

## Contributed Article

# Personal & Situational Factors as Predictors of Managerial Motivation

**Baldev R. Sharma & Mamta Mohapatra**

---

*This paper attempts to test the validity in the Indian context of a widely accepted theory which suggests that human behaviour is the product of a combination of both personal attributes and situational factors. The variables chosen for the study include (a) organisational commitment as a measure of behaviour; (b) employee needs as a measure of personal attributes; and (c) organisational climate as a measure of the situation. The data for the study consists of the responses to a structured question-naire of 88 managers from two manufacturing organisations from the same industry and located in the same state in the eastern India. The findings of the study show that while the theory is fully supported, the situational factors are far more powerful than personal attributes in influencing behaviour.*

**Baldev R. Sharma & Mamta Mohapatra** are Professor Emeritus & Associate Professor respectively in International Management Institute, New Delhi 110057. E-mail: baldevsharma@imi.edu

## Introduction

In the Indian business schools, teaching of organisational behaviour is seldom backed by empirical research. Instead, the teachers almost entirely rely on textbooks and theories/hypotheses developed in the West. That is why Maslow's theory of need hierarchy and Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation, among others, continue to hold sway in the field of teaching of OB in India. Without in any way questioning the profound nature of these and other such theories, it is our contention that many of these Western theories still remain to be validated in the Indian context. The exploratory study on which this paper is based is a modest attempt to test the validity in the Indian context of one of the widely accepted theories which maintains that individual Behaviour (B) is a function of a combination of Personal (P) and Situational (S) factors.  $[B = f(P+S)]$ . Using managerial motivation as a measure of behaviour we have tried to identify the relative importance of employee needs and organisational climate in predicting behaviour. Empirical data for this investigation

consists of responses of 88 managerial employees belonging to two manufacturing organisations from the same industry and located in the same state of Eastern India.

### **Review of Literature**

Organisational commitment is a very well-researched concept not only in the field of management but also within behavioural sciences. Behavioural scientists, having found it difficult to unravel the complexity of human behaviour in its tangible or objective form, have settled for a subjective measure of organisational commitment as its proxy. Both academicians and practitioners feel that an improvement in the level of employee commitment will result in improved job performance as well as organisational effectiveness or at least reduce tardiness, absenteeism and turnover.

Even though it is one of the most researched concepts, there is no formal definition of organisational commitment that is universally acceptable. At a very general level, it can be viewed as a positive feeling of an employee towards the organisation he works in. From the point of view of the employer, organisational commitment means an employee's loyalty to the organisation. The definitions that are widely accepted and used are basically operational in nature. Thus, Mowday et al. (1982) describes a committed person as the one who has a sense of commitment to the organization he works for, which involves his identification with, tendency to stay in,

and willingness to exert efforts for the organisation. A similar operational definition is provided by Cook and Wall (1980) who emphasize the following three related components:

- (a) Pride in the organisation and internalization of its goals.
- (b) Willingness to invest personal effort for the sake of the organisation.
- (c) Affection for and attachment to the organisation and a wish to remain its member.

These operational definitions of the concept suggest that organisational commitment is a multidimensional construct comprising both attitudinal and behavioural commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), it can be considered as a variable with three distinct constructs referred to as affective, continuance, and normative commitment. A good measure of organisational commitment, therefore, is the one that incorporates all three dimensions of the construct. Research studies on the subject of organisational commitment have come up with a diverse range of factors that constitute the antecedents or predictors of commitment. Meyer and Allen (1997) have classified them into three broad categories: (a) personal characteristics, (b) work experiences, and (c) organisational characteristics.

**Personal characteristics:** Insofar as the personal predictors are concerned, organisational commitment is reported to be positively related to the need for

achievement (Steers 1977) and protestant work ethic (Blau 1987, Singh 1990). A number of other studies have found that pre-employment attitudes and expectations are powerful determinants of organisational commitment (Bateman and Strasser 1984, O'Reilly & Caldwell 1981, Salancik & Pfeffer 1978).

Shrivastava & Dolke (1978) have identified locus of control, need strength, and need satisfaction as important antecedents of organisational identification. Others have found achievement motivation to be positively related to organisational commitment (Mathieu 1991, Steers & Spencer 1977). Several researchers have tried to study the role of personal characteristics such as age, education, gender, and organisational tenure. However, as Meyer and Allen (1997) have concluded, empirical research has not been able to demonstrate any significant relationship between these factors and either continuance or normative commitment.

**Work Experiences:** Studies have found that certain job characteristics are significantly correlated with organisational commitment (Buchaman 1974, Fukami & Larson 1984, Steers 1977). Some studies have found job stress to be negatively related to commitment (Hrebiniak & Alutto 1972, Morris & Sherman 1981). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) have found a relationship between task characteristics and organisational commitment. Several other researchers have found a positive relationship between commitment and job characteristics such as autonomy,

challenge, clarity, and membership of a cohesive work group (Wright 1990, Niehoff, Enz & Grover 1990, Flynnand & Tannenbaum 1993, Gandhi 1992, Palich, Hom & Griffeth 1995, Shrivastava & Dolke 1978).

**A large proportion of variation in job satisfaction was due to job related factors.**

Using job satisfaction as a measure of managerial motivation, Sharma and Kaur (2000) found that a large proportion of variation in job satisfaction was due to job related factors. Similar results were found earlier by Joshi and Sharma (1997). After a comprehensive review of literature on job attitudes, Locke (1976) concluded that work satisfaction is engendered by work that is varied, challenging, interesting, allows autonomy, and is not physically fatiguing. Several other studies have found a strong relationship between job characteristics and employee motivation.

**Organisational Climate:** Ogilvie (1986) has argued that HRM practices play an important role in meeting the employees' expectations and fostering high levels of organisational commitment. However, since commitment represents a dynamic emotional state that undergoes changes throughout the employment relationship, the HRM practices too must be dynamic enough to match the changing emotional needs of the employees (Pinks 1992). Guest (1998) is of the view that the concept of organisational commitment lies at the

heart of any analysis of HRM as the very rationale for introducing HRM policies is to increase the levels of commitment so that other positive outcomes can ensue.

Tao et al. (1998) found organisational climate to be one of the factors that significantly impact on organisational commitment. Satisfaction with the organisational environment is found as one of the predictors of organisational commitment (Andolsek & Stebe 2004). McMurray et al. (2004) carried out a study of 1382 employees (belonging to 42 countries) working in three large Australian automobile companies. The outcome of the study established a significant correlation between organisational climate and employee commitment.

In a survey of employees from 863 small and medium-sized Mexican firms, DeClercq and Rius (2007) found that employee commitment was significantly related to their perception of the organisational climate. The study also revealed a positive relationship between organisational commitment and employee effort. A survey study with data from 671 employees, 67 line-managers and 32 HR managers in four hospitals showed that the perception of distinctiveness, consistency and climate strength is positively related to affective organisational commitment (Sanders et al. 2008). A number of Indian studies carried out by the first author have also revealed a strong positive relationship between perceived organisational climate and self-reported organisational

commitment (Sharma & Chauhan 1991, Sharma & Singh 1991, Sharma & Joshi 2001; Sharma & Sharma 2003). However, very few studies have tried to assess the relative contribution of the personal vs. situational factors and that is the gap that the present study intended to fill.

### **Methodology**

To empirically examine the relative contribution of personal and situational factors in predicting managerial motivation, we used the following three sets of measures:

**Personal Factors :** Personal characteristics and attributes of a human being can be conceptualized in many different ways as a person is simultaneously a biological, social, psychological and spiritual being. For purposes of this study, however, we are constrained by the limitation of availability of data. Since it is a case of post-hoc analysis of data already collected by the second author, we could use only one kind of data as a measure of personal factors. A modified version of the questionnaire developed by Hofstede (1980) (Appendix I) was used in the original study to ascertain certain work-related values of the respondents. Each respondent was asked to think of an "ideal job", other than his present job. A list of 15 job characteristics was provided and the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each job characteristic was considered by them to be an important ingredient of an ideal job. The response to each

item was scored on a 5-point scale as follows:

Response	Score
(a) of very little or no importance	1
(b) of little importance	2
(c) of moderate importance	3
(d) very important	4
(e) of utmost importance	5

**How a person defines the ingredients of an “ideal job”, therefore, depends on his values.**

Since factor analysis of the 15-item questionnaire data failed to produce a set of reliable and meaningful groupings of items, it was decided to use each item separately as a measure of employee need. Hofstede (1980) is of the opinion that the varying ratings of these items can help us ascertain the values of the respondents, which are believed to help shape his perception of a situation. How a person defines the ingredients of an “ideal job”, therefore, depends on his values. One may argue, on the other hand, that differential importance assigned to the 15 items are prompted by the different needs that people would like to satisfy through their work experience. In other words, a job characteristic rated as most important may be treated as a reflection of a relatively high need of the person for that particular ingredient of the job. In the present study, we shall treat responses to the 15-item questionnaire as a measure of various employee needs. Although we propose to treat the 15-item data as 15 different variables, these items have

been classified under five sets of employee needs. This classification has been made based purely on the face value (content) of each item and not on the basis of any statistical technique.

**Situational Factors:** For purposes of the present study, the most relevant situation that can influence employee motivation is the climate of an organisation which results from the application of various man-management policies and practices. On the basis of an elaborate analysis of data reported in Mohapatra and Sharma (2008), we have developed the following five multi-item scales to measure various dimensions of organisational climate, which will be used in the present study as measures of the situational factors (Appendix II):

- (b) Progressive Management
- (c) Participative Management
- (d) Interpersonal Harmony
- (e) Ethical Practices
- (f) Benevolent Management

Unfortunately, we have no data on “work experiences” and, therefore, that part of the situation remains untested in the present study.

**Managerial Motivation:** A measure of managerial motivation was also developed on the basis of factor analysis (Mohapatra & Sharma 2008). The following 6-item scale will be treated as a measure of organisational commitment:

1. In this company our collective will to win is high.

2. In this company we share the same strategic goals.
3. In this company there is an open communication system that the employees agree is transparent.
4. In this company employees are actively involved in solving day-to-day problems through regular meetings and joint forums.
5. Organisation members are aware of the vision and mission of the company.
6. Organisation members frequently make personal sacrifices for the firm out of commitment to the company's shared values.

of organisational hierarchy ranging between Executive (lowest) and General Manager or above (highest). All of them were males (Appendix III).

**The situation within which the respondents are working appears to be more important than their personal attributes.**

### Findings

Table 1 presents in a summary form the responses of 88 managers to each of the variables used in this study. Also presented in this table are the zero-order correlations between each of the independent variables and the dependent variable (organisational commitment). A look at the last column will show that while all five situational factors are significantly correlated with employee motivation, only 3 out of the 15 personal factors are so related. On the face of it, therefore, the situation within which the respondents are working appears to be more important than their personal attributes.

The sample for this study is drawn from two manufacturing organisations belonging to the same industry and located in the same state in the eastern India. A total of 88 managers from these two organisations were personally approached and asked to complete a detailed "structured" questionnaire. The respondents belonged to different levels

**Table 1: Mean & Standard Deviation & Zero-Order Correlations of all Variables (N=88)**

Sl. No.	Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach Alpha	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Correlation with Organisational Commitment	Level of Significance
<b>I. ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE</b>							
1.	Progressive Management	6	.85	22.49	4.25	.710	P < .001
2.	Participative Management	5	.85	18.83	3.21	.703	P < .001
3.	Interpersonal Harmony	4	.84	14.61	2.68	.585	P < .001
4.	Ethical Practices	4	.82	14.76	3.46	.611	P < .001
5.	Benevolent Management	2	.88	7.21	2.07	.566	P < .001

<b>II. EMPLOYEE NEEDS</b>							
<b>A. Need for Achievement</b>							
1.	An ideal job should enable one to make a real contribution to the success of the Co.	1	-	4.41	0.64	.155	n.s.
7.	An ideal job should provide challenging tasks to be able to get a sense of accomplishment.	1	-	4.32	0.67	.036	n.s.
8.	An ideal job should provide an opportunity for advancement.	1	-	4.23	0.78	.103	n.s.
9.	An ideal job is one that is well-defined and its requirements are clear.	1	-	3.76	1.09	.022	n.s.
10.	An ideal job provides an element of variety and adventure.	1	-	3.89	0.81	.008	n.s.
<b>B. Need for Affiliation</b>							
11.	An ideal job enables one to serve one's country.	1	-	4.11	0.81	.130	n.s.
12.	An ideal job allows a good working relationship with one's direct superior.	1	-	4.24	0.61	.224	P < .05
13.	An ideal job enables one to work with people who cooperate with one another.	1	-	4.05	0.60	.048	n.s.
14.	An ideal job provides an opportunity for helping other people.	1	-	3.82	0.72	.127	n.s.
<b>C. Need for Power</b>							
15.	An ideal job allows freedom to adopt one's own approach to the job.	1	-	4.00	0.73	.098	n.s.
16.	An ideal job ensures that one is consulted by the immediate superior.	1	-	3.72	0.71	.320	P < .01
<b>D. Need for Status</b>							
17.	An ideal job is one that is located in a prestigious/successful organization.	1	-	4.11	0.63	.224	P < .05
18.	An ideal job provides an opportunity for high earnings.	1	-	3.85	0.84	.135	n.s.
<b>E. Need for Security</b>							
19.	An ideal job provides good physical working conditions.	1	-	4.14	0.89	.133	n.s.
20.	An ideal job provides security of employment.	1	-	4.09	0.85	.145	n.s.
<b>III. MANAGERIAL MOTIVATION</b>							
21.	Organisational Commitment	6	.87	21.74	4.01	-	-

As a next step, we have tried to countercheck the above conclusion with the help of a multiple regression to identify a set of critical predictors of managerial motivation and also to

pinpoint the individual contribution of each predictor. To carry out this analysis, it was decided to utilize only eight independent variables that were found to be significantly correlated with organisational commitment.

**Table 2: Inter-correlation Matrix for the Selected Variables (N=88)**

	1. Organi- sational Commit- ment	2. Prog- ressive Manage- ment	3. Parti- cipative Manage- ment	4. Inter- personal Harmony	5. Ethical Practices	6. Benevolent Manage- ment	7. Relationship With Superior	8. To be Consult- ed	9. Prestige of Organi- zation
1. Organisational Commitment	1.000	.710***	.703***	.585***	.611***	.566***	.224*	.320**	.224*
2. Progressive Management	.710***	1.000	.697***	.544***	.615***	.500***	.079 <sup>ns</sup>	.126 <sup>ns</sup>	.124 <sup>ns</sup>
3. Participative Management	.703***	.697***	1.000	.505***	.535***	.469***	.181 <sup>ns</sup>	.140 <sup>ns</sup>	.117 <sup>ns</sup>
4. Interpersonal Harmony	.585***	.544***	.505***	1.000	.371***	.518***	.114 <sup>ns</sup>	.068 <sup>ns</sup>	.101 <sup>ns</sup>
5. Ethical Practices	.611***	.615**	.535***	.371***	1.000	.459***	.159 <sup>ns</sup>	.318**	.066 <sup>ns</sup>
6. Benevolent Management	.566***	.500***	.469***	.518***	.459***	1.000	.254*	.220*	.079 <sup>ns</sup>
7. Relationship with Superior	.224*	.079 <sup>ns</sup>	.181 <sup>ns</sup>	.114 <sup>ns</sup>	.159 <sup>ns</sup>	.254*	1.000	.159 <sup>ns</sup>	.258*
8. To be Consulted	.320**	.126 <sup>ns</sup>	.140 <sup>ns</sup>	.068 <sup>ns</sup>	.318**	.220*	.159 <sup>ns</sup>	1.000	.226*
9. Prestige of Organization	.224*	.124 <sup>ns</sup>	.117 <sup>ns</sup>	.101 <sup>ns</sup>	.066 <sup>ns</sup>	.079 <sup>ns</sup>	.258*	.226*	1.000

Legend: \*\*\* (P < .001)      \*\* (P < .01)      \* (P < .05)      ns (not significant)

A look at column 1 (or row 1) of Table 2 will show that although each of the eight independent variables is significantly correlated with organisational commitment, the strength of this relationship varies widely between .224 (lowest) and .710 (highest). However, these are only zero-order correlations and, moreover, some of the independent variables are highly correlated among themselves. It is, therefore, not possible to say whether or not all of the observed eight correlations with organisational

commitment are indeed genuine as some of them might be spurious.

To identify the genuine and most critical predictors of managerial motivation, therefore, it is necessary to go beyond the zero-order correlations and undertake multivariate analysis. This was done with the help of multiple regression technique, which enabled us to identify the combination of variables that together explain two-thirds of the variance in managerial motivation (Table 3):

**Table 3: Predictors of Organisational Commitment**

Sl. No.	Predictors of Organisational Commitment	Zero-Order Correlation (A)	Std. Beta Coefficient (B)	Individual Contribution (A x B)
1.	Progressive Management	.710***	.333***	.2364
2.	Participative Management	.703***	.328***	.2306
3.	To be Consulted (Need for Power)	.320**	.210***	.1305
4.	Interpersonal Harmony	.585***	.223**	.0694
			Total (R <sup>2</sup> )	.6669

\*\*\* (P &lt; .001)

\*\* (P &lt; .01)

**Both situational factors and personal attributes influence the level of managerial motivation.**

The results of regression analysis clearly show that both situational factors and personal attributes influence the level of managerial motivation. Out of the five dimensions of organisational climate, three have emerged as critical predictors of organisational commitment. On the other hand, only one out of the three measures of employee needs is found to be a critical predictor. Moreover, out of the total variance explained (.667) by the four predictors, .536 (80 per cent) is explained by the situational factors and the remaining .131 (20 per cent) is explained by one of the personal attributes (need for power).

### Discussion

Using a relatively small sample of 88 managers, this exploratory study has been able to explain two-thirds of the variance in managerial motivation. Between the two sets of predictors, the

situational factors (organisational climate) are found to be far more critical than the personal factors (employee needs). Some renowned scholars had advocated the use of person-situation interaction as the determinant of human behaviour (Koffka 1935, Lewin 1935, Murray 1938). The findings of the present study are in complete agreement with the said position. Thus, the equation [B= f(P+S)] stands validated in the Indian context.

In a study of 148 junior and middle level managers of a public sector consultancy organization, 25 independent variables were used to predict variance in the level of organisational commitment (Sharma & Singh 1991). The independent variables included 7 demographic, 4 personality, 4 task, and 10 organisational climate related factors. The multiple regression analysis revealed that all four sets of variables were present in the best equation that predicted 55.78 per cent of the variance in organisational commitment. When they were grouped into two categories (personal and situational), the authors found that the contribution of the

situational factors in influencing employee commitment (91%) was 10 times as important as that of the personal factors (9%).

Using the same variables and instruments as the ones just described, an all India study of managerial motivation was carried out by the first author of this paper. The sample consisted of 5184 junior and middle level managers working in 30 well-known public sector organisations located in different parts of India. Using organization as the unit of analysis, Sharma and Chauhan (1991) found that four out of the 25 independent variables explained 94 per cent of variance in organisational commitment. Three out of those four predictors represented certain dimensions of organisational climate, which together explained 87 per cent of the variance. The fourth predictor related to one of the personality traits, which explained the remaining 7 per cent of the variance in organisational commitment. These results based on regression analysis confirmed the earlier finding that situational factors are far more important than personal attributes in influencing managerial motivation in India.

**Situational factors are far more important than personal attributes in influencing managerial motivation in India.**

In a somewhat related study of 200 blue-collar workers of a private sector manufacturing organization, Sharma

and Sharma (1997) investigated the determinants of job satisfaction. The 12 independent variables used in the study included 3 personality traits, 7 task characteristics, and 2 dimensions of organisational climate. The results of multiple regression analysis revealed that 4 out of the 12 independent variables could explain only 29 per cent of the variance in job satisfaction. These 4 predictors consisted of two organisational and two task characteristics, while none of the personality traits emerged as the critical determinant of job satisfaction. The results of this study too emphasize the dominant role of the situational factors in influencing employee motivation in India. Colarelli et al. (1987) investigated the relative and combined effects of personal and situational variables on job outcomes of 280 newly hired, entry-level accountants at "Big-Eight" firms. The personal variables were cognitive ability, socioeconomic status, and career goals, while the situational variables were all related to the task (e.g., job feedback, autonomy, and job context). The results of the study showed that, while both personal and situational variables predict job outcomes, the situational variables account for the most variance in job performance, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment.

### **Conclusion**

The measure of the situation used in the present study is confined only to organisational climate, which is based on the man-management policies and

practices. Another important situational factor that is not covered by the present study but ought to be included in future research is the task or job design, which too is known to be one of the significant predictors of employee motivation. Likewise, our measure of personal factors is confined only to employee needs. Further research in this area may also include certain other personal factors (e.g., values, beliefs, personality traits and demographic background) so as to make future studies more comprehensive.

These limitations notwithstanding, the results of the present exploratory study are both interesting and meaningful. The model used in this study and the methods employed to analyze the empirical data can be easily replicated by future researchers. If subsequent studies along these lines support the findings presented in this paper, it should be possible to say with greater confidence that situational factors are indeed more important than the personal factors in influencing managerial motivation. It is relatively easier to modify the situational factors than to change the personal attributes. Therefore, apart from confirming a theoretical proposition, the findings of such studies are likely to have significant practical value.

## References

- Andolsek, Dana Mesner & Janez Stebe (2004), "Multinational Perspectives on Work Values and Commitment," *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4:181-209.
- Bateman, T.S. & S. Strasser (1984), "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organisational Commitment," *Academy of Management Journal*, 27: 95-112.
- Blau, G.J. (1987), "Using a Person-Environment Fit Model to Predict Job Involvement and Organisational Commitment," *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 30:240-57.
- Buchanan, B. (1974), "Building Organisational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organisations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 533-46.
- Colarelli, Stephen M. et al. (1987), "Comparative Effects of Personal and Situational Influences on Job Outcomes of New Professionals," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72: 558-66.
- Cook, J. & T.D. Wall (1980), "New Work Attitude Measures of Organisational Commitment and Personal Need Non-Fulfillment," *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53:29-52.
- De Clercq, Dirk & I.B. Rius (2007), "Organisational Commitment in Mexican Small and Medium-Sized Firms: The Role of Work Status, Organisational Climate, and Entrepreneurial Orientation," *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45, 467-90.
- Flynn, D.M. & S.I. Tannenbaum (1993), "Correlates of Organisational Commitment: Differences in the Public and Private Sector," *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 8:103-16.
- Fukami, C.V. & E.W. Larson (1984), "Commitment to Company and Union: Parallel Models," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69:367-71.
- Gandhi, P. (1992), "Impact of Job Enrichment on Work and Organisational Identification," *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 27:289-98.
- Guest, D.E. (1998). "Beyond HRM: Commitment and the Contract Culture," in P.Sparrow and M. Marchington (eds.), *Human*

- Resource Management: The New Agenda. London: FT Pitman Publishing: 37-51.
- Hofstede, Geert (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage.
- Hrebiniak, L.G. & J.A. Alutto (1972), "Personal and Role-Related Factors in Development of Organisational Commitment," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 555-72.
- Joshi, R.J. & Baldev R. Sharma (1997), "Determinants of Managerial Job Satisfaction in a Private Organization," *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 33:48-67.
- Koffka, K. (1935), *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Lewin, Kurt (1935), *Dynamic Theory of Personality*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Locke, E.P. (1976). "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction," in Dunnette, M.D.(ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally:1297-1349.
- Mathieu, J.E. & D. Zajac (1990). "A Review of Meta-analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organisational Commitment," *Psychological Bulletin*:108-94.
- McMurray, Adela et al. (2004), "The Relationship between Organisational Commitment and Organisational Climate in Manufacturing," *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15: 473-88.
- Meyer, J.P. & N.J. Allen (1991). "A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organisational Commitment," *Human Resource Management Review*, 1:61-89.
- Meyer, J.P. & N.J. Allen (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morris, J.H. & J.D. Sherman (1981), "Generalisability of an Organisational Commitment Model." *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 512-26.
- Mowday, R.T. et al. (1982), *Organisational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Murray, H.A. (1938), *Explanation in Personality*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Niehoff, B.P., C.A. Enz & R.A. Grover (1990), "The Impact of Top-Management Actions on Employee Attitudes and Perceptions," *Group and Organisational Studies*, 15, 337-52.
- Ogilvie, J.R. (1986). "The Role of Human Resource Management Practices in Predicting Organisational Commitment," *Group and Organisational Studies*, 11: 335-59.
- O'Reilly, C.A. & D. F. Caldwell (1981), "The Commitment and Job Tenure of New Employees: Some Evidence of Post Decisional Justification," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26:597-616.
- Palich, L.E., P.W. Hom & R.W. Griffeth (1995), "Managing in the International Context: Testing Cultural Generality of Sources of Commitment to Multinational Enterprises," *Journal of Management*, 21: 671-90.
- Pinks, G.J. (1992), *Facilitating Organisational Commitment through Human Resource Practices*. Ontario, Canada: IRC Press.
- Salancik, G.R. & J. Pfeffer (1978), "A Social Information Processing Approach to Job Attitudes and Task Design," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.23: 224-53.
- Sanders, Karin et al. (2008), "The Impact of Individual and Shared Employee Perceptions of HRM on Affective Commitment: Considering Climate Strength," *Personnel Review*, 37: 412-25.
- Sharma, Baldev R. (1987), *Not By Bread Alone: A Study of Organisational Climate and*

- Employer-Employee Relations in India, New Delhi: Shri Ram Centre for IR & HR.
- Sharma, Baldev R. & Kamaljit Kaur (2000). "Determinants of Managerial Motivation in a Public Sector Manufacturing Organization," *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 36: 141-58.
- Sharma, Baldev R. & Poonam Chauhan (1991), "Organisational Commitment of Public Sector Managers," *Productivity*, 32: 203-13.
- Sharma, Baldev R. & Shailendra Singh (1991), "Determinants of Organisational Commitment," *Management and Labour Studies*, 16:63-75.
- Sharma, Madan Pal & Baldev R. Sharma (1997), "Determinants of Job Satisfaction," *Abhigyan*, 15:1-10.
- Shrivastava, P.K. & A.M. Dolke (1978), Personality and Organisational Correlates of Work and Organisational Identification, Ahmedabad: ATIRA.
- Singh, Shailendra (1990), Organisational Stress and Executive Behaviour. New Delhi: Shri Ram Centre for IR & HR.
- Steers, R.M. (1977), "Antecedents and Outcomes of Organisational Commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22:46-56.
- Steers, R.M. & D.G. Spencer (1977), "The Role of Achievement Motivation in Job Design," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62: 472-79.
- Tao, Masao et al. (1998), "A Study of Antecedents of Organisational Commitment," *Japanese Psychological Research*, 40: 198-205.
- Wright, P.L. (1990). "Teller Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment as they Relate to Career Orientations," *Human Relations*, 43: 369-81.

### Appendix I: Questionnaire Used to Measure Employee Needs

- Please think of an *ideal job - disregarding your present job*. In choosing an ideal job, how important would each of the following job requirements be to you personally?
1. Have challenging tasks to do, from which you can get a personal sense of accomplishment?
  2. Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)?
  3. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior?
  4. Have security of employment?
  5. Have considerable freedom to adopt your own approach to the job?
  6. Work with people who cooperate well with one another?
  7. Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions?
  8. Make a real contribution to the success of your company or organization?
  9. Have an opportunity for high earnings?
  10. Serve your country?
  11. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 12. Have an element of variety and adventure in the job?                               | Hofstede(1980), which consisted of 47 questions of which 15 were selected for purposes of analysis for this study. |
| 13. Work in a prestigious, successful company or organization?                         | 2. Responses to each of the above job requirements were obtained using the following scale:                        |
| 14. Have an opportunity for helping other people?                                      | - of utmost importance (5)   |
| 15. Work in a well-defined job situation where the requirements are clear?             | - very important (4)   |
| <b>Notes:</b>  | - of moderate importance (3)   |
| 1. This questionnaire is a modified version of the original questionnaire developed by | - of little importance (2)   |
|  | - of very little or no importance (1)  |

## **Appendix II: Questionnaire Used to Measure Organisational Climate**

---

### **I. PROGRESSIVE MANAGEMENT**

---

1. The company is quick to adopt latest management tools and techniques for performance improvement
  2. In this company good work is always recognized by the management
  3. In this company education and skills are an important factor in determining salary grades
  4. In this company employees who contribute to the company's productivity and efficiency are invariably appreciated
  5. In this company education and skills training is an on-going activity and forms part of a long-term vision for developing a qualified and competent workforce
  6. In this company customer's interest always comes first, ahead of the owners
- 

### **2. PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT**

---

1. In this company employee suggestions are acted upon expeditiously and contributions rewarded promptly
  2. In this company employees are encouraged to think upside down and come up with unconventional viewpoints/suggestions
  3. Organization members get necessary help and cooperation in carrying out their duties from superiors
  4. Organization members get necessary help and cooperation in carrying out their duties from peers
  5. Organization members get necessary help and cooperation in carrying out their duties from subordinates
- 

### **III. INTERPERSONAL HARMONY**

---

1. Organization members are clear about the scope and responsibilities of their role in the organization
  2. People in this company try to make friends and to keep their relationships strong
  3. People in this company often socialize outside the office
  4. People in this company stay in touch even with those persons who have left the group
-

---

**IV. ETHICAL PRACTICES**

---

1. The company eagerly carries out its social responsibility
  2. The company follows high ethical standards and practices in the conduct of its business
  3. The company has a transparent performance appraisal system
  4. The company plans on a regular basis for career development of its employees
- 

**V. BENEVOLENT MANAGEMENT**

---

1. Management of this company is always sympathetic in dealing with employee problems
  2. Management of this company always consults the employees before taking any important decision
- 

**Appendix – III: Background Profile of the Respondents (N=88)**

Sl. No.	Background Characteristics	Number	Per Cent
1.	<b>AGE</b>		
	26-35 years	25	28.41
	36-40 years	30	34.09
	Over 40 years	33	37.50
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.00</b>
2.	<b>WORK EXPERIENCE</b>		
	01-05 years	28	31.82
	06-10 years	36	40.91
	Over 10 years	24	27.27
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.00</b>
3.	<b>LEVEL OF EDUCATION</b>		
	Graduates	43	48.86
	Postgraduates	45	51.14
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.00</b>
4.	<b>PLACE OF BIRTH</b>		
	Eastern Region	84	95.46
	Northern Region	2	2.27
	Southern Region	2	2.27
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.00</b>
5.	<b>LEVEL</b>		
	Executive	42	47.73
	Middle Manager	30	34.09
	Senior Manager	8	9.09
	GM and Above	8	9.09
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100.00</b>