

Relationship between Employees' Partnership & their Organizational Commitment (Simple and Multi Correlation Analysis at University)

Dr.Nasser Javaherizadeh

Department of Management, Boroojerd Branchm, Islamic Azad University, Boroojerd, Iran

Dr.Javad Mehrabi

Department of Management, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

E-Mail: Mehrabijavad@qiau.ac.ir

Dr.Farideddin Allameh Haery

Department of management and Accounting, Mobarakeh Branch, Islamic Azad university
Isfahan, Iran

Hesam Naie

Master of Executive Management, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch, Qazvin, Iran

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v3-i5/112>

Published Date: 28 May 2013

Abstract

This article is part of research results published in year 2011. Research methodology is descriptive-correlation and statistical universe is employees of Lorestan University by having education of minimum Bachelor's Degree. 200 persons were selected by using random method. Data were collected by using questionnaire of Alen Vemir and Bavel Laver which was analyzed by using simple correlation analysis, variance analysis and regression analysis. Results of research reveal that partnership of university employees on organizational decision making has 3 components including: influence and control, access to information, organizational improvers that have significant multi correlation with organizational commitment and 3 fields (affective, continuance, normative). Results of research reveal that employees' partnership in making decision (influence, control and accessing to information) may justify 20% affective aspect of organizational commitment and accessing to information may explain 17% normative aspects and organizational controllers may explain 16% aspect of continuance organizational commitment. In addition partnership in making decisions of university may explain 51% organizational commitment of employees.

Keywords: Employees' Partnership, Decision Making, Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Duty Commitment

1. Introduction

Several researchers believe that organizational commitment improves individual dependency to organization and referred that in case of having employees with high level of organizational commitment; it may lead to increasing ability of organization and performance of employees (Sayyadi & Sarvtamin 2011). Some properties of successful leaders are including: dividing power and liability among their employees, trust their followers and attempt to eliminate any type of impediments, encourage their employees and increase their motivation (Meriac & Polling & Woehr 2009). Employees' partnership in making decision and using their comments improves responsibility and organizational commitment of employees (Joo & Lin 2009). Nevertheless, relationship between group decision making or partnership in making decision and organizational commitment is among topics that is generally neglected. Several researches have insisted on productive or service organizations; however, this topic received less attention in university. Meanwhile, universities are regarded as most important organization of each society and whereas environment of university is open and dynamic and its employees have high level of social growth and specialty, it is necessary to improve group decision making. Thus, this article is prepared with the goal of analyzing simple relationship and group multi decision making and organizational commitment of employees of Lorestan University.

2. Literature Review

Organizational Commitment

Buchanan 1974 has defined commitment as: commitment is a type of affective-prejudice dependency to values and goals of organization. Steers & Porter 1983 has defined commitment as: relative degree of person's identity and specific organization. Within this definition, organizational commitment is divided into 3 factors including:

- A) Strong belief in goals and values of organization
- B) Preference for considerable attempt for improving organization
- C) Strong desire for continuing membership in organization

Cropanzano et al 1997 defined organizational commitment as: type of affective feeling toward organization. In sum it seems that all of the aforesaid definitions in relation to organizational commitment involve the following 3 general topics:

- A) Affective dependency to organization
- B) Probable costs due to leaving organization
- C) Liability and obligation for staying in organization

Meyer & Allen 1991 believed that commitment is a type of mental mode that creates a type of preference, demand and obligation to continue staying in organization. Their model referred to 3 important factors including: affective commitment, continuance commitment,

normative commitment. The common point of these factors is that commitment is a type of mental mode determining relationship of employees with organization and implies to continuation or stop membership of person in organization. Mowday et al (1982) defined concept of Commitment Propensity as innate preference to commitment i.e. set of properties and individual experience that person may transfer them to organization and offer 3 components for them including: personal properties, expectations and organizational selection factor [Thomas 1992]. Salancik has referred to 4 important aspects of commitment as: observation, straightforwardness, unchangeable behavior and individual will (Zheng Sharan & Wei 2011). Steers et al 1983 have referred to some effective factors on improving organizational commitment of employees as: personal factors, organizational factors and non-organizational factors. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) upon analyzing several findings of research have referred to some effective personal traits on organizational commitment as: age, sex, education, marriage, service record, organizational position, inference of personal competency, abilities, salary and wage, level of job. Allen & Meyer 1991 have referred to several pre-conditions of affective commitment as: personal and structural traits and properties related to job experience. Research of Cuskelly & Boag 2011 revealed that organizational commitment is regarded as important factor preventing from absence of managers. Research by Fledman & Arnold 1985 in relation to working values and organizational commitment at a multi nationality company in the field of electronic industry in Singapore revealed that some variables including: involving in work for being successful and payment have positive significant correlation with organizational commitment. Siders Geroage & Dharwadker 2001 through offering research narrated by Brong and Snider 1993 classified some effective factors on organizational commitment as:

- * Social procedures: leadership, group coherence
- * Awareness of situation: paradox of role, ambiguity in role, clarity of role
- * Personal evaluation: personal competency
- * Job satisfaction: satisfaction from nature of job, salary and promotion.

They concluded that all of the aforesaid variables except paradox at role and ambiguity of role, have positive significant relationship with organizational commitment.

Another research was performed in relation to 285 employees working in Sydney which revealed that relation based leadership style has significant relationship with organizational commitment of employees (Peterlok Weswood & Carawford 2005). Another research was performed on employees working at U.S.A and its results revealed that units executing partnership managerial style, have higher level of organizational commitment among their managers, employees and also have lower level of job stress; which led to increasing quality and productivity of organization (Douglas 2006). Penli & Gold 2000 referred to 3 forms of commitment as: ethical commitment, thrifty commitment and alienation commitment. Definition of ethical commitment and affective commitment of Alen (1993) and value commitment of Angel Pari (1999) and Mayer Shorman (1998) is equal (Somers 2009). Thrifty commitment is compatible with CHATMAN & OREILLY 1986 model and may be regarded as form of motivation instead of commitment. Finally alienation commitment and continuance commitment of Alen is equal (Meyer Herkosih 2001). Several today's organizations are able to execute encourage their employees to offer new ideas, freedom of employees to make new decision and creation of innovation (Deft and Noi 2001). Several methods of enabling are

introduced by Robert Ford and Mireven Folter. This sequence begins from initial system of suggestion box that employees do not have any freedom (like workers of assembly line) and management without any explanation either accept or reject suggestions and terminates when there is complete ability i.e. where employees are involved in preparing strategies of organization. Lashli referred to managerial innovations for enabling employees as follows:

- 1) Enabling through partnership: delegating decision making to employees
- 2) Enabling through involving interested persons to benefit from their experiences, ideas and suggestions (Molins 1999)

Today's organization attempt to meet requirements of ever-growing technology and globalization and believe that employee's partnership in making decision is regarded as method of obtaining knowledge. Kotel claims that employee's partnership results in increasing satisfaction and commitment of employees (Lateham & Vintez 1994). For executing any type of enabling, managers should equip their employees and involve them in decision making processes. Employee's partnership in organizational decision is regarded as effective factor for obtaining to goals of organization which may have different aspects. Duchler and Vilport have referred to 3 aspects of decision making including: official influence against unofficial influence, direct influence against indirect influence and degree of access (zheng 2011). Loko & Sheikaer refer to partnership in making decision as level of partnership. Recently Belk and Gorgisen by using previous researches have mixed 6 aspects of partnership including: degree of partnership, level of partnership, domain of partnership, basis of partnership, limits of partnership. They believe that degree of partnership is more public among organizations (Branda & Verna 2004, page 43). Degree of partnership may be defined as set of key factors that based on them it is possible to evaluate partnership and make judgment in relation to partnership mechanism. These elements are including:

Influence and control: the key component of partnership is influence and control of people within decision making process that is regarded as legitimate right. Influence of employees in decision making processes is performed by counseling. Although partnership mechanisms and level of influence of employees in decision making process is not equal, all of them recognize degree of influence and control for their employees.

Access to information: for partnership of employees within all of its different forms, organizations should prepare ability of access to information. In this way employees by accessing to their required information are faced with real condition and may have more effective partnership. As Bavel and Lavler suggest, access to information about strategic goals and environmental changes led to have greater image (Lambert; Paoline 2008)

Improvement: if employees do not have required motivation for partnership, certainly they do not participate in decision making process. Anticipating improvements such as: bonus, support by senior management, partnership festivals and finding relationship between different administrative systems is necessary (Magoshi & Chang 2009).

Theoretical basics of this research according to organizational commitment model of Alen and Mir are including:

- 1) Affective commitment

- 2) Continuance commitment
- 3) Normative commitment

In spite of several researches in the field of organizational commitment, different definitions of this term, different cultures, different theories it is impossible to completely depend on results of this research. Some thinkers including Alen Mir (1990) Aiverson Batgich (1998) Grin et al (2000) have referred to such problems and Braven (2003) described these differences and disagreement as confusing issue. Such differences and disagreements reveals necessity of performing more research in this field. Whereas several researchers are related to industrial or service organizations and due to importance and complexity of condition and existence of knowledge based employees, it is a must to perform more research about this issue.

Research Hypothesis

- 1) There is positive correlation between partnership of employees for making decision and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers)
- 2) There is positive correlation between control and influence and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers)
- 3) There is positive correlation between access to information and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers)
- 4) There is positive correlation between organizational enabler and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers)
- 5) There is positive correlation between components of partnership of employees for making decision (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers) and organizational commitment

Research Methodology

Research methodology is descriptive-correlation. Statistical universe of this research is 570 employees of Lorestan University in year 2010; in which, by using Kokran formula and random sampling method 200 persons were selected as sample. Tool for collecting data was questionnaire of Alen and Mir (1990) for evaluating organizational commitment and questionnaire of Bavel Velader for evaluating level of partnership in making decision narrated by Lich Val (2006). Questionnaire of organizational commitment had 24 articles, 3 affective and normative micro scales. Validity and reliability coefficient of previous researches were confirmed so that Modi et al (1979) reported validity of this research for specialists as 91% and for office sample as 89%. In Iran Sabghian (2009) reported reliability of questionnaire with 24 questions dealing with organizational agility of Mayer and Alen with validity coefficient of 0.85 and 0.79 and 0.83 for affective, normative and continuance aspect respectively. Reliability of questionnaire was confirmed and reliability for factors including: influence and control, access to information and organizational enablers were reported as 0.83, 0.88 and 0.86 respectively (Seaborne 2003). Reliability of this questionnaire as .94 was confirmed in

Iran (Imamgholizadeh et al 2010). In order to determine reliability of questionnaire, it was randomly distributed among 30 employees of university and its Alpha Cronbach coefficient was calculated as the following table.

Variable	Alpha	Micro-scale	Alpha	Variable	Alpha	Micro-scale	Alpha
Partnership in making decision	0.87	Control and influence	0.87	Organizational commitment	0.89	Affective commitment	0.81
		Access to information	0.83			Normative commitment	0.89
		Organizational enablers	0.855			Continuance commitment	0.83

Table 1: reliability coefficient of questionnaire

In order to eliminate variable of sex and education, men and women were selected by equal number and level of education and among them some random samples were selected and questionnaire was distributed among them. In order to analyze data it was used from descriptive statistics including: average, standard deviation and inferential statistics like: Pearson correlation coefficient, regression analysis. All calculations were performed by using SPSS software

Findings & Results

Properties of research reveal that average age of university employees is 33 years, average service record was 5 years, 21% of them were educated at agriculture, 20% were educated at basic sciences, 38% of them were educated at human sciences and remained employees were educated at other field of studies.

Variable and aspect	Average	Standard deviation	Variable and aspect	Average	Standard deviation
Partnership in making decision	3.8	1	Organizational commitment	4.1	0.85
Control and influence	4.2	1.3	Affective aspect	4.6	1
Access to information	3.6	1.4	Normative aspect	3.7	1.4
Organizational enablers	3.4	1.2	Continuance aspect	3.9	1.1

Table 2: describing partnership data for making decision and organizational commitment

Table 2 reveals that average partnership of employee in decision making is 3.8, organizational commitment is 4.1 and theoretical average of research is higher than 3

Hypothesis 1 to 4

- 1) There is positive correlation between partnership of employees for making decision and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers).
- 2) There is positive correlation between control and influence and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers).
- 3) There is positive correlation between access to information and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers).
- 4) There is positive correlation between organizational enabler and organizational commitment and 3 thereof fields (control and influence, access to information, organizational enablers).

Correlation	Organizational commitment		Affective commitment		Normative commitment		Continuance commitment	
	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
Partnership in decision making	0.56	0.001	0.51	0.04	0.68	0.003	0.71	0.001
Control and influence	0.61	0.001	0.61	0.001	0.56	0.001	0.56	0.001
Access to information	0.48	0.001	0.66	0.001	0.62	0.001	0.63	0.001
Organizational enablers	0.57	0.01	0.49	0.021	0.51	0.001	0.67	0.001

Table 3: results of testing hypothesis 1

Information of table 3 shows that employee's partnership has significant correlation with making decision and organizational commitment and its related fields; therefore, hypothesis 1 is confirmed. There is significant relationship between components of partnership on making decision and organizational commitment and thereof fields. Thus, hypotheses 2 to 4 are confirmed. Range of correlation is 0.48 to 0.71 and range of sig is 0.21 to 0.001.

Hypothesis 5:

There is multi positive relationship between components of employee's partnership on making decision (level of control, access to information, organizational enablers and organizational commitment. In order to test this hypothesis it is used from ENTRR method that its results are offered in table 4:

Statistical index	MR	RS	FP	Regression coefficients		
				1	2	3
Control and influence	0.61	0.31	F= 13.2 P= 0.033	$\beta = 0.23$ t = 4.21 P = 0.001		
Access to information	0.48	0.26	F= 8.323 P= 0.004	$\beta = 0.17$ t = 3.76 P= 0.04	$\beta = 0.35$ t = 9.66 P = 0.005	
Organizational enablers	0.57	0.29	F= 6.112 P= 0.002	$\beta = 0.19$ t = 5.37 P = 0.001	$\beta = 0.26$ t = 6.12 P = 0.001	$\beta = 0.18$ t = 4.99 P = 0.021

Table 4: results of regression analysis

Results of hypothesis test show that all 3 components of partnership in making decision have multi correlation with organizational commitment of employees and whereas range of sig is 0.023 to 0.001 it is concluded that hypothesis 5 is confirmed. To determine role and importance of each field of partnership in making decision and organizational commitment, it is used from multi regression statistical method and stepwise method that its results are shown in table 5.

Variables	MR	RS	FP	Remained variables in regression equation based on priority		
				1	2	3
Organizational commitment	0.56	0.51	12.9 0.003	Access to information	Organizational enablers	Control and influence
Affective aspect	0.61	0.20	7.4 0.001	Control and influence	Access to information	
Normative aspect	0.48	0.17	4.8 0.012	Access to information		
Continuance aspect	0.57	0.16	9.8 0.004	Organizational enablers		

Table 5: regression analysis by using stepwise method

Conclusion

Difference in result of research findings and disagreement between several researchers in the field of organizational commitment not only is confusing (Braven 2003) but also is generally in the field of industry and service. Thus goal of the present research is studying simple and multi relationship of partnership of employees at Lorestan University for making decision and organizational commitment. Several factors are effective in organizational commitment of employees; in which, this article insist on some of them. In this research 5 hypotheses were introduced and analyzing data showed that there is positive significant relationship with 3 indices including: control and influence, access to information and organizational enablers

with organizational commitment. In addition partnership of employees in making decision has positive significant relationship with affective, continuance and normative aspect. Results of regression analysis showed that partnership in making decision justifies 51% of organizational commitment and is able to anticipate organizational commitment. Results of research by Peter Lok, Vest and John Keraford (2005), Daglas Trimel (2006) Konik and Fong Lag (2001) Dnaham and Tilor (2000) whereas significance of regression mode reveals that 2 factors including: control and influence and access to information justify 20% of organizational commitment. In addition access to information justifies 17% of organizational commitment and organizational enablers justify 16% of organizational commitment. Therefore, managers of Lorestan university by using results of this research and through involving their employees for decisions of university, may increasing organizational commitment of their employees.

References

Allen, Natalie J., Meyer John P., 1990, The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63.pp:1-18.

Allen, Natalie J., 2003, Examining organizational commitment in china, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 62, pp: 511-515.

\Brenda Scott Ladd, Verena Marshall (2004), "Participation in decision making: a matter of context?", *Journal of the leadership & organization development*.

Chiok, Foong loke, J. (2001), Leadership behaviors: effects on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment, *Journal of nursing management*, N4, 191-204, Vo 9.

Cuskelly, Graham & Boag Alistair (2001)"Organizational commitment as a predictor of committee member turn over among volunteer sport administrators", *Journal Article in sport Management Review*.

Daft Richard & Noe Raymond (2001), "Organizational behavior, NewYork", Harcourt Inc.

Delon.J.E.(2001).A comparative study of employee commitment: Core and contract in a federal agency. Doctorial Dissertation, faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic and Statc University.

Douglas E. Trimble. (2006),organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention of missionaries, *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, N 4,Vo 34, 349-360.

Dunham-Taylor J. (2000),Nurse executive trans for mational leadership found in participative organizational, *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 30(5), 241-250.

Fledman, D. C, Arnold. H. J (1985) "Personality types and career pattern some empirical evidence on Holland's model" *Canadian . Journal of Administrative Science*, Vol. Jun, pp 192-210.

Joo, B. & Lim, T. (2009). The effects of organizational learning culture, perceived job complexity, and proactive personality on organizational commitment and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*,16(1), 48-60.

Lambert,E and E.A. Paoline, 2008. The Influence of Individual, Job and Organizational Characteristics on Correctional Staff Job Stress, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment, *Criminal Justice Review*, (33)4: 541-564.

Latham, G. P., winters, D.C., and Locke, E. A., (1994), "Cognitive andmotivational effects of participation: A mediator study", *journal oforganizational behavior*, Vol .15, 49-63.

Leach Desmond & wall toby.d (nd),(2006), "What is empowerment?"Institute of work psychology, retrieved august 3.form www.about.com.

Lee, Thomas W., Ashford, Susan J.& Walsh,James P., Mowday, Richard .,1992,Commitment propensity, organizational commitment and voluntary turnover: A longitudinal study of organizational entry processes:, *Journal of Management*,V.18,N.1,INC.pp:15-32.

Magoshi,Emiko,Eunmi Chang,2009,Diversity management and the effects on employees organizational commitment: Evidence from Japan and Korea, *Journal world Business* 44,pp:31-40.

Maurer, T.J. & Lippstreu, M. (2008). Who will be committed to an organization that provides support for employee development? *Journal of Management Development*, 27(3), 328-347.

Meriac, J. P., Poling, T. L. & Woehr, D. J. (2009). Are there gender differences in work ethic? an examination of the measurement equivalence of the multidimensional work ethic profile. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(3), 209-213.

Meyer, j.p & herscovitch, "commitment in the workplace, toward a general model", *human resource management review*, vol \ \), (2001).

Meyer, John.P& Allen ,Natalie j,1997,Advanced Topics in Organizational Behavior, Commitment in the Workplaces Theory, Research ,and Application, International Educational and Professional Publisher,pp:67-69.

Mullins Laurie (1999), "Mmanagement and organizational behavior",London: prentice – Hall.

Nauman,W.Lawrenge,1977,Social Research Methods Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, Boston: Allen and Bacan,p:231.

Panaccio, Alexandra, Christian Vandenberg, 2009, Perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study, *Journal of Vocational behavior*,pp:1-13.

Peterlok, Robert Westwood, John Carawford (2005), Perceptions of organizational subculture and their significance for organizational commitment, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(4), P 490-514.

Powell Deborah M, Meyer John P, 2004, Side-bet theory and the three component model of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 65, and pp: 157-161.

Sayyadi, S., & Sarvtamin, H. T. (2011). Organizational Commitment in Educational Departments. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business* (3.2), 1326-1337.

Seaborne, Wendell, (2003), An examination of the relationship between leadership style and empowerment", PhD, Regent university.

Siders, M.A., George, G., & Dharwadkar, R. (2001). The Relationship of internal and external commitment foci to objective job performance measures, *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3):570-579.

Somers M.J., 2009. The combined influence of affective, continuance and normative commitment on employee withdrawal, *J. Vocational Behavior*, 74: 75-81.

Ugboro, I.O. (2003) Influence of management trust on survivors perception of the job insecurity and organizational commitment in a post restructuring and downsizing environment. *The Journal of Behavioral and applied management*, 4(3):230-252.

Zheng W, Sharan K. & Wei j. (2011). New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960 - 2009). *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 4 (1), pp. 012-020, January, 2010. Available online at <http://www.academicjournals.org/AJBM>