



REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT IN RELATION TO SOME PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL VARIABLES

*Priyanka and **Dr. Rahul Garg

*Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)

**Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, SunRise University, Alwar, Rajasthan (India)
priyankasugoor@gmail.com

Abstract: Business organizations in their work environment, aspire to create a high level of performance and low levels of absenteeism and turnover. Organizational commitment is considered a key factor in achieving this objective, however, it can be conditioned by several factors, among which is the psychological contract. The literature has related the organizational commitment with the fulfillment of the psychological contract framing it as one of the explanatory variables. This work aims to investigate research trends on psychological contract and organizational commitment. For this purpose, bibliometric techniques and the software SciMAT have been used. 220 journal articles indexed in Web of Science (WoS) were analyzed. The findings indicate that the theme chosen for this review is valid. Based on the relationship between the two concepts, as the most recurrent themes, issues such as the sense of justice and the consequences of the violation of the psychological contract, normative commitment, HR management or job insecurity are addressed. However, in the last period analyzed (2015–2018), publications related to more sensitive topics to the present time emerge, such as the employability or the impact of these two concepts in the new generations (millennial and generation-Y) or the retention of talent.

[Priyanka and Garg, R. **REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT IN RELATION TO SOME PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL VARIABLES**. *Rep Opinion* 2024;16(7):7-10]. ISSN 1553-9873 (print); ISSN 2375-7205 (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/report>. 02. doi:[10.7537/marsroj160724.02](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsroj160724.02).

Keywords: REVIEW OF LITERATURE, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT IN RELATION TO SOME PERSONAL AND ORGANISATIONAL VARIABLES

Introduction: Committed employees are crucial to organizational success in today's demanding economic environment where workers are encouraged to exceed expectations to help their employers to compete more effectively (Rubel et al., 2021; Shabir & Gani, 2020). Such workers usually identify with and have a deep understanding of their organizations' aims and ideals (Lambert et al., 2017). Due to its practical significance, the concept of organizational commitment, which refers to a psychological attachment that employees may have to their specific organizations, is common in management and organizational studies literature, particularly that which concerns developed countries (Choi et al., 2015; Fischer et al., 2020; Lambert et al., 2020; Meyer & Allen, 1984). Of note, many of the previous studies rely on Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-components of organizational commitment, namely affective organizational commitment (a favorable emotional connection to an organization), normative organizational commitment (perception that an individual is inextricably linked to the organization once he or she joins), and continuance organizational commitment (the perceived cost or reward of leaving an organization).

The purpose of this study is to decipher the dynamics underlying the continuance organizational commitment variable which has been neglected in previous organizational and human resource management research (Farrukh et al., 2017). This is a deficiency in the current corpus of research about organizational commitment, given the centrality of the idea of continuance organizational commitment in management practice. The study recognizes that despite the trivialization of the continuance organizational commitment variable, some researchers affirm that it aids organizational performance and success in (1) entrepreneurial entities (Abdul Rashid et al., 2003), (2) situations where workers are less unionized and institutional leaders are dominant, and (3) where workers believe that working harder for organizational success will enhance their long-term personal interests (Suliman & Iles, 2000). In the current study, the focus is exclusively on this variable due to its relevance to the unique condition of workers in under-resourced institutions functioning in contexts with few better alternative job prospects. In such circumstances, an individual's decision to quit or remain in an organization is heavily influenced by the

payoffs associated with leaving or remaining. Thus, leaders of such organizations cannot afford to discount the continuance organizational commitment variable's relevance. In addition, previous studies have focused overwhelmingly on the affective and normative dimensions with scant regard for continuance organizational commitment.

The present study draws on the views of a sample of employees of selected independent but non-trust funded schools in western Zimbabwe. Many of these schools are severely under-resourced, struggle to retain staff, and occasionally provide subpar services to students (Mangwaya et al., 2014; Mhandu & Dambudzo, 2016; Nyagadza & Mazuruse, 2021; Tichagwa, 2012). It is worth noting that managers and leaders in these organizations struggle to reduce high staff turnover, even though departing employees have few job options in the Zimbabwean labor market. According to the Zimstats (2021), only 26% of the country's employed population worked in the formal sector, highlighting the country's ongoing job problem.

In the current business context, a change toward an efficiency model based on organizational commitment is required. Business organizations need to form teams that are highly committed to their strategic objectives, oriented toward organization and work. Human resource management is positioned as one of the main functions within the organization where working conditions, worker welfare and job satisfaction are valued, which helps to maintain high levels of organizational commitment (Tiwari and Singh, 2014; Kurtessis et al., 2017). The formation of organizational commitment is related to the inputs that the worker receives from the organization and is intimately linked to the results of the relationship between both parties, as well as to the emotional bond between the goals and values of the organization and the employee (Buchanan, 1974). This exchange relationship between worker and company can affect work performance, absenteeism and job rotation (Betanzos and Paz, 2007). The literature in many works has related the organizational commitment to the fulfillment of the psychological contract, that is, the degree of compliance with the promises made by the organization (Rousseau and Parks, 1993), framing it as an explanatory and determining variable of the organizational commitment (Guest, 1998; Zaragoza and Solanes Puchol, 2013). The following provides a review of these two concepts; psychological contract and organizational commitment, as well as the relationship between them.

Meyer and Allen (1984, p. 289) define continuance organizational commitment as “the extent to which employees feel that they are committed to their organizations when considering the costs of leaving the organization.” Workers become psychologically

attached to their employers over time (Clarke, 2010). This is because workers generally invest in long-standing stays in organizations (Vandenberghe & Panaccio, 2013). Ultimately, they consider these investments when contemplating leaving an organization (Lambert et al., 2015). If new job opportunities arise elsewhere, individuals make cost-benefit comparisons of quitting or remaining using opportunity costs as a criterion. Continuance organizational commitment is stronger when personal stakes in the current role surpass the perceived benefits of a new job offer (Wang et al., 2010).

Results from research on the effects of continuance organizational commitment on organizational performance are mixed. Some suggest continuance organizational commitment does not enhance performance (Kaplan & Kaplan, 2018; Rahman et al., 2015) and entrenches employee resistance to change (Genevičiūtė-Janonienė & Endriulaitienė, 2014). However, others claim that the nature of the relationship is circumstantial. For instance, results of Abdul Rashid et al.'s (2003) study of the influence of culture and organizational commitment on financial performance in Malaysian firms suggested that in corporations with entrepreneurial cultures, continuance organizational commitment has a greater influence on organizational success. Suliman and Iles (2000) also assert that where labor is less unionized and managers are powerful, workers work harder to ensure continued membership of their organizations. In such circumstances, continuance organizational commitment motivates employees to work harder and enhance firm performance to protect personal interests.

Review of Literature

There are various definitions of organizational commitment one been as the desire on the part of the employee to make high efforts for the good of the institution, longing to remain in it and accept its main objectives and values (Porter and Lawer, 1965). Another widely accepted definition is that of Greenberg and Baron (2008) who define organizational commitment as the degree to which employees identify with the organization where they work, the degree of commitment they show and whether they are willing to leave it. In research related to organizational engagement, three different perspectives can be distinguished. The first one is born from the perspective of social exchange, where the commitment of the individual to the organization is the result of the small investments that he or she has made over time and that would stop his or her voluntary disengagement from the organization (Becker, 1960). This perspective was later developed by Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997) where it was called Commitment

to Continuity (CC). The second model, Affective Commitment (CA), leans toward a psychological perspective, where emphasis is placed on the binding force between the person and the organization. It is characterized by the employee's desire to remain a member of the organization, accepting values and goals from the organization in exchange for certain psychological rewards, such as support or recognition (Mowday et al., 1979; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). The third perspective, or Normative Commitment (NC) developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) is focuses on the work ethic and the responsibility that the worker acquires, which drives him/her to do his/her job well in any circumstance. This normative commitment has been the source of multiple interpretations regarding its independence as an element of study (Varona, 1993; Ko et al., 1997; Bergman, 2006; González and Guillén, 2008). On the other hand, organizations have assimilated that employees represent their most important asset (Glen, 2006; Fulmer and Ployhart, 2014; Millar et al., 2017). Job satisfaction and job motivation, among other factors, become key aspects for the company's success. Several attempts have been made at an integrated theory for analyzing motivation at work, covering most approaches and factors involved in employee motivation and expectations (Donovan, 2001; Locke and Latham, 2004), although no complete consensus has been reached. As for organizational commitment, it is closely linked to job satisfaction. This satisfaction depends on many factors, but most are related to what the organization brings to the employee. Some studies indicate that job satisfaction precedes the level of organizational commitment (Meyer et al., 2002; Morrow, 2011), in contrast, other research defends the idea that it is organizational commitment that is a predecessor to job satisfaction (Price and Mueller, 1981; Curry et al., 1986). Organizational engagement of employees has been addressed in remarkable research where one can distinguish between so-called individual theories and process theories. Individual theories are based on the individual, the needs of the individual, and his or her motivation to act in one way or another. In this section we could cite: the Theory of Motivation (Maslow, 1943); the Theory of Hierarchy (Alderfer, 1969); or the Theory of Motivation-Hygiene (Herzberg, 2005). The process theories also include the characteristics of the job or work environment, where other factors surrounding the individual are taken into account and are focused on analyzing why people have different behaviors in relation to the commitment to their organization. Among these process theories are, The Theory of Work and Motivation (Vroom, 1964), Goal Setting Theory (Locke, 1968) and the Theory of Equity (Adams, 1963) (see Culibrk et al., 2018).

Research on OC have indicated that OC is a spontaneous, organic process that develops through the association of an individual to the organization (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1990, Meyer & Allen, 1991; Messner, 2013). It can be based on various stages or levels of commitment with antecedents that are based on an individual's perception of loyalty. The commitment of employees to an organization is essential because it affects their engagement in the organization and contributes to their retention (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Ghazzawi, 2008; Tuna et al., 2011). Employees are more willing to invest in their work when they feel that the organization supports their psychological need to feel safe and supported (Kahn, 1990; Maslow, 1958). Those employees who are committed also have a greater sense of job satisfaction, which may be a predictor of engagement (Ghazzawi & Smith, 2009; Nelson & Quick, 2008; Toor & Ofori, 2009; Tuna et al., 2011). Nelson and Quick (2008) and Tuna et al. (2016) among others have noted that, the extent of how strongly an individual identifies with an organization is a predictor of the individual's OC. Employees who are committed have a sense of purpose that may help them to advance organizational goals and objectives (Tuna et al., 2011). These researchers connected OC to the social identity theory. This theory is an integral relevance to the organization's external image or its perceived external prestige and looked at in a positive sense. Thus this connection plays an integral role in employees' strong identification with and commitment to an organization (see for example, Alias et al., 2013; Carmeli, et al., 2006; Demir, 2011; Tuna, et al., 2016). Others have classified OC into attitudinal and behavioral ones. While attitudinal commitment focuses on the process by which people come to think about their relationship with the organization, behavioral commitment relates to the process by which individuals become locked into a certain organization and the way they deal with organizational circumstances (Mowday et al., 1982). The understanding of the employees' psychological attachment to the organization that is based on one's attitude, organizational identification or involvement, and loyalty, is imperative to understanding the subject of OC (Porter et al., 1974). Porter et al. (1974) further developed the idea of employee attitude as a perspective that includes either a psychological or an affective relationship between the employee and the organization, which is dependent upon the employee's identification with, and involvement in, the organization. This theoretical conceptualization became known as the exchange theory of employee commitment (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Singh & Gupta, 2015). Accordingly, Porter et al. (1974) defined employee commitment as "an attachment to the organization, characterized by the

intention to remain in it; an identification with the values and goals of the organization; and a willingness to exert extra effort on its behalf" (p. 604). Individuals consider whether their personal goals and values align to those of the organization, and if so, there is a greater likelihood of loyalty and attachment of the individual to the organization (Porter et al., 1974). Similarly, while side-bet commitment (Becker, 1960) is both a normative and calculative consideration of the employee, it is influenced by psychological factors outside of economic compensation (Mowday et al., 1982). An individual will remain committed until certain situational pressures create a need for the employee to conduct a cost-benefit analysis to leave the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). This behavioral aspect is unique to each individual, and cannot be adequately accounted for when determining long-term employee commitment to the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). In 1984, Meyer and Allen conducted a study in an attempt to compare past methodologies used in testing the side-bet theory. Prior to 1984, the most common way to test the side-bet theory was to show an increase in commitment as side bets increased (Meyer & Allen, 1984). The conflict, in Meyer and Allen's (1984) hypothesis, was that correlations in the former methods of testing Becker's side-bet theory were subject to alternate interpretations (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990). Most studies pointed to continuance commitment, defined as the extent to which an employee feels committed to his or her organization as a construct of his or her compensation (Meyer & Allen, 1984).

References:

- [1]. Bagozzi, R. P. 1980. Performance and satisfaction in an industrial sales force: An examination of their antecedents and simultaneity. *Journal of Marketing*, 15(4): 65-67.
- [2]. Bartol, K. M. 1979. Professionalism as a predictor of organizational commitment, role stress, and turnover: A multidimensional approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22: 815-821.
- [3]. Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. 1984. A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1): 95-112.
- [4]. Becker, H. S. 1960. Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66: 32-40.
- [5]. Bell, N. and Staw, B. (1989). People as sculptors versus sculpture: The roles of personal and personal control in organizations. In J. Ott (Ed.), *Classic readings in organizational behavior* (365-378).
- [6]. Florida: Harcourt Brace & Company. Benkhoff, B. (1997). Disentangling organizational commitment. *Personnel Review*, 26, 114-131.
- [7]. Brandes, P., Castro, S.L., James, M., Martinez, A.D., Matherly, T.A., Ferris, G.R., Hochwarter, W. 2008. Interactive effects of job insecurity and organisational cynicism on work effort following layoff. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies*, 14, 233-247.
- [8]. Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. 1994. The effect of effort on sales performance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(2): 70-80.
- [9]. Brownell, P. (1981). Participation in budgeting, locus of control and organizational effectiveness. *The accounting review*, 56, 844-860.
- [10]. Cooke, D. K. (1997). Discriminant validity of the organizational commitment questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 431-441.
- [11]. Curry, J.P., Wakefield, D.S., Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. 1986. On the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 847-858.
- [12]. Dailey, R. (1980). Relationship between locus of control, task characteristics, and work attitudes. *Psychological reports*, 47, 855-861.
- [13]. DeCotiis, T.A., & Summers, T. P. 1987. The path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*. 40(7): 445-470.

7/12/2024