothesized that: i) Task orientation is positively related to organizational commitment. ii) Task orientation is positively related to job involvement.

The literature reviewed in the present section reveals that at the present stage of empirical research, there are very few operationalised constructs which have clear relationships with organizational commitment and job involve-
ment. On the Indian sample especially, most relationships, even those concerning the demographic variables need to be investigated for facilitating the formulation of various action plans as well as improvement strategies.

Keeping in mind the need of the hour, the present research was designed as, "A study of organizational commitment and job involvement in relation to role stress, Protestant Work Ethic, organizational climate and orientation". The primary and secondary aims, and hypotheses are presented below:

**Aims and Hypotheses**

1) To determine the extent to which there is a common factor running through organizational commitment and job involvement.

2) To determine whether organizational commitment and job involvement have common correlates.

3) To study the nature of the relationships of organizational commitment and job involvement with the following variables:
   a) Role Stress,
   b) Protestant Work Ethic,
   c) Organizational Climate, and
   d) Orientation.

Some secondary aims were also postulated as stated below:

1) To investigate the relationship of organizational commitment and job involvement with the following personal and socio demographic variables:
socio demographic variables:

a) Age,
b) Level of educational qualifications,
c) Marital status,
d) Status of spouse (earning/non-earning),
e) Residential background (rural/urban), and
f) Number of dependents.

2) The following few "organization specific" variables were also included in the study and their relationship with organizational commitment and job involvement was also examined.

a) Tenure with present organization,
b) Total work experience,
c) Salary,
d) Promotions, and
f) Number of suggestions given by the employee and accepted by the organization.

With regard to the present investigation, it is hypothesized that:

1) Organizational commitment, job involvement and Protestant Work Ethic are distinct constructs, displaying a positive correlation with each other (the distinctiveness of the constructs is to be tested by subjecting them to factor analysis).

2) Both dimensions of role stress, i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity are negatively related to organizational commitment.
3) Both dimensions of role stress, i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity are negatively related to job involvement.

4) Protestant Work Ethic is positively related to organizational commitment.

5) Protestant Work Ethic is positively related to job involvement.

6) The relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and job involvement is stronger, as compared to the relationship between Protestant Work Ethic and organizational commitment.

7) The following positive dimensions of organizational climate, viz.,
   a) Status acceptance,
   b) Efficiency,
   c) Task oriented climate,
   d) Involvement,
   e) Favourable working conditions,
   f) Work relationships, and
   g) Inter-personal relationships,
are positively related to organizational commitment.

8) The following positive dimensions of organizational climate, viz.,
   a) Status acceptance,
   b) Efficiency,
   c) Task oriented climate,
   d) Involvement,
   e) Favourable working conditions,
   f) Work relationships, and
g) Inter-personal relationships, are positively related to job involvement.

9) The following two negative dimensions of organizational climate viz.,
   a) Authoritarian climate, and
   b) Bureaucratic climate,
are negatively related to organizational commitment.

10) The following two negative dimensions of organizational climate viz.,
   a) Authoritarian climate, and
   b) Bureaucratic climate,
are negatively related to job involvement.

11) Task orientation is positively related to organizational commitment.

12) Task orientation is positively related to job involvement.

The following hypotheses were formulated for the various personal, socio-demographic, and organization specific variables:

1) Age is positively related to organizational commitment, the older employees being more committed.

2) Age is positively related to job involvement, the older employees being more involved.

3) Tenure is positively related to organizational commitment, the employees with longer tenure being more committed.

4) Tenure is positively related to job involvement, the employees with longer tenure being more involved.
5) Employees having more dependents are higher on commitment to the organization.

6) Married employees, as compared to unmarried employees, are higher on commitment to the organization.

7) Employees having an earning spouse, as compared to those having a non-earning spouse, are more committed to the organization.

8) Total work experience is positively related to organizational commitment, the employees with longer experience being more committed.

9) Total work experience is positively related to job involvement, the employees with longer experience being more committed.

10) Level of educational qualifications is inversely related to organizational commitment, the more educated employees being less committed.

11) Salary is positively related to organizational commitment.

The present investigation will provide an opportunity to examine the following relationships about which no hypotheses are being formulated:

1) Promotions attained by the respondent and its relationship to both organizational commitment and job involvement.

2) The number of suggestions given by the respondent, accepted by the organization and its relationship to both organizational commitment and job involvement.
3) The relationship between background (rural/urban) and organizational commitment and job involvement of the respondents.

4) Relationship between job involvement and the following variables needs to be explored:
   a) the respondent's educational qualifications,
   b) the respondent's marital status,
   c) the number of dependents a respondent has,
   d) the tenure of the respondent,
   e) salary drawn by the respondent, and
   f) the status of the respondent's spouse (earning/non-earning).